The Effect of Teacher Role-Development Training on the Teaching Effectiveness, Motivation, and Confidence of Undergraduate Music Education Majors: A Preliminary Study

By: David J. Teachout and Constance L. McKoy

Teachout, D. J. & McKoy, C. L. (2010). The effect of teacher role-development training on the teaching effectiveness, motivation, and confidence of undergraduate music education majors: A preliminary study. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 20*(1), 88-104.

Abstract:

The purpose of this study was to examine effects of teacher role development training on undergraduate music education majors' teaching effectiveness, attributions for success and failure in music teaching, and confidence to continue pursuing a music teaching career. Participants (N = 18) included students who had received teacher role development training (n = 9) and students who had not received such training (n = 9). Participants completed the *Concerns, Attributions, and Confidence Measure*. Participants' teaching effectiveness was determined using the *Survey of Teaching Effectiveness*. No significant differences were found between the two groups for any dependent variables; however, main effect differences were found among levels of concerns and among areas of attribution for success or failure in teaching.

Article:

Music teacher educators increasingly view their role as one of facilitating a level of maturation in undergraduate music education majors such that these prospective music teachers might likely go on to transcend tradition and improve and expand current music education practice (Regelski, 1998; Rose, 1990; Woodford, 2005). It would follow that such a charge requires innovative approaches to music teacher pedagogy based on foundational principles explaining occupation identity formation, the aim being to empower prospective music teachers to construct their own occupational identities unencumbered by current norms of the profession (Kincheloe & McLaren, 2000).

One such principle, occupational socialization, is the process of adopting and developing attitudes and displaying behaviors necessary to establish recognized and sustainable competence within the social context of a particular profession, involving interactions between an individual and others in the profession. Occupational socialization can explain how one's occupational identity is formed (Merton, 1957). In describing social construction of music teacher identity in undergraduate music education majors, Woodford (2002) suggests the socialization process occurs in two stages: (a) primary socialization, occurring in childhood and affected by personal significant others (e.g., parents, other family members, teachers, etc.) with whom the individual identifies emotionally, and (b) secondary socialization, occurring as one enters undergraduate school when the individual begins pursuing specialized knowledge and skills associated with a career and is affected by peers and significant others in the profession. Isbell (2008) found

experience associated with secondary socialization to be a stronger predictor of occupational identity than experience from primary socialization. Given the opportunity music teacher educators have to affect the secondary socialization process, it is important to develop and test approaches to music teacher education pedagogy that have promise in facilitating music teacher role development (Teachout, 2007; Woodford, 2002).

The present study was a preliminary attempt to examine early effects of role development training on undergraduate music education majors as they progressed through their degree program. When determining components to include in training, several theories and specific activities were considered. Becker and Carper (1970) claimed role development takes place when people are (a) able to accept and embrace their occupational title, (b) given opportunities to learn professional knowledge through performing tasks common to the profession, (c) able to identify with the group practicing the role by committing to particular organizations or institutional positions common to the profession, and (d) able to recognize and accept the social position of the professional group from the perspective of those outside the profession.

Fuller and Brown (1975) identified three ordered levels of teacher development and characterized each by the associated concerns of the teacher: Level 1 = concerns with self-survival, Level 2 = concerns with the task of teaching, and Level 3 = concerns with the impact of teaching on students. Glickman (1985) identified three ordered conferencing styles (directive, collaborative, and non-directive), and found each to be effective at a corresponding Fuller and Brown level of teacher development. Glickman asserted a directive conferencing style worked best with those at Level 1, a collaborative style was most effective with those at Level 2, and a non-directive style worked best with those at Level 3. Subsequent and related research has both challenged (Burden, 1990; Burn, Hagger, & Mutton, 2003; Guillaume & Rudney, 1993; Smith & Sanche, 1993) and substantiated the Fuller and Brown hypothesis (Burden, 1982; Katz, 1972; Ralph, 2004). Borich (2000) suggests the Fuller and Brown development theory is an idealized construct and a linear progression from self to task to impact concerns may not always occur. Similarly, Campbell and Thompson (2007) found a marked departure from Fuller and Brown's theoretical sequence when preservice teachers in their sample found impact-related issues to be of more concern than task- or self-related issues.

