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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to compare and contrast music teacher preparation programs across the United States. Demographic and curricular information about fifty-one schools in each of the nine regions (N=51) established by National Association of Schools of Music was collected. These data were compared to each other and to the requirements set forth by NASM. Questionnaires were completed by music education faculty of those schools and compared to questionnaires completed by music education alumni of each of those schools. Data were analyzed both qualitatively and quantitatively to determine the most important components of an undergraduate music teacher preparation program. Results of this study indicate that music teacher preparation programs have many of the same requirements and courses as they did 100 years ago. Curricular change needs to occur in order for music teaching to meet the needs of a 21st century society. Suggestions for improvement to music teacher preparation programs are that: (a) music faculty engage in serious discussion about the state of the music education degree program; (b) more time be allotted in the degree program for those courses music teachers find to be the most useful in the field, and (c) field experiences be based in authentic contexts such as those of held in professional development partnerships.
CHAPTER 1

The Need for Reform in Music Teacher Preparation

The field of music education is on the verge of a major change in both its policies and curricular implementation. Over the last half-century, music’s role within the school day has dramatically changed, as has the role of the music educator. Music education philosopher John Kratus (2007) asserts that music in American public schools is in a time of crisis. Contributing to this crisis are historical, political, philosophical, and practical issues. Music educators must be critically aware of those factors that are contributing to the crisis in order for music to maintain its place in American public school education.

Historical Issues and Music Education

The snowball effect. Music education in America has an eclectic past. Historians have recognized individuals that have transformed music education in the United States. Although Lowell Mason (1792-1872) is credited as the “Father of Music Education” because he assisted in bringing public school music to America (Gary, 1954; Howe, 1992), William Channing Woodbridge was the actual source of change in American public school music (Jorgensen, 1983; Sunderman, 1956). An educational reformer, Woodbridge, who was not a musician, travelled to Europe (1824-1829) and observed school music classes. Upon returning to America, Woodbridge contacted key musicians, educators (among them Lowell Mason and Elam Ives Jr.), and other influential individuals in society to assist him with lobbying
for music classes as part of the school curriculum (Jorgensen, 1983). Within a decade of returning from Europe, Woodbridge had initiated the Boston school music movement, which has had the largest impact on the current state of music education in America today (Jorgensen, 1983).

Jorgensen (1983) identified a political process of change based on the actions of Woodbridge. Woodbridge motivated key political, educational, and musical figures to assist in implementing his idea of school music education. From here, a snowball effect occurred and large-scale change happened quickly. This process can be seen throughout the course of the history of music education in America.

**Catalysts for music education in America.** Other researchers have identified key individuals who have influenced large changes in a short amount of time within the field of music education through their work as catalysts in the political process. Deverich (1987) examined the Maidstone Movement¹ in England and how it influenced public school instrumental music classes in America. Albert Gore Mitchell (1850-1933) (Wassell, 1954) listened to a lecture about the Maidstone Movement by Charles H. Farnsworth (1860-1947) (Dunham, 1947), who had observed its use in European schools. Mitchell travelled to Europe to learn the method behind the Maidstone Movement and implemented it into the Boston public schools by 1911. In 1920, Mitchell facilitated the adaptation of the Maidstone Movement for violin

---

¹ The Maidstone Movement was a method of group violin instruction that gained popularity in Europe in 1897. Representatives travelled to different schools to teach group violin classes. Starting in London, the movement lost popularity in Europe by 1939. See Deverich (1987) for more information.
classes, and other instruments as well; Mitchell adapted what he learned in Europe to meet the needs of his students in Boston. Deverich (1987) cited the Maidstone Movement as the “catalyst in developing public school instrumental classes in the United States” (Deverich, 1987, pp.51). Jorgensen’s model of the political process is evident in Deverich’s research on the implementation of the Maidstone Movement into school music education. Mitchell was the driving force behind the development of instrumental music in American public schools (Deverich, 1987).

Another catalyst for change in music education was Phillip C. Hayden (1854-1925). Hayden was the founder of the Music Supervisors Conference. He was supervisor of music in Keokuk Iowa schools in the early 1900s. Hayden published a journal called School Music Monthly and invited music specialists to attend a conference in Keokuk. In 1907, the first Music Supervisors Conference was held. Hayden presented his work with rhythm reading and called for an organization that dealt specifically with music education issues. Eventually, the Music Supervisors Conference became the MENC: The National Association for Music Education, which is now the largest organization for music education related issues in America (Molnar, 1955).

In 1886, General John Eaton, commissioner of the United States Bureau of Education, surveyed schools to ascertain the state of music education in American

\[ \text{MENC- the National Association for Music Education is an organization that serves a variety of purposes including publishing research, providing outlets for advocacy about music education, and creating conferences for music educators to gather and share work.} \]
schools. Theodore Presser, music philanthropist and publisher had urged Eaton to create the survey on behalf of musicians and educators who were concerned that specialists were no longer teaching music in the classrooms. Eaton became interested in the state of music instruction after meeting with Presser and created the survey to collect data about music education programs across the United States. He received responses from 311 cities across the United States. The result of his “survey generally was seen as evidence that music in the public schools was far from being accepted as part of the basic curriculum,” (Bergee, 1987, pp. 114). Importantly, Eaton’s work on assessing the state of public music education serves two purposes for the present study. First, he was a catalyst because he implemented a nation-wide survey of public school music, which aligns with Jorgensen’s (1983) model of the political process for change in music education. Second, the results of Eaton’s survey are as alarming today as they were then. His conclusions indicated that as early as 1886, music was viewed by society as being less important than the core curriculum. There were many reasons for this, but the most important was the lack of preparation for quality instructors of music. With the apparent lack of music teacher preparation in 1886, Eaton issued a call to arms for music teacher education (Bergee, 1987). To better understand the development of music teacher preparation, the following section outlines the history of music teacher preparation in America.
A brief history of music teacher preparation in the United States. In 1833, the Boston Academy of Music began as an institution where individuals, children to adults, could partake in advanced study of music. By 1834, the academy introduced teacher-training conventions for individuals to gain knowledge and skills to become public school music teachers. Lowell Mason, a music teacher educator at the Boston Academy of Music, compiled a manual for these potential teachers (Pemberton, 1986). The purpose of the manual was to outline a plan for music instruction for individuals responsible for teaching music in the public schools, whether they were professional musicians hired as specialists, or classroom teachers incorporating music into their regular curriculum. Pemberton (1986) discussed the nature of music teacher education stating that, “there were, of course, very few sources of instruction for music teachers, certainly no college or university music education departments, no professional journals or organizations, and few practicing teachers from whom to seek help” (p. 54). The manual of the Boston Academy of Music, published in 1834, was widely used as the primary source for training music instructors, as the book was the first of its kind in American music education.

Research indicates that higher education degrees in music began at least as early as the 1870s in America. There is speculation among researchers as to which institution awarded the first bachelor degree of music in America (Eells, 1961; Phelps, 1983). Researchers have documented that a bachelor degree in music was awarded in 1876 from Boston University (Eells, 1961; Phelps, 1983). However, Eells (1961) argued that the first Bachelor of Music degree was awarded in 1873 at Adrian College
in Michigan. It is unclear whether these first degrees in music equipped individuals to become music educators; however, in 1895, John J. Dawson received the first doctorate in music education at New York University’s School of Pedagogy (Phelps, 1983).

Dawson’s dissertation examined the value of vocal music instruction in the schools. Phelps (1983) noted that many of the problems Dawson encountered with school music instruction are still pertinent in today’s society. One conclusion from Dawson’s research is that vocal music was overlooked in schools, and yet it had many positive physical and emotional values for those who participate in the subject (Dawson in Phelps, 1983). Dawson used the aesthetics of music as his theoretical rationale for music in the schools (Phelps, 1983). His rationale was that music should be in the schools because of the aesthetic essence of music itself (Phelps, 1983).

**Standardization of the curriculum.** Toward the end of the 19th century, there was a push to standardize the curricula for all subjects in education (Ambrose, 1994; Elliott, 2001; Humphreys, 1988). The American College of Musicians, founded in 1886, implemented competency examinations for music teachers. There were two subtests for the exams: demonstrative (performance) and theoretical (music theory). These exams arose from beliefs that music teachers should be specialists “to protect the public from incompetent teachers” and “to protect the teachers who have made adequate preparation” (Bowman in Ambrose, 1994, p. 237). According to the American College of Musicians, performance skills and theoretical knowledge of music were the essential competencies music teachers needed in order to be successful
in the profession. However, music education has lacked the standardization that other core academic subjects have at their foundation. Since the last two decades of the 19th century, the problem with standardization of teaching music at all levels has been that, “the profession simply could not agree upon goals for music instruction in the schools” (Humphreys, 1988, p. 17).

**Competencies for music teachers.** There is a paucity of research regarding the core competencies for preservice music teachers during the early years of public school music. In 1933, Chauncey King wrote of the need for reform in college music education courses because teachers were ill prepared to face the realities of public school instruction. Despite the push for standardization of music courses at the end of the 19th century, no standardization occurred (King, 1933). A foreshadowing of future practice in music teacher preparation, King suggested that the profession put a greater emphasis on novice music teachers observing excellent model teachers, with more time for practice teaching (King, 1933).

**Contemporary Issues in Music Education**

The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) (2008) is the only music-specific accrediting body for music schools and departments in the United States. NASM has accredited over 600 institutions with music education degree programs. NASM recommends that all accredited music teacher preparation programs devote 50% of the degree to music core classes with 30-35% of the courses in general education studies (university breadth requirements), leaving a mere 15-20% of the degree in professional knowledge classes (e.g. education classes, music education
methods, and secondary instruments classes) (NASM, 2008). In addition to the standardization of music teacher preparation curricula, National Standards for music were adopted by MENC in 1995 in order to standardize K-12 music programs (MENC, 2010). Despite these efforts, music education faces other challenges, which will be outlined in this section.

Declining participation in school music. A large concern for music education researchers is the growing lack of participation in school music programs (Music for All, 2004). The GRAMMY Foundation examined high school music participation rates in band, chorus, and orchestra because of school socio-economic status, school location, music teacher role, and community. Across all of the categories, the participation rates in high school music programs was less than 35% of the student population of the school (Braza & Porter, 2002). The musical options of band, chorus, and orchestra do not keep the attention of the majority of high school students as indicated by the results of the study.

Researchers have investigated why students drop out of music when it becomes optional at the secondary level of education (Corenblum & Marshall, 1998; Martignetti, 1965; Music for All, 2004). Over 40 years ago, Martignetti (1965) explored causes of student drop outs in elementary instrumental music programs. According to the music teachers surveyed, the most common reasons for attrition in instrumental programs were: (a) loss of interest, (b) lack of perseverance, and (c) lack of ability on the instrument. According to the students who dropped out of music classes, the most common reasons for quitting were: (a) loss of interest in the
instrument, (b) lack of time to practice, and (c) grades were too low in other classes (Martignetti, 1965).

More than thirty years after Martignetti’s study, researchers were still examining why children drop out of music programs (Corenblum & Marshall, 1998). In a survey of 253 ninth graders, Corenblum & Marshall (1998) found that the most common reasons for dropping out of music at the high school level were: (a) the monetary cost of participating, (b) the teacher’s opinion of the student’s ability, and (c) how much music was valued in the attitudes of other people important to the music student (e.g., parents or peers) (Corenblum & Marshall, 1998).

Although students had different reasons for dropping out of music in the 32 years between the two studies, lack of participation in music remains a concern to music educators. One reason for the attrition of students in school music could be how music educators are prepared to teach school music and their eventual job satisfaction.

**Recruitment and retention of quality music teachers.** Introduced as a subject in American public schools over 100 years prior, music education was booming in public schools by the 1950s. “The demand for school music teachers is so great that college, university, and other teacher-placement agencies are finding it impossible to meet the call for qualified young men and women to fill the current vacancies” (Sur, 1954, p. 29). Music education grew so quickly by the middle of the 20th century, that music teacher preparation programs struggled to produce quality teachers.
However, this is not the story today. Recruitment and retention of quality music teachers has been a major concern in the profession for some time. According to the *Music for All Foundation* (2004), researchers observed trends of the music programs in California for five years. They found that California had a 26% decrease in the number of music teachers and an almost 50% decrease of student enrollment in music during the same time-period (Music for All, 2004).