Woodford (2002) affirmed "One of the first steps in any reflective or critical model of music teacher education is to make students' beliefs explicit so that they can be subjected to critical scrutiny" (p. 690). Further, researchers in education have found evidence suggesting beliefs of preservice teachers strongly influence what they learn, how they learn, and their levels of engagement in the teacher education program (Richardson, 1996). Likewise, Thompson (2007) affirmed, "When the goal is encouraging students to examine their belief structures, the first step must be to create opportunities for preservice teachers to uncover their beliefs about teaching and learning" (p. 33).

Music education researchers have found support for activities that facilitate teacher role development of undergraduate music education majors. Wolfgang (1990) found early field experience had a positive effect on role identity of music education majors. Broyles (1997) found videotaping of teaching sessions helped music student teachers to take on the teacher role, and Paul (1998) found a strong connection between peer teaching laboratory experience and

commitment to professional tasks and knowledge. Fant (1996) found a positive correlation between field experiences with feedback and scores of teacher effectiveness, measured by the Survey of Teaching Effectiveness (STE) (Hamann & Baker, 1996) during student teaching. He also concluded a peer-teaching laboratory with reflective feedback is an effective setting for undergraduate teacher training in music. Similarly, Paul, Teachout, Sullivan, Kelly, Bauer, and Raiber (2001) found early field teaching experience, peer teaching experience, and self reflection on videos of such teaching to be positively correlated with teaching effectiveness. Further, those with a greater number of such experiences were found to score higher on initial teaching performance than did those with fewer such experiences.

Components of Teacher Role Development Training

Guided by related literature, the first course of a three-course foundational role-development sequence was conceptualized to include components and activities that require class members to claim their professional title (Becker & Caper, 1970), examine their preconceptions about music teaching (Thompson, 2007; Woodford, 2002), engage in activities with their professional reference group (Becker & Carper, 1970), engage in field observation, peer-teaching and self-reflection on their observation and teaching activities (Broyles, 2007; Paul, 1998; Paul et al., 2001; Raiber, 1997; Wolfgang, 1990), and examine their concerns about music teaching (Fuller & Brown, 1975). In Spring 2007, an experimental version of the sequence's first course was offered as an elective option for any interested freshmen; second and third courses of the sequence are being developed and will be implemented beginning Spring 2010 and Fall 2010, respectively. By Fall 2008, most of those freshmen were in their junior year and those following the choral/general music education track were enrolled in a required elementary general music education methods course. Due to the optional nature of the experimental course, exactly half of the students in the elementary general music education methods course had taken the experimental course, providing a unique opportunity to compare groups. When contemplating such a comparison, several questions arose immediately. Would there be a difference between groups in teaching effectiveness? Would there be a difference between groups regarding Fuller and Brown's levels of concerns? Upon further consideration, more questions surfaced. How might groups compare when examining attributions of causes for success and failure in music teaching? Asmus (1985, 1986a, 1986b) examined attributions of causes for success and failure in music with a variety of populations and found success to be most often associated with internal attributes (i.e., effort and ability). Would similar results occur when examining music *teaching*? Finally, would there be a difference between groups in their confidence about their career plans to teach music? These queries formed the foundation of specific research questions identified for the present study:

1. Does a difference in teaching effectiveness exist between students who have taken a teacher role development course and those who have not taken such a course?
2. Do differences among levels of concerns (self, task, and impact) exist between students who have taken a teacher-role development course and those who have not taken such a course?
3. Do differences in attributions of causes for success and failure in teaching (effort, background, classroom environment, ability, and affect) exist between students who have taken a teacher role development course and those who have not taken such a course?

4. Does a difference in degree of confidence about career plans to teach music exist between students who have taken a teacher role development course and those who have not taken such a course?

METHOD

Participants

Participants (N = 18) were undergraduate music education majors at a large Southeastern university enrolled in the fall 2008 semester offering of an elementary general music education methods course taught by one of the researchers. Nine participants had received teacher role-development training during their previous enrollment in an elective introduction to music education course in the spring semester of 2007. The other nine participants had not experienced such training.

Surveys

Two surveys were used to address research questions in this study. A modified version of *The Survey of Teaching Effectiveness* (STE) (Hamann & Baker, 1996) was used to examine participants' teaching effectiveness as assessed by behavioral observation of the participants. Two weighted categories comprise the STE: "Lesson Delivery Skills," weighted 40%, and "Planning and Presentation of Lesson," weighted 60%. Items in the "Lesson Delivery Skills" category of the survey include posture, eye contact, use of gestures, facial expression, and vocal inflection. Items in the "Planning and Presentation of Lesson" category of the survey include evidence of lesson planning, subject matter competence, pacing, sequence pattern/rehearsal cycle, and teaching style. Each survey item consists of a Likert scale ranging from 1 (poor) to 5 (excellent) with observable behavioral descriptors defining "poor" and "excellent" performance for each survey item. A total score for the STE can range from 10 to 50 points.

To assess participants' self-reported level of teaching concerns, attributions of teaching behaviors, and confidence to pursue a music teaching career, a second survey, the *Concerns, Attributions, and Confidence Measure* (CACM), was devised by the researchers. Items in the CACM relating to level of teaching concerns were adapted from a measure developed by Campbell and Thompson (2007); survey items relating to attributions of teaching behaviors were adapted from Asmus' (1989) *Measures of Motivation in Music*. The one item in the CACM relating to confidence to pursue a music teaching career was developed by the researchers.

Each of the 41 items in the CACM consists of a statement with a four-point Likert response scale. The "Concerns" portion of the CACM survey was used to assess participants' self-reported concerns related to self, the instructional task, and impact of instruction on student learning. Response options for this portion of the survey are as follows: 1 = *Not Concerned,* 2 = *Somewhat Concerned,* 3 = *Concerned,* and 4 = *Highly Concerned*. The "Attributions" portion of the survey was used to assess the extent to which participants attributed importance of effort, background, classroom environment, ability, and affect to success or failure in music teaching. Response options for this portion of the survey are as follows: 1 = *Not Important,* 2 = *Somewhat Important,* 3 = *Important,* and 4 = *Highly Important.* Response options for the "Confidence" item were as follows: 1 = *Not Confident,* 2 = *Somewhat Confident,* 3 = *Confident,* and 4 = *Highly Confident.*

Hamann (1995) reported test-retest reliability of .83 for the STE. Although Campbell and Thompson (2007) did not report reliability coefficients for their survey, they did indicate *Teaching Concerns Checklist* (Borich 2000) on which their instrument was based yielded alpha coefficients of reliability of .91 for the self subscale, .84 for the task subscale, and .94 for the impact subscale (Borich & Tombari, 1997). Asmus (1989) reported maximum alpha coefficients of reliability of .83, .77, .79, .81, and .73 for the respective "Effort," "Background," "Classroom Environment," "Musical Ability," and "Affect for Music" attributes comprising subscales of the *Measures of Motivation in Music.*

Data Collection

The elementary general music education methods course included weekly peer teaching experience during the first half of the semester followed by weekly practicum field experience in the second half of the semester. As part of participants' practicum field experience, each participant was video recorded teaching several music lessons to public school students in one instructional level with a range from kindergarten to grade five. A digital video recording of each participant's first practicum teaching episode was imported into a digital video editing program to create excerpts of approximately 10 minutes in length. A total of 18 excerpts were created then uploaded to an area of the elementary general music education methods course website accessible to participants.

Because one of the two researchers was an instructor for the course in which students targeted for participation in the study were enrolled, precautions were taken to assure only the researcher who was not the students' instructor was involved in data collection. During one of the scheduled elementary general music education methods course class sessions, students met with the non-instructor researcher in a computer laboratory where they were provided information regarding informed consent and a copy of the CACM. Students who signed the consent form were then asked to access and view their video excerpt from the online course website via individual desktop computer terminals equipped with headphones or ear buds, after which they completed the CACM. The instructor researcher was not present during the data collection session and did not receive access to data until after the conclusion of the semester.