Similarly, Madsen and Hancock (2002) studied trends in retention among graduates of a large music teacher education program in Florida. Their research revealed that of all of the alumni of the music education program in the last 10 years, 31.3% of men and 34.5% of women were no longer teaching music. With such a large number of young graduates leaving the profession music educators will struggle to sustain strong music programs in American schools (Krueger, 2000; Madsen & Hancock, 2002).

Researchers are also concerned with *why* teachers choose to leave the profession. Insufficient support (Conway, 2001) and a sense of isolation (Krueger, 2000) are the two main reasons new teachers leave the field. New teachers cite a lack of support from several sources including school administrators, other teachers, and the community (Conway, 2001). New teachers often feel ill-equipped to handle all of the responsibilities of the job and are often physically isolated from other teachers in their field (Krueger, 2000).

Support for new teachers is challenging when burnout is a common problem among experienced music teachers. Burnout occurs more often with music teachers
than classroom teachers (Hamann, Daugherty, & Mills, 1987). Burnout is defined as “a phenomenon related to job stress where individuals spend considerable time in close encounters with others under conditions of chronic tension and stress” (Hamann, Daugherty, & Mills, 1987, p. 128). Music teacher burnout is most closely associated with feelings like “there is too much work to accomplish and not enough time to do it”, “lack of understanding of administrative goals”, and “lack of recognition by the students” (Hamann, Daugherty, & Mills, 1987, p. 138-139).

Additionally, many music teachers are ill prepared to fight the various battles associated with teaching music in the United States in the 21st century. Political movements like No Child Left Behind have forced teachers to be held accountable for what happens in their classrooms, yet music is not one of the subjects tested; therefore, music teachers are not held accountable for quality instruction in their classrooms. Teachers are also struggling to maintain participation in music programs, and many want to leave the music education profession. Still, colleges and universities maintain a curriculum that does not prepare music teachers to handle the changing needs of students and society successfully. Teachers would rather leave the profession (Madsen & Hancock, 2002) than face the struggles associated with the very reasons for the crisis in music (Conway, 2001; Kratus, 2007; Krueger, 2000). For society to take the music education profession seriously as a viable subject, music teacher educators must examine teacher preparation curricula in colleges and universities. To this end, they must decide what knowledge and skills are needed to make a change in how society
views music education and to develop a curriculum that prepares music teachers for authentic music education in the 21st century.

Political Issues and Music Education

No Child Left Behind. When No Child Left Behind (NCLB) (U.S. Department of Education, 2008) was enacted in the United States, the crisis in music education became a renewed topic of conversation among music educators (Ester, 2006; Kimpton, 2005; Kratus, 2007). The legislation demands that schools show accountability for their quality of education through high stakes testing of core subjects during the school day (U.S. Department of Education, 2008). Under this legislation the only core subjects regularly tested throughout a child’s public school career are language arts and math.

With schools under scrutiny for their language arts and math scores, there has been an increase in the amount of time spent to teach these subjects; as a result, time for other core subjects has decreased. “What is tested is what is taught” (Jennings in Lang & Lillie, 2007, p. 2). Therefore, school districts across the United States spend more time and money helping students obtain higher scores on language arts and math tests. Music and other non-tested subjects have become less important and have been reduced or cut from the school day across the nation (Lang & Lillie, 2007; Zastrow & Janc, 2004).

The Council for Basic Education (CBE) (2004) sought to examine exactly how much time is spent on the core subjects of reading, math, social studies, science, the arts, and foreign languages, and whether these numbers have changed since the NCLB
legislation was enacted. Through interviewing elementary and secondary principals across the country, the researchers noticed a trend: More time was spent studying reading, math, social studies, and science, but there was a decrease in the amount of time spent studying the arts and foreign languages (Zastrow & Janc, 2004). In this study, principals reported a 20-50% decrease in the amount of time devoted to teaching the arts and foresaw future decreases in program offerings in their schools (Zastrow & Janc, 2004).

Since the launch of NCLB almost a decade ago, music educators have struggled to justify music programs and the purpose of their jobs (Lehman, 1995) while trying to maintain the integrity of the subject they teach (Kratus, 2007; Myers, 2003). In addition to facing strenuous changes in policies, music teachers also face a decline in student participation in music programs.

**Philosophical Issues and Music Education**

Two differing philosophical perspectives define the debate on music teacher preparation programs of the last half-century. Elliott (2001) wrote about the differences between a modernist (teacher-centered education) and post-modernist (student-centered education) view of music teacher education. The modernist view is “that all music can be evaluated by the same universal criteria” (Elliott, 2001, p. 35); therefore, music professionals were prepared under the same core criteria for music. The value of the modernist perspective is that it provoked the need for a standardization of curriculum in higher education (Elliott, 2001). Without the modernist view of education, there would not be public schooling, or music teacher
preparation programs. To music education researchers, the modernist view is synonymous with a traditional view of education. Barrett (2005) described the traditional view of education as teacher-centered, where “considerable attention is paid to the decisions teachers make prior to students’ engagement with the curriculum” (p. 22). The modernist view of teaching music served the United States for more than 100 years, but the educational needs of society have changed and other views are emerging.

**Post-modernist view of music teacher preparation.** Post-modernism is a philosophical view that has been difficult to define for many music education researchers. Elliott (2001) wrote that this is because a key component of post-modernism is flexibility within the curriculum and teaching. Music educators with a post-modernist view of teaching embrace “the notion that students construct their own learning” (Abrahams, 2005, p. 14). Barrett (2005) suggests that it is “times of conflict and change” (p. 22) that cause music educators to embrace a post-modernist view of teaching. Music education researchers like Kratus (2007), Myers (2010), Webster and Campbell (2010) assert that the current crisis in music education emerges from internal and external issues affecting the profession. These issues include: (a) historical trends in music education reform, (b) the politics of music and education, (c) philosophical differences of educators in the profession, and (d) unclear practical applications from higher education to the K-12 music classroom. The quality of music teacher preparation programs is the lynchpin in the crisis music education faces (Kratus, 2007; Myers, 2010; and Webster & Campbell, 2010).
The Tipping Point

Kratus suggests that music educators be critically aware of the danger of losing public school music. He calls this the tipping point, taken from Gladwell’s book *The Tipping Point: How Little Things Can Make a Big Difference* (as cited in Kratus, 2007). “Gladwell's thesis is that small changes and events can accumulate and cause rapid, large-scale transformations once a critical mass, or tipping point, has been reached,” (Kratus, 2007, pp. 42). Like the snowball effect Jorgensen (1983) identified with William Channing Woodbridge, and the dawn of music in American schools, Kratus believes individuals can still impact the state of school music education today. Due to challenging times for music educators arising from external forces that negatively contribute to the tipping point in music education, Kratus (personal communication, September 19, 2009) believes that creating and sustaining quality music teacher preparation programs is the only way to overcome this peril. In order to keep music as a viable subject in public school curricula, music educators must first understand the factors that contribute to the tipping point and then create a plan of action to keep music as a core subject in public education.

Suggestions for Improvement in Music Teacher Preparation

**Highly effective music teachers.** Music educators have frequently conducted research on the qualities of expert teachers so as to expand their understanding of excellent teaching (Asmus, 2000). Cassidy (1990) observed that preservice music teachers with intensity training were able to meet the varying instructional needs of their students. Madsen and Geringer (1989) affirm that effective teachers have a
higher intensity or “on-task” time in the classroom. Duke and Madsen (1991) corroborate these findings and found that it is important to develop proactive observation and instructional skills in music teacher preparation programs.

Preservice teachers need more time to experience teaching so they can properly adjust to the stresses of teaching post-graduation (Conway, 2001). Like Henry (2001), Burton and Greher (2010) found that the connection between theory and practice is crucial and that professional development partnerships allow for positive collaboration between preservice and expert teachers. Additionally, Wiggins (2007) suggests that excellent music teacher preparation programs allow for students to construct understandings of music, education, and music education.

The cumulative findings of this research provides music educators with information to improve music teacher preparation programs and to help pre-service and experienced teachers hone those skills needed to gain expertise. In general, the goal of teacher preparation programs in the university setting is to prepare students to become expert teachers. The two main components of teacher preparation competencies that have been set forth by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) are: “teacher knowledge of the subject to be taught, and knowledge and skill in how to teach that subject” (NCATE, 2009, pp. 4).

While new teachers often feel adequately prepared in their content area, they often lack the mastery of how to teach the content, or pedagogical content knowledge (Asmus, 2000; Krueger, 2000). Expert teachers, on the other hand, are reflective practitioners in all aspects of the classroom environment and have the ability to use
student cues to inform instruction (Berliner, 1986; Schön, 1987). They have developed automated routines and procedures through ample time and practice in the classroom (Berliner, 1986). Three components identified in the literature as essential to mastering the skills necessary to teach are: (a) instructional decision making (Kohler, Henning, & Usma-Wilches, 2008), (b) reflective practice (Schön, 1987), and (c) enriching field experiences (Burton & Greher, 2007, 2010).

**Instructional decision-making.** Expert teachers constantly make instructional decisions based on student cues (Carter, Cushing, Sabers, Stein, & Berliner, 1988). These cues assist teachers in determining the instructional course of the classroom (see Figure 1). Teachers must use student cues to adjust teaching during the planning, implementation, and reflection stages of instruction so as to better meet the needs of their students and gain mastery in the classroom (Kohler, Henning, & Usma-Wilches, 2008).
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*Figure 1.* The forms of student cues and the types of decisions teachers must make based on those cues. Adapted from Kohler, Henning, & Usma-Wilches, 2008.
Expert teachers are keen observers of student behaviors in the classroom and are able to articulate adaptations that may need to be made in future instruction as a result of these observations, while novice teachers lack the ability to interpret multiple meanings from student cues (Carter et. al., 1988). Being able to read and interpret student cues is a crucial part of a teacher’s transformation from novice to being an expert in the classroom.

NCATE mandates that accredited colleges and universities provide pre-service teachers with a curriculum that will enable mastery of instructional decision-making skills to help them accommodate the needs of all students in the classroom (NCATE, 2002). One way that pre-service teachers can learn to develop these skills is through their ability to interpret instruction from a student’s perspective (Kagan & Tippins, 1991). Frequently, pre-service teachers are unable to recognize student cues to inform their instruction; one effective way to help them do this is through overt, guided self-reflection (Kagan & Tippins, 1991).

**Reflective practice.** Schön defines practice as both “performance in a range of professional situations” (1983, p. 60) and “preparation for performances” (1983, p. 60). Reflective practice occurs when a teacher thinks critically about his “knowing-in-practice” (1983, p. 61). Researchers have shown that this is a skill pre-service teachers must learn to develop. With careful guidance from knowledgeable supervisors and cooperating teachers, pre-service teachers can master this skill (Schleuter, 1991; Sparks-Langer, Simmons, Pasch, Colton, & Starko, 1990).
Most pre-service teachers lack the understanding that student cues are not only important for instructional decision-making, but also a crucial aspect of teacher reflection (Kohler, Henning, & Usma-Wilches, 2008). Colton and Sparks-Langer (1993) found that there are four attributes of reflective decision-makers: (a) efficacy, (b) flexibility, (c) social responsibility, and (d) consciousness. Woolfolk and Hoy (1990) describe efficacy as a teacher’s belief about his own ability to teach, while Colton and Sparks-Langer (1993) refer to flexibility as the ability to adapt and examine teaching from multiple perspectives. The researchers define the social responsibility of teachers as care and awareness of students, community, and societal needs in association with creating, revising, and reflecting on teaching experiences (Colton & Sparks-Langer, 1993). Finally, consciousness is synonymous with metacognition, or the ability to be aware of one’s own thinking and decision-making (Colton & Sparks-Langer, 1993). Sparks-Langer, et. al. (1990) corroborate these attributes and state that reflective practice is a competency preservice teachers need to develop with careful guidance from expert teachers.

*Enriching field experiences.* The most effective way for pre-service teachers to gain confidence with instructional decision-making and reflective practice is through a variety of enriching practical teaching experiences (Berliner, 1986). For over twenty-five years, educational researchers have shown the value of professional
development schools\(^3\) (PDS), school-university partnerships, and extensive internship programs for pre-service teachers. In 1986, the Holmes Group published Tomorrow’s Teachers, which highlighted a vision for good teaching through authentic partnerships between schools and universities (Holmes Group, 1986). Using this landmark publication as a foundation many researchers have explored the nature of partnerships and professional development schools as a significant component of teacher education training.

Moore and Sampson (2008) reflected on the development of PDS programs in Texas schools and universities. After beginning the PDS program for education majors in 1991, they determined that many partnerships are not a true merging of school and university. Their research indicates that there are three levels of partnerships that occur: (a) cooperative partnerships which are short-term, (b) symbiotic partnerships which are longer term but without growth or change within the organizations, and (c) organic partnerships which enable both the school and the university to grow.

Moore and Sampson (2008) concluded that the most beneficial partnership is organic because both the school and the university share a common set of goals and work through problems and challenges collaboratively. They found that pre-service teachers who participated in an organic-partnership school for a year or more became integrated into the school community and received valuable feedback from

\(^3\) The term *professional development school* was first coined by the Holmes Group in 1986 (Holmes Group, 1986). The National Association of Professional Development Schools meets yearly to foster research and growth among schools and universities in partnership. www.napds.org.
supervisors, cooperating teachers, and school administrators. In these partnerships, teacher educators were visible within the school since they participated in professional development with school teachers and worked as part of the school community. The students that took part in the Moore and Sampson PDS program emerged as reflective, instructional decision-makers with strong leadership skills (Moore & Sampson, 2008).

Button, Ponticell, and Johnson (1996) had similar findings in their three-year self-study of a PDS program. The researchers stress that “university researchers give up the exclusivity of their expert status and welcome the expertise of others in the educational community as teachers, learners, and researchers,” (Button, Ponticell, & Johnson, 1996, p. 19). In their study, the university faculty and the school community emerged as collaborative researchers with a common goal of improving expertise in teaching (Button, Ponticell, & Johnson, 1996).

The truest form of a PDS does not lend itself well to preparing music teachers. In a traditional PDS situation, several preservice teachers can work in the same school because there are multiple classroom teachers to accommodate all students in the program (Conkling & Henry, 1999, 2002). However, Conkling & Henry (1999) suggest that music teacher preparation programs establish professional development partnerships with schools, based on the same aims of PDS programs in elementary and secondary education programs. Similarly, Burton and Greher (2007) examined a variety of partnership models in music teacher preparation, the Holmes Group notwithstanding. They found that a professional development partnership is better
suites for music education due to the way music is scheduled in schools (Burton & Greher, 2007).

Researchers of field experiences and music teacher preparation agree that practice teaching in real-life scenarios, with support from supervisors and cooperating teachers is essential to the growth and development of expert teachers. Conkling & Henry (1999) believe that professional development partnerships help preservice teachers shed their student identities and gain authentic socialization experiences in teaching. Henry (2001) declares that this type of partnership allows for a community of learning between university students and collaborating teachers. Robbins & Stein (2005) determined that these partnerships also reenergize experienced teachers through the collaboration with university students. Finally, Burton & Greher (2010) concur with previous research and suggest that professional development partnerships allow for students to become socialized as music teachers when provided with opportunities to practice expert teaching competencies. Teaching is a practiced-based profession (NCATE, 2009), and professional development partnerships allow for the development of these skills for preservice teachers.

**Rationale for the Study**

Researchers have a clear idea of the competencies students need when graduating from teacher preparation programs, yet most music teacher preparation programs do not focus on developing these competencies. Rather, they tend to be focused on training students to be professional musicians since a majority of programs are based on the conservatory model (Kratus-personal communication, September 19,
This model, borrowed from the European conservatories, focuses on a music core of private lessons, ensemble playing, theory/aural skills, music history, and literature for music programs in the nineteenth century (Kratus, personal communication, September 19, 2009; McGillen, 2006). Kratus asserts that, in general, faculty and administration of schools of music are resistant to a complete reform of music teacher preparation programs, thus, the conservatory model of music teacher preparation in schools of music has remained largely unchanged. Kratus postulates that recruitment and admission to music teacher preparation programs is still “driven by the need to fill existing ensembles and studios,” thereby maintaining the conservatory model through faculty who are resistant to change.

As a result of the antiquated process for preparing music teachers, new music teachers lack proper induction into the field (Conway, 2001; Ester, 2006; Myers, 2003). Krueger (2000) discovered that new teachers thought that the amount of time allotted to student teaching was too brief, that they felt isolated in their first job, and were ill-prepared to face the challenges of being a novice teacher. Whereas, Hamann, Daugherty, & Mills (1987) concluded that music teachers leave the profession more frequently than regular classroom teachers, and approximately one-third of all music teacher graduates leave the profession after six years (Madsen & Hancock, 2002). With the alarming rate of attrition in the music education profession, the time has come for reform in music teacher preparation programs.

**Purpose of the Study and Research Questions**
With the intent of improving music teacher preparation, the purpose of this research is to examine the efficacy of music teacher preparation programs in the United States of America.

The research questions of this study are as follows:

1. How much time do music education majors spend in classes devoted to the acquisition of: (a) general education knowledge, (b) music content knowledge, and (c) professional education knowledge?

2. To what degree do music teacher preparation programs align with the NASM structural guidelines for music education curricula?

3. What components of a music teacher preparation program are most useful to new music teachers?

4. To what extent do music teacher educators and graduates of teacher preparation programs agree about the success of their programs in preparing future music teachers?

5. In what ways are teaching competencies developed in music teacher preparation programs?

**Summary**

In the late 1800s, professionals in the field of music education made significant changes in the way music is taught in America through enlisting the help of key individuals in music, education, and society. Despite this evidence, music educators have been unable to bring about reform in K-12 or higher education music curriculum. The profession is on the verge of a tipping point due to an apparent unwillingness or
inability to change the direction of music teacher preparation programs and the way that music is implemented in K-12 schooling. External factors from policy changes in education, declining participation rates in programs, and large attrition rates of specialists in the field also contribute to the current state of music education. Researchers have identified three key components to preparing capable and competent music teachers: (a) instructional decision-making, (b) reflective practice, and (c) enriching field experiences. Understanding those features that comprise quality music teacher preparation will enable new professionals to manage the problems within and outside of the field, leading to reform in music education in the United States.
CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

The literature discussed in this chapter relates to the division of coursework in undergraduate music education curricula, how teaching competencies are developed in these programs, and how music education faculty and their graduates rate different aspects of the music education degree offered at their respective institutions. A brief history of pertinent policies regarding music teacher preparation programs will be presented, followed by an overview and critique of the related literature on evaluating teacher preparation programs.

A Concise History of Music Teacher Preparation Policies

The development of music curricula in public schools and institutions of higher education has been a topic of discussion among music teachers and music education researchers for more than seventy years. In 1936, Archie Jones discussed curricular trends in music education in an article written for the *Music Educators Journal*. Jones (1936) stressed the need to examine the curriculum of all music programs regularly to ensure that the teaching practice met the needs of the students and matched current research. Jones’ commentary on the curricular trends of music education in 1936 shows that music programs struggled to stay current with teaching practices to meet the needs of a changing society. He argued that music teachers were not updating curricula as time elapsed and that research showed better practices for teaching. “Our present music texts for elementary schools reveal a startling similarity to those of
twenty years ago,” (Jones, 1936, p. 14). In addition, Jones also believed that there was a lack of practical application of skills learned in music class to the real world. “We train a large number of boys and girls in instrumental and choral ensembles and after the four years of school the instruments are laid on the shelf and the voices grow rusty from disuse for lack of any outlet for the newly acquired skill,” (Jones, 1936, p. 14).

Over 80 years ago, Jones called for a change in music teaching to meet the needs of the students served.

**The Tanglewood Symposium.** Similar needs were discussed at the Tanglewood Symposium in 1967. The weeklong event brought a variety of important individuals together to determine what music education should look like in America, and how to meet these goals. The Tanglewood Declaration was drafted because of the proceedings at this event. Among the aims for music education from the declaration were: (a) making music in schools more relevant and transferrable to students beyond the classroom, and (b) preparing teachers who are equipped to deal with the ever-changing needs of society, while still maintaining integrity for the art of music (Choate, Fowler, Brown, & Wersen, 1967).

**The first commission on teacher education.** Immediately following the publication of the Tanglewood Declaration, MENC established a Commission on Teacher Education (1968). Music teacher educators recognized that for some of the changes stated in the Tanglewood Declaration to take place, reform needed to begin with the preparation of music teachers. Music educators believed that “increasing numbers of first-year music teachers [were] finding that there is an enormous disparity
between the preparation for teaching and the practice of it,” (MENC Commission on Teacher Education, 1970, p. 35). MENC warned the commission to address changes that could: (a) be implementable within two years, (b) be cost effective, and (c) not impact the overall degree requirements (MENC Commission on Teacher Education, 1970).

Over four years (1968-1972), the members of this committee met to discuss the immediate goals for teacher preparation programs. The members of the committee divided into several task forces to address specific issues such as qualities and competencies for music educators and curriculum reform in music teacher preparation programs. The task force charged with examining the undergraduate music education curriculum was Task Force II. Task Force II specifically addressed critical changes needed in the preparation of music teachers. Using the division of degree requirements that NASM established as (a) general education requirements, (b) music core requirements, and (c) professional education requirements, the Commission on Teacher Education task force established goals that are pertinent to the aims the present study (see Figure 2).

Among the goals set forth by the task force were to: (a) reexamine music courses to determine how the art of music relates to man’s other, more critical, needs; (b) replace the music core courses with a four-year comprehensive musicianship course that enables students to make a direct transfer of knowledge and skills to areas like theory, ear training, history, and literature; and (c) ensure that instructors of music education methods courses are current in the practices related to the age group and
Figure 2. Statements of change for music teacher preparation programs as produced by MENC’s Commission on Teacher Education (1970)

area of the courses taught at the colleges and universities. Despite its publication 40 years ago, the resolutions of the task force of the Commission on Teacher Education are still pertinent to the implementation of quality music teacher preparation programs. The 1970 resolutions on teacher education from the MENC commission highlight the critical need for change in music teacher preparation programs. Yet, the suggested
changes were vast and large-scale. The resolutions, although ideal to music educators, were not realistic to implement within two academic years. For example, creating a four-year comprehensive musicianship course would require alterations to almost all of the music core requirements (music theory, aural skills, history and literature, and piano); objectives for these courses would need to be developed. Questions abounded as to who would teach these comprehensive musicianship courses since faculty are generally hired for specialized courses in the music core and professional education areas.

Perhaps, smaller curricular changes would have a larger impact on music teacher education as current researchers suggest (Ester, 2006; Kratus, 2007; Myers & Wang, 2010; Webster & Campbell, 2010). By taking smaller steps toward curricular reform music educators can act as mavens by improving the way music teachers are prepared, which can have a large impact on music education as a whole.

The second commission on teacher education. Seventeen years later MENC created a task force on music teacher education to address the changing societal needs for music teaching professionals and ways to adjust music teacher education curricula accordingly. At the Symposium for Music Teacher Education in 1985, music teacher educator and researcher, Paul Lehman addressed colleagues about reform in public school music education. Lehman stressed that, in order for reform to occur in K-12 public music education, music teachers must possess the qualities needed to make these changes (Metz, 1986). Some of these qualities included (a) leadership skills, (b) organizational skills, and (c) communication skills. Upon completion of the
symposium, the second Task Force on Music Teacher Education was charged with creating resolutions for music teacher reform. The 1987 task force addressed the need for professional development partnerships but put a greater emphasis on responsibilities and individual qualities of new music teachers. Among the suggestions for the improvement of new music teachers by the 1987 task force were generic statements including: (a) become an increasingly independent individual, (b) develop communication skills, (c) participate and serve in professional organizations, and (d) assist with educational policy-making. Unfortunately, these aims were vague and did not address the heart of the issue of teacher preparation, which was that music education degree programs had not been revised in nearly a century. Clearly, quality music teacher preparation programs in the 21st century will enable a new teacher to naturally develop these skills and responsibilities.