To evaluate participants' teaching effectiveness, three veteran licensed public school elementary general music teachers were selected to view the 18 video teaching excerpts and complete the STE. Prior to viewing the video excerpts, teacher adjudicators were presented with video exemplars of effective (i.e., mean score across three judges from a prior study = 46.74) and ineffective (i.e., mean score across three judges from a prior study = 19.92) teaching as a method of establishing a standard for evaluation. As participants' video teaching excerpts were accessed from the course website via a computer workstation and shown on a projection screen, teacher adjudicators were able to view the video teaching excerpts simultaneously. Teacher adjudicators completed an STE for each of the 18 video teaching excerpts they viewed.

RESULTS

Four research questions were formulated for this study: (a) Does a difference in teaching effectiveness exist between students who have taken a teacher-role development course and those who have not taken such a course? (b) Do differences among levels of concerns (i.e., self, task, and impact) exist between students who have taken a teacher-role development course and

those who have not taken such a course? (c) Do differences in attributions of causes for success and failure in teaching (i.e., effort, background, classroom environment, ability, and affect) exist between students who have taken a teacher-role development course and those who have not taken such a course? (d) Does a difference in the degree of confidence about career plans to teach music exist between students who have taken a teacher role development course and those who have not taken such a course?

An intra-class correlation analysis using a two-way mixed effects model where judges are a fixed effect and target ratings are a random effect was used to determine reliability of judges' STE scores. Average measures reliability analysis, which uses the mean of all ratings as the unit of analysis, yielded a coefficient of $r = .75$. Consequently means of judges' scores for each participant were used in data analysis. Due to the small number of participants, non-parametric statistical analyses were used to address the research questions. Finally, a probability level of $\alpha = .05$ was applied to all four research questions.

A Mann-Whitney U test was calculated to determine whether significant differences in teaching effectiveness existed between those having taken a teacher role development course and those who have not taken such a course. No significant differences were found between the two groups in either of the two weighted categories comprising the STE or in overall STE scores.

Regarding research question two, a Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA was used to determine whether significant differences existed between the two groups across the three levels of concerns. No significant differences were found between groups for any of the three levels of concerns. Further, a Friedman's Rank Test was used to determine whether differences occurred among levels of concerns, regardless of training. Significant differences were found among concerns levels, X^2 (2) = 19.34, $p = .000$. A series of Wilcoxon Signed Ranks tests were used to determine statistical significance among levels; impact concerns were found to be rated significantly higher than were self concerns or task concerns. Further, self concerns were found to be rated significantly higher than were task concerns.

Regarding research question three, a Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA was used to determine whether significant differences existed between the two groups across the five attributions. No significant differences were found between groups for any of the five attributions. Further a Friedman's Rank Test was used to determine whether differences occurred among attributions, regardless of training. Significant differences were found among attributions, X^2 (2) = 51.01, $p = .000$. A series of Wilcoxon Signed Ranks tests were used to determine statistical significance among attributions; effort, ability, and affect were found to be rated significantly higher than were background or classroom environment. No significant differences were found among attributions of effort, ability, and affect, or between attributions of background and classroom environment.

A Mann-Whitney U test was calculated to determine whether a significant difference in confidence to pursue a music teaching career existed between those having taken a teacher role development course and those having not taken such a course. No significant difference was found between the groups regarding confidence to pursue a career in music teaching.

DISCUSSION

Teaching Effectiveness

As judged by three veteran public school general music teachers, participants who had received teacher role development training (Group 1) and those who had not taken such a course (Group 2) generally exhibited similar levels of effectiveness regarding lesson delivery skills and the planning and presentation of lessons. One explanation that could account for these results is the span of 1.5 years between the time when members of Group 1 were enrolled in teacher role development training as second-semester freshmen and when they were enrolled in the elementary general music methods course as first-semester juniors. An introductory course in instrumental music methods, required of all students with a choral/general music program concentration, is the only other teaching methods course participants would have taken prior to the elementary general music course. It is possible instructional skills developed in the teacher role development training course were sufficiently mitigated by the passage of time to bring members of Group 2 on par with members of Group 1 by the time the present study was conducted. Paul et al. (2001) found those with a greater number of peer-teaching experiences, field-teaching experiences, and reflections on those experiences scored higher on initial teaching performance than did those with fewer such experiences. Perhaps the number of peer-teaching experiences and reflections on those experiences provided in the role development training course was not sufficient to affect initial teaching performance. Further, the role development training course did not include field-teaching experience.