Whereas the 1970 task force addressed specific goals for institutions of higher education to implement, the 1987 task force created statements of music teacher qualities that did not provide direction for institutions of higher education to reform undergraduate music teacher preparation programs. Further, these statements lacked a timeline for implementation; the 1970 document clearly stated that the resolutions had to be cost effective and attainable within two years of publishing the document. The 1970 resolutions align with research on quality teacher preparation and serve as a starting point for the survey development of the present study.
Related Research on Music Teacher Preparation Programs

The music education degree compared to NASM curriculum guides. The resolutions of the 1970 document published in the *Music Educators Journal* were presented at the 1972 MENC National Convention. By the mid-1970’s, institutions of higher education had the standards set forth in the NASM handbook and the resolutions of the MENC Commission on Teacher Education to guide the development of music teacher preparation programs. In light of these standards and resolutions, researchers examined music teacher preparation programs to compare how schools aligned with the NASM standards for the degree. For instance, Funk (1977) examined the curriculum of music education degrees at twenty-five colleges and universities in Texas. The purpose of his study was two-fold:

1. To determine the relationship between music education curricula and the standards set forth in various policies established in Texas; and
2. To determine the relationship between music education curricula and the curricular standards established by NASM in the 1973 handbook (Funk, 1977).

To fulfill the aims of his research study, Funk examined institutions that granted music education degrees in Texas. The researcher selected participant schools based on the number of students enrolled in the music departments and the number of graduates that were produced; the top 25 schools in his study accounted for over 90% of all music teachers in the state. Funk (1977) collected data from school bulletin and conducted phone and personal interviews with faculty at each of the schools to obtain
the most accurate information on music education curricula. The data were analyzed by calculating the percentage of curriculum devoted to the following: music core, general education, and professional education. Funk found that most schools generally adhered to the percentage of degree requirements as established by NASM, but tended to require more general education classes than necessary for accreditation. Moreover, the schools offered enough professional education classes to meet the 15-20% guidelines by NASM, but lacked student exposure to real-life teaching scenarios. Among his recommendations for further study, Funk suggested, “that college and university performing ensembles become less concerned with performance standards and more concerned with music educational functions of the ensemble within the structure of the music department” (p. 110).

In 1977, Funk saw the need for music education programs to focus on the teaching aspects of the music education degree and less on the performance aspect. Based on the results of his study, Funk suggested that researchers regularly examine music teacher preparation curricula to document whether music teacher preparation programs and the NASM standards have evolved over the years to meet the changes and challenges of contemporary education.

The present study follows the direction of Funk’s recommendation by examining the curricular structure of schools accredited by NASM in the 2009-2010 academic year. Whereas Funk did not address whether the division of curriculum was optimal for both music skill and teaching competency development, the present study
explores how music education faculty and alumni view the division curriculum in terms of its practicality in developing both music and teaching competencies.

**Research on establishing competencies for music education degrees.**

Stegall, Blackburn, and Coop (1978) created a list of teaching competencies to add to the curricular guidelines from NASM. The researchers developed a questionnaire to administer to executives of colleges and universities accredited by NASM. This survey contained questions regarding the competencies music teachers should have upon graduating with a degree in music education. Through interviews of 30 department heads and deans representing schools across the nation, the researchers drafted a set of competencies based on the highest rated responses from the participants. The questionnaire listed 99 competencies, which fell into three broad categories: (a) basic musicianship, (b) applied music (principal instrument or voice), or (c) music education methods. The researchers then sent the questionnaire to administrators of schools of music selected from the 1975 NASM directory. Of the 400 surveys distributed by Stegall, Blackburn and Coop, 58% were returned. Based on the results of the study, 18 of the 20 original competencies listed under basic musicianship were considered important to the participants. All seven competencies listed under applied music were vital to master upon completing a music education degree, according to the participants. Of the 72 remaining competencies listed under music education methods, 58 were considered important for music educators to master. These competencies divided further into the categories: (a) music education basic learnings [sic.], (b) elementary general music- K-8, (c) performing groups-
grades 5-12, (d) instrumental performing groups- grades 5-12, and (e) choral performing groups- grades 5-12. Upon analyzing the survey responses, Stegall, Blackburn, and Coop, created a list of 84 competencies. Participants found these competencies important enough to include as necessary skills to master in undergraduate music education degree programs. Stegall, Blackburn, and Coop (1978) recommended that future research on music education competencies determine the relationship between music teacher responses and those of department heads of schools of music.

While Stegall, Blackburn, and Coop reviewed literature regarding the development of music competencies in music teacher preparation programs, they did not review the research regarding teaching competencies for pre-service educators. The researchers did not identify at what point teaching competencies were to be developed in teacher preparation curriculum. The present study aims to survey music teachers about their mastery of teaching competencies as identified by experts on how music teachers learn. As indicated in the previous chapter, curricular change in music education must begin with music teacher preparation programs. The present study intends to identify whether institutions are adequately developing teaching competencies in pre-service music educators.

The division of time in music education degree programs. In a further attempt to isolate those competencies pre-service teachers should master prior to graduation, Schmidt (1989) polled colleges and universities across the nation about the skills developed in undergraduate music education curricula. Schmidt’s purpose was
to “examine music education curricular allotments within a national sample of music
teacher training institutions” (Schmidt, 1989, p. 54). The researcher addressed
questions related to those competencies that are included within the curriculum, time
allotted to the topics, and variability that occurs in the inclusion of certain topics to
specific demographic variables. To answer these questions, Schmidt developed a
questionnaire that included a list of topics twenty-five music educators believed
should be included in curriculum. He piloted the study with twenty institutions and
included a feedback sheet, which was used to determine the reliability and validity of
the survey. The survey ultimately included fifty statements about competencies and
participants were to respond using a Likert scale that ranged from 1 (not included in
the curriculum) to 5 (the main focus of one or more courses) along with
demographical questions.

Schmidt (1989) randomly selected 180 schools accredited by NASM to
participate in the study. Sixty-two percent of the participants returned surveys. He
found considerable variability for curricular goals that were regularly included in the
music education curricula of these institutions. The topics most often included were:
(a) lesson planning, (b) evaluation and grading, (c) music education philosophy,
(d) curriculum construction, (e) child development in music, (f) classroom
management, and (g) creative music activities. The mean allotment of time for the
inclusion of these topics in music education courses was 3-7 hours of class time per
semester. One-third of the participating schools did not include the following topics:
(a) individualized instruction, (b) music education history, (c) the nature of musical
ability or aptitude, or (d) achievement testing. Several topics were considered specialized by the researcher were either regularly included in the curriculum, such as: (a) marching band, (b) band and choral methods, and (c) brass and woodwinds techniques. Those areas that were hardly ever included in the curriculum were: (a) musical theatre, (b) instrument repair, and (c) guitar techniques.

In the same study, Schmidt (1989) examined the curricular components of the undergraduate music education degree at each of the schools. Calculating the mean percentage for each component, Schmidt found that music courses comprised 33.8% of the degree programs, music education courses accounted for 9.54% of the degree, professional education courses comprised 17% of the programs, and general education courses were 28.1% of the curriculum. Regarding the analysis of the demographical information provided by the schools, the researcher found the greatest variability for hours spent in field experience prior to student teaching. This amount of time ranged from zero to 300 hours. Finally, Schmidt ran a multivariate analysis of the demographical information provided on the topics most often included in the music education curricula. He concluded that the most significant indicator of curriculum structure at institutions of higher education was geographical location.

Schmidt (1989) determined that music teacher preparation curriculum in higher education rarely follows the guidelines as set forth by research. He recommended that world music cultures, jazz band methods, and multi-media be included in music teacher preparation programs, yet none of the schools he surveyed followed guidelines from previous research. He also asserted that future studies on the curricula of
undergraduate music education programs should determine the extent to which research and practice align. Schmidt stated that there should be a balance between practical skill development and intellectual skill development. In sum, Schmidt’s conclusions highlight the need for music teacher preparation programs to examine the best practices set forth in quality research and to adjust curricula to meet the changing needs of students and the current times. He also suggested that follow up studies should occur regularly to inform the necessary adjustments to curriculum.

Similar to Schmidt’s research, the present study will examine the curricular structure of music teacher preparation programs and further discern whether current practice in colleges and universities is evolving to meet the needs of a 21st century society. Schmidt suggested the music teacher preparation programs develop practical skills that will directly aid pre-service music teachers in their development as professionals. The present study will survey alumni of music teacher preparation programs to determine the strengths and the weaknesses of their undergraduate music education degree programs and to discern which knowledge and skills have been the most applicable to their current teaching situations.

Following the research design of Schmidt (1989), Wollenzien (1999) examined the music education curricula of NASM accredited institutions in the North Central Division of MENC. Wollenzien (1999) aimed to determine whether the percentage of music core, general education, and professional education courses compared to the NASM standards had changed or been updated in the years since Schmidt’s (1989) research had been conducted. He also sought to determine if the NASM percentage
requirements of: 50% of music core courses, 30-35% of general education courses and 15-20% of professional education courses were being met by the institutions in the north central part of the United States. Using a survey format similar to that of Schmidt (1989), Wollenzien piloted his survey with ten schools in Minnesota. After revisions were made, he mailed the survey to 135 schools that were accredited by NASM and that belonged to MENC’s North Central Division. The researcher obtained a response rate of 35% and drew conclusions on the curricular programs for music educators based on the responses to his survey. Wollenzien determined that in music teacher preparation programs: (a) 34.4% of courses were music core courses, (b) 28.6% were general education courses, (c) 15.2% were music education courses, (d) 14% were professional education courses, and (e) 7.8% of coursework was devoted to student teaching. The researcher found that schools generally adhered to the NASM percentage guides, but there was great variance in the way individual courses were structured. Each school had a different way to address the topics in the survey and there was no standardization of individual course objectives or learning goals across institutions.

Wollenzien (1999) added to the body of research about the structure of music education curricula by following a parallel research design to Schmidt’s (1989) study. However, Wollenzien neglected to update the survey Schmidt used despite conducting his study twelve years later. In addition, Wollenzien did not thoroughly examine the literature to highlight the conclusions researchers have drawn about expert practices in preparing quality music teachers. The research on vital and pertinent teaching
competencies for all music educators should serve as a guide for assessing whether music teacher preparation programs are adequately preparing their students in these areas. The present study will explore the format of courses as well as strengths and weaknesses of pedagogical techniques.

**Comparing music teacher preparation programs from two perspectives.**

Since the report, Teacher Education in Music by the MENC Commission for Teacher Education in 1970, studies like those of Funk (1977), Schmidt (1989), and Wollenzien (1999) have determined that schools accredited by NASM generally adhere to the guidelines set forth by NASM. Additionally, Stegall, Blackburn, and Coop (1978) demonstrated a need to establish a set of competencies for music teachers who graduate with a degree in music education. The dilemma still exists; what aspects of quality music teaching preparation are missing in the development of excellent music teachers? As a way to investigate this question, Keeler (2008) combined aspects of the research of Funk (1977), Schmidt (1989), Wollenzien (1999), and Stegall, Blackburn, and Coop (1978) to explore the state of music teacher preparation programs and music teachers in Iowa. Keeler (2008) had three research questions:

1. **What are the differences in music core, general education, and professional education in the courses of study in music education at twenty-five colleges and universities in Iowa?**

2. **What are the differences between Iowa college and university programs of study and the requirements of NASM?**
3. To what degree do music education faculty and school administrators agree about the competencies music teachers should have upon entering the workforce?

Keeler first collected curricular information about the music education degree programs at colleges and universities in Iowa (N=25). Using undergraduate degree catalogs and telephone interviews, she compiled the music education degree plans for the 25 institutions in her study. Keeler then compared the degree plans to each other and to the requirements established by NASM. Next, she created two questionnaires that shared a similar design; she then distributed the faculty survey to the two most senior music education faculty members at each of the Iowa colleges and universities, and the administrator survey to a random sample of school administrators from Iowa school districts. Keeler (2008) used the surveys to determine what competencies music education faculty and school administrators believed to be important for future music teachers to master. She created her surveys based on questions from previous research studies as highlighted in her review of literature, and cross-referenced the origins of the survey questions in one of her appendices.

The survey sent to music education faculty and school administrators required subjects to rate the importance of aspects of music mastery and teaching competencies. Participants used a four-point scale to determine if the competencies were 1 (not important) to 4 (critically important). Keeler (2008) had a 56% return rate for the music faculty survey and an 80% return rate for the school administrator
survey. She compared sizes of schools to each other in order to analyze the data of music teacher preparation programs.