Levels of Concerns

No differences were found between groups for any of the three levels of concerns. Similar to the result for teaching effectiveness, role development training provided in one course seems to be insufficient to sustain an effect on subjects' concerns over time. Perhaps a different result might occur with the implementation of the two additional courses planned for the sequence. The only individual item found to be significantly different between the groups was #5, "Having enough materials for all the students," with those having taken the role development course expressing the greater concern. Because the role development course included peer teaching that required the preparation of materials, this result would not be unexpected. Results of the Concerns portion of the CACM suggest all participants identified impact-related issues as being of more concern than task- or self-related issues. That impact concerns were rated significantly higher than were task or self concerns across all participants was an unexpected result and represented a marked departure from the theoretical sequence outlined by Fuller and Brown (1975). With exception of three first-semester seniors in the instrumental track of the music education degree program who were a semester away from student teaching, participants were first-semester junior level undergraduates for whom the elementary general music methods course was the first course in which any of the study participants engaged in field experiences enabling them to instruct public school students. In such new circumstances, the preeminence of self or task concerns is more common. Indeed, self concerns were the next most highly rated concern category indicated by the participants and was rated significantly higher than were task concerns. The low position of task concerns is reflective of the research examining knowledge and skills perceived necessary by preservice teachers in which preservice teachers were found to hold views of teaching that are unrealistically optimistic and not related to previously learned or studied methods of teaching (Richards & Killen, 1993; Schmidt, 2005; Weinstein, 1988). Campbell and Thompson (2007) found a result similar to that of the present study (i.e., impact concerns were rated highest while

task concerns were rated lowest) and concluded:

> This apparent lack of understanding regarding the perceived needs of beginning teachers may contribute to the reality shock often experienced in the early years of teaching. The low task scores in this study bear out this disconnect between preservice teachers' concerns for the tasks of teaching and having the skills necessary to effectively make an impact. (p. 173)

Given Fuller and Brown (1975) described the three phases as hierarchical, beginning with self concerns and followed by task and impact concerns, the high ratings ascribed to self concerns may have been due to the fact that participants completed the CACM after watching a video excerpt of their own teaching. It is encouraging, however, to note the study participants' primary concerns were focused on impact of their teaching on students' learning, particularly given most of the participants were more than a year away from their student teaching semester.

Attribution of Teaching Behaviors

There were no differences between the two participant groups with regard to attribution of teaching behaviors; however, among the five factors attributable to success or failure in music teaching, both groups rated effort, ability, and affect significantly higher in importance than background or classroom environment. Participants' ratings in order of magnitude of importance were effort, ability, affect, classroom environment, and background. Excepting the selection of effort as the most important attribute, these results differed from results reported by Asmus (1986b) in a study wherein high school music students' ratings of the attributes from most to least important were effort, background, classroom environment, ability, and affect. Differences between Asmus' results and those of the current study may be due to the fact participants in the current study were asked to rate importance of factors attributable to success or failure in *music teaching* as compared to Asmus' charge to rate success or failure in *music*. In particular, the significantly higher importance attributed to areas of effort, ability, and affect suggest participants believed their success or failure in music teaching is largely dependent upon an internal locus of control, as opposed to a belief that external factors such as musical backgrounds or atmosphere of their music education courses significantly influence their success or failure in music teaching. That effort and affect for music teaching, both internal-unstable factors[1], were among the pool of highest rated attributes for both groups is especially fortunate because internal-unstable causes have been found to encourage persistence until a task has been achieved successfully (Asmus, 1986a).

Confidence to Pursue a Music Teaching Career.

No significant difference was found between the two groups in confidence to continue pursuing a career in music teaching, with both groups indicating a reasonable degree of confidence in their career plans as music teachers. This result might be attributed to practicum opportunities offered in the elementary general music education methods course and to the timing of the completion of the survey. As mentioned earlier, the general music education methods course, unlike the teacher

---

[1] Asmus (personal communication, June 18, 2009) categorized effort and affect as internal-unstable factors, ability as an internal-stable factor, environment as an external-unstable factor, and background as an external-stable factor.

role development training course, included weekly peer teaching experiences during the first half of the semester followed by weekly practicum field experiences. These weekly practicum field experiences brought participants into intense engagement with the social context of the music teaching profession. Participants' first weekly practicum field experience occurred mid-semester; however, when asked to view the video of their first teaching episode and complete the CACM, both participant groups were nearing completion of the semester in the methods course. Through watching their first teaching episodes, participants may have been made more keenly aware of the gains in content knowledge and instructional skills they had made over the course of the semester, which in turn may have affected their confidence that pursuing a career in music education was the right choice for them.

CONCLUSIONS

The present study is a response to the charge for needed development and testing of approaches to music teacher education pedagogy that hold promise for facilitating music teacher role development (Teachout, 2007; Woodford, 2002). This study is preliminary for a number of reasons. First, it included a relatively small sample of convenience. Subjects coincidentally included equal numbers of those having previously taken an experimental elective role development course and those who had not taken such a course. Because the course will be required for all future music education majors at this Southeastern university, the present sample provided a rare opportunity to compare two groups who had experienced nearly identical music coursework except for those who had taken the role development course. Second, the role development course is the first of a three-course sequence intended to facilitate a foundation from which one might successfully negotiate the remainder of his or her degree program. That no significant differences were found between the two groups for any of the variables tested is not an indication of the success or failure of role development training to produce an effect. Rather, the results of the present study can be used to support the idea that experiences and activities provided in one course were insufficient to sustain an effect for the sample tested. Perhaps instruction provided during the initial three semesters of one's degree program may offer the foundation needed to sustain an effect. Similar to the results of Paul et al. (2001), perhaps there are a critical number of experiences beyond which music teacher role development becomes self-sustaining. Additionally, it is important to consider that students reaching upper division coursework do not include those who had previously self-selected out of the program. Regardless of role development training, those remaining in the program through the first semester of their junior year may have a particularly clear sense of identity as music teachers due to being relatively close to their internship semester and subsequent graduation. Future research at this Southeastern institution should compare results from the present study with data gathered from the first groups that complete each of the subsequent foundational courses planned for implementation. A component of this research should consider those who may have dropped out of the program to determine the degree to which role development training might mitigate such attrition. Further, research should be conducted in other music teacher education programs that implement role development training to identify critical points in the program that affect role development.

In the present study, we attempted to examine the effects of role development training provided to participants 1.5 years prior to their being tested. If, as music teacher educators, we want our students to be successful teachers once they graduate, we need to be looking for methods that

have lasting effects and testing to learn when courses or experiences do not sustain an effect. In the present era of legislatively-imposed limits on credit hours in degree programs coupled with the constraints of general education, licensure, and music accrediting association rubrics, there is precious little opportunity for music education professors to impact the teacher development process of undergraduates. It is incumbent upon the profession to design and continue testing the most effective possible activities and experiences that will enable students to fulfill their potential as teachers.

REFERENCES

Asmus, E. P. (1985). Sixth graders' achievement motivation: Their views of success and failure in music. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 85*, 1-13.

Asmus, E. P. (1986a). Achievement motivation characteristics of music education and music therapy students as identified by attribution. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 86*, 71-85.

Asmus, E. P. (1986b, April). *Factors students believe to be the causes of success or failure in music*. Paper presented at the bi-annual meeting of the Music Educators National Conference, Anaheim, CA.

Asmus, E. P. (1989). Measures of motivation in music: *Motivating Factors* and *Magnitude of Motivation. Motivating Factors* scale retrieved October 15, 2005 from http://www.music.miami.edu/asmus/measures.html.

Becker, H. S. & Carper, J. (1970). The elements of identification with an occupation. In H. S. Becker (Ed.), *Sociological work: Method and substance* (pp. 177-188). Chicago: Aldine Publications.

Borich, G. D. (2000). *Effective teaching methods* (4th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall.

Borich, G. D., & Tombari, M. (1997). *Educational psychology: A contemporary approach* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.

Broyles, J. W. (1997). *Effects of videotape analysis on role development of student teachers in music.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oklahoma, Norman.

Burden, P. (1982). Implications of teacher career development: New roles for teachers, administrators and professors. *Action in Teacher Education, 4*(4), 21-25.

Burden, P. (1990). Teacher development. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 311-328). New York: Macmillan.