Faculty members and school administrators were found to have very little agreement on music competencies, especially those of sight-reading skill, appropriate rehearsal techniques, and performance skill. Regarding teaching characteristics, faculty and administrators differed on the importance of professional behavior, the importance of music, and type of communication skills needed by music teachers. Both sample populations agreed that classroom management, energy, and enthusiasm in the classroom were important for music teachers to be successful in the state of Iowa.

Keeler (2008) found that the larger schools had more commonalities in their music education degree programs than smaller schools. Larger schools also followed the NASM percentage guides for music core, general education, and professional education courses more closely. The largest variation in credit hours between music core, general education, and professional education was in the general education hours (19-90 credit hours). More schools differed on the number of general education requirements than any other aspect of the curriculum for music education majors. Therefore, Keeler’s research showed that, in Iowa, most music education programs are providing future music teachers with a similar amount of music core courses and professional education courses, but institutions of higher education set the requisites for general education courses for their school.
Keeler compared the views of music faculty members to those of school administrators, setting her study apart from previous research on music teacher preparation programs. Her study is significant to the present one because she was the first to compare the views of music education faculty to the views of school administrators; both of which influence pre-service and new music teachers. Among the aims of Keeler’s study was to determine what teaching competencies music teachers must master upon graduation from an undergraduate music education program. However, she neglected to include literature from mainstream teacher education to determine what competencies should be included in her questionnaire. While her surveys were based on the work from previous research on music teacher preparation programs, Keeler’s work does not account for changes in theory or practice in the ten years between Wollenzien’s study and her own.

In order to research current trends in music teacher preparation programs, survey instruments need to be updated to account for changes in theory or practice and to meet the changing musical and educational needs of society. Although Keeler was the only researcher to compare views between two populations closely related to music teacher preparation programs, the present study will enhance this research by surveying alumni of these programs rather than school administrators who may or may not have an education or a background in music.

The present study also accounts for current research on teaching competencies from the general education field and included this information in the questionnaires created for alumni and music education faculty (see Appendix G). Another difference
between Keeler’s surveys and those of the present study is the use of open-ended response questions to identify strengths and weaknesses in professional education courses and degree programs as a whole. The present study will use both qualitative and quantitative data to gain a picture of the life of a typical music major and the strengths and weaknesses of the degree based on the professional experience music teachers have acquired.

**The establishment of specific teaching competencies.** Of the studies explored for the related literature portion of this chapter, none examine the beliefs of graduates of music teacher preparation programs about how prepared they feel to teach music or how satisfied they are with the level and intensity of instruction from their undergraduate music education programs. To examine what competencies should be included in the present study, the researcher explored the work of Imbimbo and Silvernail (1999). Imbimbo and Silvernail (1999) surveyed 3,000 novice teachers in New York City in regard to their teaching competencies to determine whether teacher preparation influences what teachers feel prepared to do upon entering the profession. Imbimbo and Silvernail used a questionnaire that was adapted from the National Center for Restructuring Education, Schools, and Teaching (NCREST)\(^4\) 1997 survey.

“The revised survey consisted of five sections: (1) current teaching status; (2) professional knowledge; (3) in-service professional development participation; (4) 

\(^4\) Established in 1990 by Linda Darling-Hammond and Ann Lieberman the purpose of this organization is to document, support, and sustain reform in education in New York and the rest of the United States. For more information:  
http://www.tc.columbia.edu/NCREST/
teacher satisfaction and efficacy; and (5) demographic information” (Imbimbo & Silvernail, 1999, p. 2). Teachers responded to statements about 39 teaching competencies using a four-point Likert-scale of 4 (very prepared), 3 (somewhat prepared), 2 (somewhat unprepared), and 1 (very unprepared). (Imbimbo & Silvernail published in Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002). Results indicated that teachers entering the field from accredited programs felt more prepared than teachers entering from alternative certification pathways. Additionally, teacher preparation programs that were highly rated had extensive clinical experience with a focus on connecting theory to practice. The sample population felt most prepared to teach when they (a) had an understanding of the subject matter knowledge, (b) implemented effective instructional strategies, (c) were proficient in educational technology, and (d) had a consistent classroom management plan.

Imbimbo and Silvernail (1999) concluded that the study helped teacher educators to pinpoint specific competencies and facilitate mastery of the art of teaching in teacher preparation programs. The competencies presented in the Imbimbo and Silvernail (1999) study more accurately demonstrate the knowledge and skills new teachers believe successful teachers must possess when inducted into the teaching profession.

According to the ongoing research at NCREST (Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002), well-prepared teachers need to:

1. Be able to teach subject matter concepts, knowledge, and skills in ways that enable students to learn;
2. Use instructional strategies that promote student learning;

3. Relate classroom learning to the real world; and

4. Evaluate and reflect on their own practice to improve instruction

Music teacher preparation programs need to be evaluated for their development of these teacher competencies. Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow (2002) assert that these are the necessary qualities of successful teachers.

Summary

With the intent of improving music teacher preparation, the purpose of the present study is to examine the efficacy of music teacher preparation programs in the United States. Key proclamations from the Tanglewood Symposium were: (a) music must be more relevant and transferrable to students beyond the classroom, and (b) teachers must be prepared to teach to the ever-changing needs of society while still maintaining the integrity of the profession (Choate, Fowler, Brown, & Wersen, 1967). In a similar spirit, the MENC Commission on Teacher Education (year) suggested changes to the general education, music core, and professional education components of music teacher preparation curricula.

Despite the practical aims of the 1970 MENC document, the 1987 publication of the Commission on Teacher Education contributed very little toward improving music teacher preparation programs. The 1970 document aligns with the aims of the present research study and will serve as a guide to survey development and eventual interpretation of results.
Funk (1977) examined music teacher preparation programs in Texas in relationship to the NASM standards. His method of analyzing the curriculum compared to the NASM standards will be used as a model in the present study because he used percentages of the credit total for each category. Using this method to analyze the data accounts for any differences in the way credit hours are structured in different schools, but discloses the amount of time devoted to each area of study compared to the credit total of the degree program. Stegall, Blackburn, and Coop (1978) created a list of music competencies and then determined the most important competencies based on responses of music educators from across the nation. Similar to Stegall, Blackburn, and Coop, one aim of the current study is to examine those teaching competencies pre-service music teachers develop in their undergraduate degree programs.

Keeler (2008) added to the body of research on the curricular structure of music teacher preparation programs as compared to NASM requirements, and examined how music education faculty rated music and teaching competencies compared to school supervisors. The present study will also examine schools based on the size of the enrollment of music departments to determine similarities and differences in the division of curriculum for music education majors at these institutions.

The teaching competencies from the research of Imbimbo and Silvernail and the characteristics of well-prepared teachers (Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow,
2002) will be used to develop survey questions that gain insight into the thoughts of music faculty and graduates about their music teacher preparation programs.

In the following chapter, the researcher will discuss the research questions and the design of the present study in light of her theoretical framework. The methodology of the study will be presented, encompassing a description of the participants, the design, reliability and validity of the measurement tools, and the means for data collection and analysis.
CHAPTER 3

Methodology

The purpose of this research was to compare the music education degree curricular components at NASM accredited colleges and universities in the United States, and to determine if there was a relationship between music education faculty and music education graduates’ assessment of their music teacher preparation programs. In this chapter, the theoretical lens that guided the construction of the research questions, and the method for conducting the study, will be presented.

The present study was based upon a transformative mixed methods design. In transformative mixed methods research, a theoretical lens often becomes a perspective for researchers to design a study, analyze data, and draw conclusions. The lens provides a framework for examining the quantitative and qualitative variables of a study, and to draw meaningful conclusions that tie aspects of both parts of the design together (Creswell, 2009). Creswell states that a theory explains “how and why the variables are related” (2009, p. 69) and acts “as a bridge between or among the variables” (2009, p. 69). The theoretical lens acts as a map to direct how the study should be designed and is used as a guide for interpreting results and drawing conclusions from both the qualitative and quantitative aspects of a mixed methods study.
**Theoretical Lens**

Creswell (2009) defines a theory as “...an interrelated set of constructs formed into propositions or hypotheses that specify the relationship among variables (typically in terms of magnitude or direction)” (p. 51). To strengthen the connection between the research literature and the design of the study, the researcher embraced two philosophical perspectives, which provided direction for the present study. The philosophical perspectives of functionalism and critical social theory served to form a foundation for this research. A discussion of each perspective and its relationship to the present study follows.

**Functionalism.** Well-known music education philosopher, Thomas Regelski (2009) provides a functionalist perspective for examining music teaching as a profession. In his article, The Ethics of Music Teaching as Profession and Praxis, Regelski set forth the premise that music teachers with a functionalist outlook believe they are providing a unique service to their students and the community. Accordingly, he believes that music teachers are professionals who provide a distinctive service that is useful for students beyond the scope of the classroom.

Music teachers, in Regelski’s (2009) opinion, should consider their job as a professional and functional occupation. From this lens, the aim of music education professionals should be to provide a service to the students and the community at large. Furthermore, teachers should be able to evolve to meet the changing educational and societal needs of both their students and the community. According to Regelski, learning, by its very nature, is not stagnant but ever-changing and, as such, the role of
the teacher should not remain stagnant. Therefore, effective teachers are self-reflective and self-critical and strive to best meet the changing needs of their students as judged by the benefits their students and the community receive (Regelski, 2009).

Regelski (2009) identifies two critical questions when thinking about music teaching as a profession: (a) “What noticeable changes in musically beneficial directions does the teacher intend to be the typical result of instruction?” (p. 20) and (b) “What can a student do mindfully and musically – and thereafter chooses to do– at all, better, or more often as a result of instruction?” (p. 21). The research questions for this study align with Regelski’s functionalist view. Regelski believes teaching professionals should be mindful of educating all children and reflect on teaching practices to best meet the musical needs of all students. This provided the basis for the questionnaires used in the present study.

**Critical social theory.** Critical social theory is a blend of both critical theory and social theory and is most often referred to in the field of education. Leonardo (2004) believed the aim of professionals, under a critical social framework, is to self-reflect on their work in order to gain a deeper, more educated understanding of their careers. Critical social theorists find understanding through a critical look of their own profession from multiple angles so they make the most accurate and effective professional decisions. In the education profession, these theorists value knowledge of teaching and student learning through sound, moral research. “Critical research does not require the investigator to maintain complete objectivity about the study,” (Phillips, 2008, p. 86). Leonardo (2004) stressed that educators should use this lens to
Examine the strengths of the teaching profession and to pinpoint areas for reform. Hope, the executive director of NASM, critically examines policies as related to music teacher preparation programs. In his position paper, Strategic Policy Issues and Music Teacher Preparation, Hope (2007) identifies the potential dangers and illusions that can misguide reform in music teacher preparation.

Students and faculty involved with music teacher preparation programs need to be critically aware of the dangers hindering growth and reform within the profession. These dangers are found not only externally from the profession, but also from within each program itself. Hope (2007) warned educators to be aware of the gradations of danger when thinking of policy arenas associated with music teacher preparation. These gradations are different levels of danger that the field faces and include the following: (a) a loss of interest in music study at the collegiate level, (b) a loss of engaged personnel in music study (professors and students), (c) a loss of music teacher preparation programs that create career leaders in the field, and (d) a failure to prepare music teachers who will succeed (Hope, 2007).

In analyzing music teacher preparation programs, music educators must keep these four points in mind so as to ensure awareness of the illusions that are inherent in a non-critical view of the programs. In this context, Hope defined illusions as parts of music policies and structures of programs that skew judgment and create false realities and unrealistic dreams for personnel involved with these music teacher preparation program. Some of the illusions identified by Hope that are relevant to the present study are:
1. Control - Music educators think they have more control of the musical culture than they really do.

2. Time - Music education programs have been stuffed with so many credits and requirements that students do not have time to learn and engage and reflect and master any skills before graduating.

3. Scope - Researchers often think that what works in one area will work in all other areas of music.

4.Opponents - Often music education professors spend time arguing with applied faculty, but instead we should think about fighting the forces that are opposed to the best conditions for music study.

5. Curriculum Content - Music proficiency, music teaching proficiency, general knowledge of education, and general knowledge in other studies have different weights in every music teacher preparation program and schools need to discuss what is absolutely important and necessary to know before graduating (Hope, 2007).

Researchers of music teacher preparation programs have generated critical questions that music education faculty should use to guide reform of these programs to better meet the changing needs of preservice teachers and society as a whole. Equally important, the following questions are stated here to further define the theoretical framework for the present study:

1. What is it that music educators want to achieve? (Hope, 2007)
2. Who are music education students and what do they want to do? (Hope, 2007)

3. Are they musicians or teachers first? (Mark, 1998)

4. Are music teacher educators focusing on essential and enduring understandings of being a music teacher? (Hope, 2007)

5. What should be contained within a music education curriculum? (Asmus, 2001)

Critical social theory will guide the interpretation of the present study’s results. From this lens, the researcher may examine how behaviors and interactions have had a positive or negative impact on a particular topic that is being studied.

The present study is grounded in functionalism (Regelski, 2009) and critical social theory (Leonardo, 2004; Hope, 2007). The researcher embraces the ideals of functionalism as they apply to developing expertise in music teaching. As the primary investigator, critical social theory provides the lens for the researcher to examine the construction of music teacher preparation curriculum.

**Research Design**

One aim of the present study was to identify the amount of time devoted to classes in general education, music core, and professional education areas of the undergraduate music education degree. In addition, the present study determined how these degree programs aligned with the NASM standards for undergraduate music curricula. The functionalist lens guided the researcher’s development of questionnaires to identify the perspectives of music education faculty and their alumni of the
strengths and weaknesses of the undergraduate music education degree programs at their schools.

The present study took a transformative mixed methods approach, which combines both qualitative and quantitative research methodologies (Creswell, 2009). To answer the research questions of this study, the method of data collection was divided into two phases. A description of the two phases, the subjects of the study, and analyses of data will follow.

**Phase one.**

*Subjects.* In Phase One of the current study, research questions one and two were addressed:

1. How much time do music education majors spend in classes devoted to the acquisition of music content, professional knowledge, and general education knowledge?

2. To what degree do music teacher preparation programs align with the NASM structural guidelines for music education curricula?

To answer these questions, the curriculum for music teacher preparation programs accredited by NASM (N=51), across the United States, were examined and compared. Schools were selected using a stratified random sampling process where larger music schools were more likely to be selected and all nine regions of NASM were represented. To be considered for participation, all music teacher preparation curricula had to be posted on the university’s website according to regulations from NASM. The subjects for Phase One of the study were NASM accredited colleges and
universities with music teacher preparation programs. NASM divides the schools into nine geographical regions; a random selection of schools from each geographical region (N=51) served as the sample for this study.

Phase One began with an accumulation of the curricular content of the random sampling of schools as a stratified cluster sample (Ilvento, Warner, & Maurer, 1986). The population of the survey was the number of schools accredited by NASM (N=485). Accordingly, the researcher arranged the total number of schools accredited by NASM into their respective nine regions of the country. The enrollment size of each of the school’s music department was cumulatively totaled (t= 86,843). The sampling interval was determined by dividing the cumulative total by the desired number of schools for the study (N=51). The sampling interval was calculated to be 1736. Using a random number formula in Microsoft Excel (2007) the researcher used the sampling interval to select the 51 schools (see Appendix D). This technique allowed for the researcher to select schools from each of NASM’s nine geographical regions and for larger music schools to have a greater chance of being selected for the study.

Data collection. The researcher examined each school’s curriculum and determined the percentage of total classes required for music content knowledge, professional knowledge, and general education knowledge (see Appendix A). Instrumental music education degree programs were examined and compared to the following NASM (2008) minimum requirements for accreditation in music teacher preparation:
1. Music core classes, which comprise 50% of the total degree program.

2. General education studies, which comprise 30-35% of the total degree program.

3. Professional knowledge classes, which comprise 15-20% of the total degree, program (NASM, 2008).

To account for classes that addressed music education professional knowledge and school of education classes that focused on professional knowledge, the researcher determined the percentage of professional knowledge classes from both of those areas. Results from each aspect of the curriculum were compared among the schools to determine if there was a trend in the requirements from each of participant colleges and universities.

Phase two.

Development of questionnaires. In Phase Two, the researcher answered research question three, four, and five:

3. In what ways are teaching competencies developed in music teacher preparation programs?

4. What components of a music teacher preparation program are most useful to music teachers?

5. Do music teacher educators and graduates of teacher preparation programs agree about the success of their programs in preparing future music teachers?
The MTQ and the MFQ were developed to address the research questions of this study regarding the practical application of courses in instrumental music teacher preparation programs and whether faculty and alumni had agreement about the state of their music teacher preparation programs. A cross-reference of questions developed for both the MTQ and the MFQ from previous research studies can be found in Appendix G. The questionnaires were developed in Qualtrics (1997), a survey research software program.

Two questionnaires were created for this phase of the study: The Music Teacher Questionnaire (MTQ) and the Music Faculty Questionnaire (MFQ), both of which share a similar design (see Appendix B).

Music teacher questionnaire (MTQ). The MTQ has four sections; the first part of the survey asks for demographical information from the participants. Questions in this section addressed participants’ alma mater, the concentration of their music education degree, and their current teaching assignments. Part two addressed research question number four: What components of a music teacher preparation program are most useful to new music teachers? Participants were asked to answer questions regarding music core courses (theory, aural skills, history/literature, composition, orchestration, private study, and ensembles), and professional education courses (music methods, secondary instruments, conducting, and school of education courses). One question addressed the instructional format of the following courses: (a) lecture, (b) lecture with some class discussion, (c) large group discussion, (d) small group work/cooperative learning, (e) a blend of all formats, or (f) other. Another question
asked participants to rank how often they use the information gained in the music core and professional education courses. The final questions in this section required participants to reflect on the amount of time spent preparing for these courses and to determine if these time allotments would change if they were to be an undergraduate music education major again.

Parts three and four addressed research question three: *In what ways are teaching competencies developed in music teacher preparation programs?* Part three included questions about secondary instrument courses and pertained to instructors who primarily taught these classes, and took into account those aspects that were beneficial or challenging when students took these courses. The second portion of part three addressed field experiences, requesting information about the amount of time pre-service teachers spent in schools and the type of feedback and reflection that followed teaching. Part four required participants to rate their level of satisfaction in preparation of general teaching competencies.

The MTQ was developed from a foundation of previous research that addressed quality teacher preparation programs, including student development of instructional decision-making, reflective practice, and use of enriching field experiences. A complete reference of the questions that were drawn from the related literature can be found in Appendix G.

*Music faculty questionnaire (MFQ).* The MFQ shared a similar design to the MTQ in order to address research question five: *Do music teacher educators and
graduates of teacher preparation programs agree about the success of their programs in preparing future music teachers?

Part one addressed demographical information, including college of employment and number of years employed at the school. Part two asked participants to identify the format of the music core courses and professional education courses in their school’s undergraduate music education program. Further, part two required participants to rank the amount of time students tend to spend preparing for these courses and then to address the amount of time they wish students would devote to these courses. Part three concentrated on respondents’ thoughts about secondary instrument instruction and field experiences. Respondents were asked the same questions as found in the MTQ, including open-ended questions about the strengths and weaknesses of secondary instrument instruction and field experiences in the schools. In part four participants rated the preparation level of graduates of their undergraduate music teacher preparation programs on general teaching competencies. All questions were modified from the wording of the MTQ to address the music education faculty members in order to make comparisons between the two groups.

**Content and construct validity.** To confirm the content and construct validity of the questionnaires, the researcher piloted the MTQ and MFQ with a population representative of each sample. As participants took either the MTQ or the MFQ they responded with written comments and suggestions for modifications to the questionnaires. After revisions were made to the questionnaires, the researcher conducted a talk-aloud with music education faculty and experienced teachers in the
field of music education for a final verification of the content and construct of each questionnaire. The questionnaires were revised accordingly. Upon completion of the final revisions of the surveys, the researcher electronically sent the requests for participation to the chairs of the music education departments at the schools randomly selected to participate in Phase Two of the study.

To address the validity of the open-ended questions, the researcher used a third party debriefer to verify that the coded results matched the data collected.

Subjects. The study was submitted to the University of Delaware’s Institutional Review Board, and the use of human subjects for this research study was approved (see Appendix E). The MTQ was sent to teachers who were graduates of the schools examined in Phase One of this study. The MFQ was distributed to music teacher educators employed by the schools examined in Phase One.

Data collection. To be realistic of the time constraints for this study, the researcher randomly selected a sample of participants (n=12) to be surveyed from the schools selected in Phase One. These schools were selected based on the following criteria: (a) average enrollment size (three schools from each size: very large, large, medium, and small); and (b) the likelihood of response based on personal contacts at the participating schools. This technique allowed the researcher to obtain a more realistic response to the surveys while still taking into consideration the purpose and research questions for this study.

The 51 schools, examined in Phase One, were divided into four categories based on size. These sizes were determined by taking each music department’s total
enrollment and then by determining the median, upper, and lower quartiles based on enrollment size of each school. Schools with music department enrollment greater than 645 students were determined to be Very Large, schools with enrollment between 465 and 645 students were determined to be Large, schools with enrollment between 375 and 465 were determined to be Medium and schools with enrollment less than 375 were determined to be Small. The University of Delaware was added to the small school list as a pilot school for the distribution of the MTQ and the MFQ because it is the alma mater of the researcher and fits the criteria established in Phase One of the study.

Once the schools were placed into the four size categories, the researcher identified which schools would be more likely to participate in the study due to personal connections with her advisor and others involved with her study. These schools were selected from each category because the chance of success in responses was more likely.

The researcher then randomly chose three schools from each of the size categories. The pool from each category was determined by the personal connections the researcher and her thesis advisory committee had at each school to increase the likelihood of higher response rates to the surveys. Once three schools with personal connections from each category were randomly selected, the researcher had a list of twelve schools to survey for Phase Two of this study (see Appendix F).

In Phase Two the researcher sent a cover letter (see Appendix C) requesting participation of alumni from the schools selected in Phase One. A cover letter and the
MTQ were sent electronically to the alumni. At the same time the researcher contacted music education faculty of the random sampling of schools and requested that they complete the MFQ. The researcher created a website where participants could appropriately access either the MFQ or the MTQ. The link to the website was included in the cover letters and emailed to the potential participants of the study. A follow up email was sent a week before the deadline to complete the survey.

**Data Analysis**

Quantitative data collected through Phase One (curricular structure) and Phase Two (survey responses) were organized and analyzed using Microsoft Excel (2007) and JMP5 (2009). Qualitative data collected through the open-ended questions in each survey in Phase Two were organized into text documents and imported into HyperRESEARCH6 (1997).

**Quantitative data analysis.** Information about the curricular structure of undergraduate music education degree programs was collected from online catalogs at each of the schools’ websites. This information was organized in Microsoft Excel (2007) and imported into JMP (2009).

Quantitative data from Phase Two was automatically organized in Qualtrics (1997), exported into Microsoft Excel (2007), and analyzed in JMP (2009).

---

5 JMP (2009) is a statistical software program distributed by SAS, a large statistical software company. The program is ideal for basic statistical analysis similar to Microsoft Excel but has more functions than the Microsoft product.

6 HyperRESEARCH (1997) is software which assists researchers with coding and categorizing data.
**Qualitative data analysis.** All open-ended responses from the MTQ and MFQ were re-typed as a text document since HyperRESEARCH (1997) does not open text from files other than text documents. Once all of the data were converted to text documents, the researcher coded participant responses to the MTQ and the MFQ separately. Each response was coded according to the school where the participant was associated.

Although potential subjects were contacted in person initially, both surveys were designed for participants to anonymously respond. Thus, no data were linked to participants.

**Strategy of inquiry.** The researcher used the theoretical lens of critical social theory to guide how she read and coded the qualitative data. Creswell (2009) explains that transformative mixed methods studies may use a combination of inductive and deductive approaches for analyzing qualitative data. Researchers who use this mode of inquiry develop codes based on several readings of the data; the codes are constantly compared and themes emerge. To that end, the researcher determined the codes for the qualitative data based on her theoretical lens and from reading the participants responses. She then looked for emergent themes based on the coding of data.

**Qualitative data validity.** To address the validity of the qualitative data collected, the researcher asked a third-party to examine the qualitative data collected, and analysis to verify this matched the results the researcher interpreted. Creswell (2009) identifies this as peer debriefing. “This involves locating a person (a peer debriefer) who reviews and asks questions about the qualitative [aspects of the] study.
so that the account will resonate with people other than the researcher” (Creswell, 2009, p. 192). The peer debriefer determined that the researcher’s results aligned with the data collected from the open-ended responses (see Appendix H).