Burn, K., Hagger, H., & Mutton, T. (2003). The complex development of student-teachers' thinking. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice, 9(*4), 309-331.

Campbell M. R., & Thompson, L. K. (2007). Perceived concerns of preservice music education teachers: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 55*(2), 162-176.

Fant, G. R. (1996). *An investigation of the relationships between undergraduate music education students' early field experience and student teaching performance.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Arizona, Tucson, AZ.

Fuller, F., & Brown, O. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher education, Part* II: The 74th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education (pp. 25-52). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Glickman, C. D. (1985). *Supervision of instruction: A developmental approach.* Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Guillaume, A. M., & Rudney, G. L. (1993). Student teachers' growth toward independence: An analysis of their changing concerns. *Teaching and Teacher Education,* 9(1), 65-80.

Hamann, D. L. (1995). Preservice teachers' teaching effectiveness and social skill development. *Southeastern Journal of Music Education, 7,* 1-12.

Hamann, D. L., & Baker, D. S. (1996). *Survey of teaching effectiveness.* Unpublished document available from Donald L. Hamann at the University of Arizona, School of Music, Tucson, AZ, 85721.

Isbell, D. S. (2008). Musicians and teachers: The socialization and occupational identity of preservice music teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 56*(2), 162-178.

Katz, L. (1972). Developmental stages of preschool teachers. *Elementary School Journal, 73*(1), 50-54.

Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2000). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed. pp. 279-313). London: Sage.

Merton, R. K. (1957). *The student physician.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Paul, S. J. (1998). The effects of peer teaching experiences on the professional teacher role development of undergraduate instrumental music education majors. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 137*, 73-92.

Paul, S. J., Teachout, D. J., Sullivan J. M., Kelly, S. N., Bauer, W. I., & Raiber, M. A. (2001). Authentic-context learning activities in instrumental music teacher education. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 49*(2), 136-145.

Raiber, M. A. (1997). *A study of reflective practice elements in undergraduate music education curricula.* Paper presented at Symposium ’97: Innovations in Music Teacher Education, University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK

Ralph, E. (2004). Interns' and cooperating teachers' concerns during the extended practicum. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 50*(4), 411-429.

Regelski, T. A. (1998). Critical theory as a foundation for critical thinking in music. In P. Woodford (Ed.), Critical thinking in music: Theory and practice [Monograph]. *Studies in Music from the University of Western Ontario,* 17 (pp. 1-21).

Richards, C., & Killen, R. (1993). Problems of beginning teachers: Perceptions of pre-service music teachers. *Research Studies in Music Education, 1,* 40-51.

Richardson, V. (1996). The role of attitudes and beliefs in learning to teach, in J. P. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, and E. Guyton (Eds.) *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education,* (2nd ed., pp. 102-119). New York: Macmillan.

Rose, A. M. (1990). *Music education in culture: A critical analysis of reproduction, production, and hegemony.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin, Madison.

Schmidt, M. (2005). Preservice string teachers' lesson planning processes: An exploratory study. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 53,* 6-25.

Smith, D. J., & Sanche, R. P. (1993). Interns' personally expressed concerns: A need to extend the Fuller model? *Action in Teacher Education, 15*(1), 36-41.

Teachout, D. J. (2007). Understanding the ties that bind and the possibilities for change. *Arts Education Policy Review, 108*(6), 19-32.

Thompson, L. K. (2007). Considering beliefs in learning to teach music. *Music Educators Journal, 93*(3), 30-35.

Weinstein, C. S. (1988). Preservice teachers' expectations about the first year of teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 4*(1), 31-40.

Wolfgang, R. E. (1990) *Early field experience in music education: A study of teacher role socialization.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon, Eugene.

Woodford, P. G. (2002). The social construction of music teacher identity in undergraduate music education majors, in R. Colwell and C. Richardson (Eds.) *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning,* (pp. 675-694). New York: Oxford.

Woodford, P. G. (2005). *Democracy and music education: Liberalism, ethics, and the politics of practice.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

APPENDIX

Concerns Attributions Confidence Measure (CACM) - Key

CONCERNS

The following is a list of statements that represent possible concerns you might have at any given moment when you were teaching your lesson. For each item, please **circle the number** that most accurately represents the degree of concern you felt when you were teaching (4 = Highly Concerned; 3 = Concerned; 2 = Somewhat Concerned; 1 = Not Concerned).