**Summary**

In this chapter, the researcher delineated the design and outlined the theoretical lens for the present study. A functionalist perspective guided the design of the study and critical social theory provided a foundation for the development of the MTQ and MFQ and the subsequent interpretation of the results. The researcher collected curricular information on schools accredited by NASM (N=51) and created two surveys to disperse to music education faculty and alumni of twelve randomly selected colleges for the first phase of the study. The surveys were piloted, revised, and sent by email to potential participants of the study. Data collected from Phase One was analyzed quantitatively, whereas data collected from Phase Two was analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. Using a mixed-methods design will provide a clear picture regarding the current state of music education teacher preparation programs.

Upon data analysis, the results of this study were presented and interpreted. From the results, conclusions were formed that address the research purpose of examining the efficacy of music teacher preparation programs. The conclusions provided a basis for determining implications for music teacher preparation and recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 4

Data Analysis and Results

The purpose of this study was to examine music teacher preparation programs by (a) analyzing their curricular structure and (b) surveying faculty and alumni about the strengths and weaknesses of their programs. The study was conducted in two phases. In Phase One, undergraduate music education curriculum was collected from 51 randomly selected, NASM accredited schools. The credit totals were converted to percentages and the data were analyzed comparing the music education curricula at small, medium, large, and very large schools. In Phase Two, the researcher collected both quantitative and qualitative data from music education faculty and alumni through their completion of MFQ or the MTQ, respectively. The data analyses and results of the data collected from Phase One and Phase Two are presented in this chapter.

Phase One

Data collection and analysis. The researcher gathered curricular information on undergraduate music education degrees from 51 schools accredited by NASM. These schools represented all nine geographical regions of the United States (see Figure 3) and ranged in music department enrollment size from 1608 to 302 students (see Table 1).
**Figure 3.** The nine geographical regions for schools accredited by NASM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentile</th>
<th>Quartile</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Size Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>Very Large Schools: Larger than 645 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>Quartile</td>
<td>645.75</td>
<td>Large Schools: Between 465 and 645 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>Median</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>Medium Schools: Between 375 and 465 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>Quartile</td>
<td>375.75</td>
<td>Small Schools: Less than 375 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>302</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The University of Delaware was included as a pilot school for Phase One of the data collection. Twelve schools fit the Very Large category, thirteen schools fell into the Large category, thirteen schools were in the Medium category, and thirteen schools comprised the Small category.
Question One

1. How much time do music education majors spend in classes devoted to the acquisition of (a) general education knowledge, (b) music content knowledge, and (c) professional education knowledge?

Data collection and analysis. An understanding of the types of courses that comprise general education, music content, and professional education was needed prior to data collection and analysis. NASM describes general education as those courses not devoted specifically to music or music education. Students take these courses to develop general competencies needed for a career in the professional world. Music content knowledge courses provide those needed skills that all music professionals must have (NASM, 2008). The courses included under music content knowledge for this study are: (a) music theory, (b) ear training and aural skills, (c) history and literature, (d) composition and orchestration, (e) piano skills, (f) private study on primary instrument, and (g) music ensembles. Professional education, as described by NASM, includes courses that develop the competencies necessary for a person to be considered as a professional in the field of education. For the present study, the courses included in professional education were: (a) music education methods, (b) secondary instruments, (c) conducting, and (d) school of education courses (regular education methods). Courses typically found in regular education methods were those relating to diversity in the classroom, special learners, and child development.

The researcher calculated the number of credits devoted to (a) general education knowledge, (b) music content knowledge, and (c) professional education
knowledge for each school. She then totaled the amount of credits and determined the percentage of courses in each area of the participant schools’ music education degree program. This accounted for schools working on different weights of credits and different academic divisions. Once the percentages were calculated for each school, the average percentage of time devoted to these areas was calculated for each size division (see Figures 4, 5, 6, & 7).

Results. The schools with a Very Large enrollment (n = 12) selected for this study were from Regions 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, and 9. The average amount of time spent in music core courses in very large schools was found to comprise 41% of the total degree program. Thirty-four percent of the total degree was devoted to professional education, while 25% of the music education degree was spent in general education courses. The range of the percentage of music core courses was 29% to 55% of the total degree program. The range of the percentage of general education courses ranged from 11% to 41%, while the range of the percentage of professional education courses was 26% to 41% of the total degree program (see Figure 4).
The schools with a Large enrollment (n = 13) selected for this study were from Regions 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. The average amount of time spent in music core courses in large schools comprised 44% of the total degree program. For these schools, thirty-two percent of the total degree was devoted to professional education, while 24% of the music education degree was spent in general education courses. The range of the percentage of music core courses was 36% to 54% of the total degree program. The range of the percentage of general education courses was 17% to 35%, while the range of the percentage of professional education courses was 21% to 42% of the total degree program (see Figure 5).
Figure 5. Average of Curriculum Content Distribution - Large Schools

The schools with a Medium enrollment (n = 13) selected for this study were from Regions 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9. The average amount of time spent in music core courses in medium schools encompassed 39% of the total degree program. Thirty-two percent of the total degree was devoted to professional education, while 29% of the music education degree comprised general education courses. The range of the percentage of music core courses was 33% to 46% of the total degree program. The range of the percentage of general education courses was 15% to 35%; while the range of the percentage of professional education courses was 22% to 39% of the total degree program (see Figure 6).
The schools with a Small enrollment (n = 13) selected for this study were from Regions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9. The average amount of time spent in music core courses in medium schools comprised 38% of the total degree program. Thirty-two percent of the total degree was devoted to professional education, while 30% of the music education degree program were general education courses. The range of the percentage of music core courses was 29% to 47% of the total degree program. The range of the percentage of general education courses was 19% to 41%; whereas the range of the percentage of professional education courses was 23% to 44% of the total degree program (see Figure 7).
Figure 7. Average of Curriculum Content Distribution- Small Schools

To examine the curricular structure of the study schools, the researcher calculated the percentage of course hours devoted to music education courses and school of education courses. Not every school required students to enroll in school of education courses, so the average percentages were taken at each school size: Very Large, Large, Medium, and Small. Table 2 shows the average of professional education credit hours for each category of school as well as the percentage of courses offered in the music education department or the school of education.

Table 2
Division of professional education courses by percentage of the average of professional education credit hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music Education</strong></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School of Education</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Credit Hours of Professional Education Courses</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.46</strong></td>
<td><strong>43.77</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.85</strong></td>
<td><strong>47.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 51
The researcher then calculated the average credit hours devoted to music core courses. The courses included in music core for this study were: (a) music theory, (b) aural skills, (c) history and literature, (d) composition and orchestration, (e) piano, (f) private study, and (g) performing groups. The percentage of credit hours devoted to those courses compared to the average number of credit hours for music core courses is provided in Tables 3-9. These numbers are displayed in the size categories established for the 51 schools from the initial stages of research for this study. Stem and leaf plots show the distribution for each type of course by each of the fifty-one school percentages.

Music theory (see Table 3) courses accounted for an average of 21% of the total credit hours in music core courses, with a standard deviation of 6% (see Figure 8). Curricular percentages for music theory ranged from 0-38% for the 51 schools. The school with no courses in music theory had a comprehensive musicianship class with theory embedded into part of the curriculum. For the largest number of schools, music theory comprised 24% percent of the music core.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music Theory Courses</th>
<th>Very Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Total Music Core Courses (Credit Hrs)</th>
<th>Very Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hrs</td>
<td>55.25</td>
<td>60.38</td>
<td>54.69</td>
<td>54.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 51
Aural skills courses (see Table 4) accounted for an average of 10% of the total credit hours of music core courses, with a standard deviation of 4% (see Figure 9). Curricular percentages for aural skills ranged from 0-24% for the 51 schools. The school with no courses in aural skills had a comprehensive musicianship class with aural skills embedded into part of the curriculum. For the largest number of schools, aural skills comprised 8% percent of the music core.
Table 4
Percentage of aural skills courses by the average total of music core credit hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aural Skills</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Total Music Core Courses (Credit Hrs)</td>
<td>55.25</td>
<td>60.38</td>
<td>54.69</td>
<td>54.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N = 51

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Leaf</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>66667</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0000001</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>888888888888999999</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>66677777777</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Aural Skills Course Distribution (by percentage). 2|4 = 24%

History and literature (see Table 5) courses accounted for an average of 16% of the total credit hours in music core courses with a standard deviation of 5% (see Figure 10). Curricular percentages for history and literature ranged from 3-33% for the 51 schools. For the largest number of schools, history and literature were 15% percent of the music core.
Table 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History and Literature</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Total</td>
<td>55.25</td>
<td>60.38</td>
<td>54.69</td>
<td>54.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Core Courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Credit Hrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stem</th>
<th>Leaf</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2233</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0000</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8888</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6667</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4444</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2223</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0001</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. History and Literature Course Distribution (by percentage). 3|3 = 33%

Composition and orchestration (see Table 6) courses accounted for an average of 3.5% of the total credit hours in music core courses, with a standard deviation of 3.5% (see Figure 11). Curricular percentages for composition and orchestration ranged from 0-13% for the 51 schools. For the largest number of schools, composition and orchestra were not a part of the music core.
Table 6
Percentage of composition and orchestration courses by the average total of music core credit hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition and Orchestration</th>
<th>Very Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Total Music Core Courses (Credit Hrs)</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Comp. and Orch. Course Distribution (by percentage). 13|0 = 13%

Piano courses (see Table 7) accounted for an average of 6.7% of the total credit hours in music core courses, with a standard deviation of 4.5% (see Figure 12).
Curricular percentages for piano ranged from 0-19% for the 51 schools. For the largest number of schools, piano courses comprised 8% percent of the music core.
Table 7

Percentage of piano courses by the average total of music core credit hours

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Core</td>
<td>55.25</td>
<td>60.38</td>
<td>54.69</td>
<td>54.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses (Credit Hrs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N = 51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 12. Piano Course Distribution (by percentage). 1|9 =19%

Private study courses (see Table 8) accounted for an average of 27.5% of the total credit hours in music core courses, with a standard deviation of 7% (see Figure 13). Curricular percentages for private study ranged from 14- 52% for the 51 schools. For the largest number of schools, private study comprised 26% percent of the music core.
Table 8  
*Percentage of private study courses by the average total of music core credit hours*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Study</strong></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music Core</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Courses (Credit Hrs)</strong></td>
<td>55.25</td>
<td>60.38</td>
<td>54.69</td>
<td>54.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 51</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Stem-and-Leaf Plot](https://via.placeholder.com/150)

**Figure 13.** Private Study Course Distribution (by percentage). 5[2] = 52%

Ensembles (see Table 9) accounted for an average of 15.8% of the total credit hours in music core courses, with a standard deviation of 5% (see Figure 14).

Curricular percentages for ensembles ranged from 6- 35%. For the largest number of schools, the ensemble distribution ranged from 12% to 18% of the music core.

Table 9  
*Percentage of ensemble courses by the average total of music core credit hours*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Very Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ensembles</strong></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Total</strong></td>
<td>55.25</td>
<td>60.38</td>
<td>54.69</td>
<td>54.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Music Core</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Courses (Credit Hrs)</strong></td>
<td>55.25</td>
<td>60.38</td>
<td>54.69</td>
<td>54.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N = 51</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 14.** Ensemble Course Distribution (by percentage). $3|5 = 35\%$

**Summary of results.** Results from the analysis of the percentage of courses in music education degree programs indicate that there is little variation in the way the curriculum is divided among schools in all four size categories. The most amount of time, 37-40% of the total curriculum is spent in music core courses, followed by professional education (32-35% of the total curriculum), and general education (24-30% of the total curriculum) courses. Further analysis of professional education courses revealed that two-thirds of the curriculum is comprised of music education courses, while one third of the total curriculum is relegated to general education courses.

The analysis of the courses commonly found in the music core illustrated that the majority of curricular time is devoted to private study (23-30%), followed by
music theory (19-23%), music history (15-19%), ensembles (15-17%), aural skills (10-11%), piano (6-8%), and then composition and orchestration (3-4%).

**Question Two**

2. To what degree do music teacher preparation programs align with the NASM structural guidelines for music education curricula?