When reviewing the video of the lesson I taught; I remember feeling the following degrees of concern about:

	Highly Concerned	Concerned	Somewhat Concerned	Not Concerned
1. (S) Whether the students respect me	4	3	2	1
2. (T) Not having enough time to prepare/plan	4	3	2	1
3. (I) Whether each student is reaching his or her potential	4	3	2	1
4. (S) Doing well when I am observed when I teach	4	3	2	1
5. (T) Having enough materials for all the students	4	3	2	1
6. (I) Increasing students' feeling of musical accomplishment.....	4	3	2	1
7. (S) Losing the respect of my peers	4	3	2	1
8. (T) Having to plan for too many students.....	4	3	2	1
9. (I) Recognizing the musical needs of the students	4	3	2	1
10. (S) My ability to maintain the appropriate degree of classroom control	4	3	2	1
11. (T) Not getting through my lesson plan.....	4	3	2	1
12. (I) Meeting students' diverse needs	4	3	2	1
13. (S) Teaching effectively when another teacher is present	4	3	2	1
14. (T) Getting through my lesson plan too soon ..	4	3	2	1
15. (I) Making sure students learn musical concepts	4	3	2	1

(S) = =Self; (T) = Task; (I) = Impact (Codes were not included on the CACM measure administered to participants.)

ATTRIBUTIONS

The purpose of this portion of the survey is to determine your attitudes toward various aspects of music teaching. Because the items determine only your attitudes, there are no right or wrong answers. Please **circle the number** that most accurately represents how important you believe each item is in determining success and failure in music teaching (4 = Highly Important; 3 =

Important; 2 = Somewhat Important; 1 = Not Important).

	Highly Important	Important	Somewhat Important	Not Important
1. (E) Trying hard enough to succeed in music teaching	4	3	2	1
2. (B) Having parents who are supportive of music teaching	4	3	2	1
3. (C) Getting along with others in music education classes	4	3	2	1
4. (Ab) Maintaining excellent delivery skills (posture, eye contact, gestures, facile express., vocal inflection)	4	3	2	1
5. (Af) Wanting to affect others through music teaching	4	3	2	1
6. (E) Taking music teaching seriously	4	3	2	1
7. (B) Having a natural talent for music teaching	4	3	2	1
8. (C) Being with your friends in music education classes	4	3	2	1
9. (Ab) Planning lessons that effectively address the lesson objectives and content	4	3	2	1
10. (Af) Thinking that music teaching is fun	4	3	2	1
11. (E) Putting the effort into finding opportunities to practice music teaching	4	3	2	1
12. (B) Having effective teachers throughout your P-12 schooling	4	3	2	1
13. (C) Experiencing a sense of camaraderie in music education classes	4	3	2	1
14. (Ab) Organizing effective lessons with the proper number and sequence of activities	4	3	2	1
15. (Af) Enjoying teaching music to others	4	3	2	1
16. (E) Setting a music teaching goal and trying to reach it through practice	4	3	2	1
17. (B) Being interested in teaching when you were very young	4	3	2	1

18. (C) Having a music education instructor who doesn't show favoritism	4	3	2	1
19. (Ab) Delivering accurate information with an appropriate musical model	4	3	2	1
20. (Af) Enjoying seeing inspirational music teachers teach	4	3	2	1
21. (E) Being willing to put in the effort required by the music teaching profession	4	3	2	1
22. (B) Having music teachers in your family	4	3	2	1
23. (C) Having a music education instructor who understands you	4	3	2	1
24. (Ab) Demonstrating excellent pacing	4	3	2	1
25. (Af) Liking seeing students "get it" when I'm teaching.	4	3	2	1

(E) = Effort; (B) Background; (C) = Classroom Environment; (Ab) = Ability; (Af) = Affect for Music Teaching
(Codes were not included on the CACM measure administered to participants.)

CONFIDENCE

	Highly Confident	Confident	Somewhat Confident	Not Confident
Please rate the degree confidence you currently feel about pursuing a career in music teaching	4	3	2	1