**Data analysis.** To answer research question two, curricular data were compared side by side with NASM percentage guides of the distribution of credit hours for the music education degree. The NASM guidelines for music core, general education, and professional education courses are in percentages to account for varying credit weights of different schools; the researcher converted the curricular information of the content subjects to percentages in order to account for the varying credit totals. Table 10 shows the side-by-side comparison of each of the four size categories according to the NASM standards for the division of curricular percentages.

**Results.** The researcher compared each of the average percentage of courses to the NASM percentage guidelines for the division of the music education curriculum. Table 10 shows the NASM percentage guide for music core courses followed by each average percentage for the four school sizes. Table 11 indicates the NASM percentage standard for general education courses followed by the average percentage for Very Large, Large, Medium and Small schools. Table 12 highlights the NASM guidelines for professional education courses followed by the average percentages for the four size categories.
Upon comparing the average percentage totals of the four size categories to the NASM standards, no institutional size category (Very Large, Large, Medium, or Small) average was found to meet the NASM standards for music core courses. Comparing the individual 51 schools to the NASM guide, only four schools met or exceeded 50% for music core courses. The average percentage of all of the schools for music core was 40% with a standard deviation of 5%. The most common percentage amount of all 51 schools for music core was 39%; seven of the 51 schools had 39% of the music education degree in music core courses (see Table 10).

Table 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Music Core</th>
<th>NASM</th>
<th>Very Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music Core</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Total Credit Hours | 120 (Minimum) | 138.13 (Average) | 137.46 (Average) | 142.38 (Average) | 145.58 (Average) |

N=51

Table 11 shows that medium and small sized schools are the closest to the NASM percentages for general education courses, while very large and large schools fall short of allotted time for the requirement. Comparing all 51 schools to the NASM guide of 30-35% of curricular allotment, 19 schools met or exceeded this amount. The average percentage of all of the schools for general education in all of the schools was 27% with a standard deviation of 6%.
Table 11
*General education courses by percentage as compared to the NASM percentage guide*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NASM</th>
<th>Very Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Education</td>
<td>30-35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Credit Hours</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>138.13</td>
<td>137.46</td>
<td>142.38</td>
<td>145.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Average)</td>
<td>(Average)</td>
<td>(Average)</td>
<td>(Average)</td>
<td>(Average)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N=51

All four school size categories averaged more than 20% (the upper percentage total for NASM) of their courses to be professional education (see Table 12). All 51 schools exceeded the 20% allotment for professional education courses in their degree programs. Comparing the distribution of professional education percentages for all 51 schools, the researcher found that the average amount was 32% with a standard deviation of 7%.

Table 12
*Professional education courses by percentage as compared to the NASM percentage guide*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NASM</th>
<th>Very Large</th>
<th>Large</th>
<th>Medium</th>
<th>Small</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Education</td>
<td>15-20%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Credit Hours</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>138.13</td>
<td>137.46</td>
<td>142.38</td>
<td>145.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Average)</td>
<td>(Average)</td>
<td>(Average)</td>
<td>(Average)</td>
<td>(Average)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N=51

**Summary of Phase One Results**

In Phase One, the researcher collected curricular information on 51 schools accredited by NASM. Upon data analysis, she determined that these schools devote 24-30% of the total degree to general education courses, 32-34% of the total degree to professional education courses, and 38-44% of the total degree to music core courses. Further, approximately two-thirds of professional education courses are music...
education courses, while one-third are general education courses. The researcher also determined that private study is weighted the most (23-30%) of the music core courses, followed by music theory (19-23%), and history and literature (15-19%). Composition and orchestration (3-4%), piano (6-8%), and aural skills (10-11%) have the least weight in the music core courses. When comparing the 51 schools to the NASM guidelines of 50% for music core, 25-30% for general education, and 15-20% for professional education, the researcher determined that music core courses encompass less than 50% of the total degree program at the participant schools, while professional education courses make up more than 15-20% of the total degree program at these institutions of higher education. In general, all schools examined for Phase One of the study are meeting the guidelines set forth by NASM for the instrumental music education degree. In Phase Two, the researcher used the MTQ and MFQ to gather more information about the music core and professional education courses at the NASM accredited schools.

**Phase Two**

The MTQ and the MFQ found in Appendix B were developed to answer research questions three, four, and five. Due to the relatively small number of participants for Phase Two of this study, readers are cautioned that results only reflect the responses from this small sample population.
**Quantitative data collection and analysis.** The researcher randomly selected twelve schools from Phase One of the study to participate in Phase Two. These schools represented the four size categories from Phase One. A cover letter (see Appendix C) and a link to the survey were sent to the music education chair at each school. In the letter, the researcher requested that faculty members send the cover letter and link for the MTQ to graduates of their undergraduate programs. The survey information for both the MTQ and the MFQ was collected and analyzed in Qualtrics.

**Qualitative data collection and analysis.** To further address the research questions regarding the development of teaching competencies, the successful components of a music education degree, and the extent to which faculty and alumni’s perceptions align about the strengths and weaknesses of music teacher preparation programs, the researcher developed open-ended questions as part of the MTQ and MFQ. The use of both quantitative and qualitative data collection allows researchers to examine social and behavioral questions from multiple angles (Creswell, 2009).

The open-ended questions in the present study allowed for the researcher to understand an alumni’s attitude toward aspects of professional education courses and music teacher preparation programs as a whole. The quantitative data collection indicates patterns and trends in music programs, but the qualitative data collection highlights the memories of alums, former typical music education majors, regarding the development of teaching competencies in the undergraduate degree program. These questions were included in the survey to understand the learning environment in music education-specific courses. The open-ended responses allowed participants to
describe strengths and weaknesses of, and to elaborate on, those aspects of the degree programs that the participants’ had wished that were stressed in their undergraduate degree programs.

Once all of the data were collected, the researcher exported the open-ended question responses into the qualitative data analysis program, HyperRESEARCH (2009). This happened in two ways; data were taken from the website and converted into JPEG files to be coded, or they were re-typed by the researcher into a text file that could be read by the HyperRESEARCH (2009) software. After organizing the data into readable formats for the program, the researcher was able to analyze the open-ended responses to the surveys.

Responses were categorized first by the question to which the participants answered. The theoretical lens described in Chapter 3 served as a framework for creating the codes for the data analysis. Creswell (2009) describes this method of analysis as transformative mixed methods because the theoretical lens of the study provided the framework for reading and coding the data. As the researcher coded the data, trends emerged. The codes were then categorized into themes. To address the validity of the results, a third-party verified the imported data, codes, and themes.

7 JPEG stands for Joint Photographic Experts Group, the group that created the standard for image files. JPEG is a compressed format of an image that is easily interchangeable between programs (Cambridge Dictionary Online, 2010).
Demographical information of participants.

Faculty respondents. Nineteen music education faculty completed the MFQ representing nine of the twelve schools selected for the study. Five faculty members representing Very Large schools, four faculty members from Large schools three faculty members from Medium schools, and seven faculty members representing Small schools completed the survey. Twelve of the participants were female and four were male. Three faculty members chose not to respond to the question regarding gender.

Six of the faculty members have worked at their school 5 years or less, three have worked at their schools 6 to 10 years, and three have worked at their schools 11 to 15 years. One participant has been employed at the same school for 17 years and another for 21 years at his institution. Two respondents have worked at their college or university more than 25 years.

Alumni respondents. One hundred-twenty-nine alumni took the MTQ, 79 were female, 39 were male; nine persons did not respond to the question of gender. Of these respondents, only four schools were represented of the 12 invited to participate in this study. Seventeen respondents went to very large schools, four respondents went to medium schools, 102 respondents went to small schools, and six participants did not respond to this question about their undergraduate alma mater.

Alumni participants ranged in graduation years from 2009 to before 2004, with the most responses, 61, coming from individuals who had graduated before the year

When asked about their primary concentration in their music education degree program, the most respondents, 68, were instrumental majors (winds and percussion). This was followed by 28 choral majors, 11 general music majors, nine instrumental majors (strings, guitar, piano), and seven participants who indicated “other.” Other responses included choral/general with a piano concentration, music education (all ages and levels), and voice.

Of the 129 participants in the study, 92 are currently teaching music, while 25 are not. Fifty-seven have been teaching more than five years, four have been teaching five years, 13 for four years, nine for three years, eight for two years, six for one year, and 19 have been teaching less than one year.

MTQ participants have taught in a variety of settings for their first teaching positions. The majority of the participants (35%), have taught elementary general music, followed by middle school general music (29%), and then high school band (27%). The fewest responses for initial teaching experiences were high school, middle school, and elementary school strings. See Table 13 for the percentage of respondents who taught in various teaching situations. Twenty-four percent of respondents replied with “other” when asked about their first teaching situation. Other types of music teaching included: (a) private lessons (14 responses), (b) music theory (three responses), (c) handbells (two responses), (d) special needs students (two responses), (e) guitar or piano (two responses), and (f) musical theatre (one response).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Teaching Situation</th>
<th>Percentage of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary General Music</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School General Music</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Band</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Band</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Chorus</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Band</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Chorus</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Chorus</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood Music</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School General Music</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Strings</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle School Strings</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Strings</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison of faculty and alumni responses. To complete a music education degree program, most graduates (48%) took eight semesters plus some additional coursework in the winter or summer semesters of their degree programs; the second highest response was eight semesters (34%). However, faculty stated that graduates take 8 semesters to complete a degree in music education (47%), followed by eight semesters with additional coursework in the summer or winter terms (24%). Figure 15 shows a comparison of the responses of music education faculty and alumni to the question about the number of semesters it typically takes to complete a degree in music education.

![Length of Time to Complete the Degree (Semesters)](image)

Figure 15. MTQ and MFQ comparison of semesters for degree completion.

Question Three

Several questions on the MTQ and MFQ were used to address question three:
3. What components of music teacher preparation programs are most useful to music teachers?

Table 14 shows how often alumni of music teacher preparation programs use the skills and content taught in the areas most commonly found in music education degree programs. Alumni most often use the knowledge and skills from Performing Groups (67%), Conducting (67%), Music Education Methods Courses (61%), and Ear Training/Aural Skills (60%).
Table 14
*MTQ percentage of responses to how often skills and content learned in music courses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Course</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music Theory</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear Training/ Aural Skills</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Literature</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestration</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Study- Primary Instrument</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Groups</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education Courses</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Instruments</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Courses</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 shows how satisfied music education faculty members are with the way music core and professional education courses are taught at their institution of employment. MFQ respondents are most satisfied with Private Study- Primary Instrument (44%), Performing Groups (44%), and Music Education Methods Courses (38%).
Table 15

*MFQ responses to the level of satisfaction with the way material is taught in common music education courses*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Course</th>
<th>Very Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Very Satisfied</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music Theory</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear Training/ Aural Skills</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Literature</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchestration</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conducting</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Study- Primary Instrument</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Groups</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education Courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Instruments</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Courses</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were asked to rank the amount of time students spend preparing for and participating in courses related to each of the common music education degree components. Table 16 shows a comparison of the results of the music education faculty and alumni responses (1-most often through 11-least often) to preparation and participation in courses.
Table 16
*MTQ and MFQ responses to the amount of time music students prepare for and participate in common music courses.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>MTQ Average Response</th>
<th>MFQ Average Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Private Study on Primary Instrument (2.95)</td>
<td>Private Study on Primary Instrument (2.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Music Education (4.15)</td>
<td>Performing Groups (3.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Performing Groups (4.39)</td>
<td>Music Theory (3.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conducting (4.79)</td>
<td>Ear Training/Aural Skills (4.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Music Theory (5.00)</td>
<td>History and Literature (4.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ear Training/Aural Skills (5.10)</td>
<td>Music Education (5.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>History and Literature (6.64)</td>
<td>Conducting (7.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Secondary Instruments (6.80)</td>
<td>Secondary Instruments (8.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Composition (8.35)</td>
<td>Composition (8.31)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Orchestration (8.81)</td>
<td>Orchestration (8.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Education (9.03)</td>
<td>Education (9.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Responses</strong></td>
<td><strong>118</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The next question on both the MTQ and the MFQ asked participants to rank these courses again. The alumni ranked the courses in order of priority if they were to take these classes again. Music education faculty ranked these courses based on how they wished students would prioritize time spent in music courses. Table 17 shows the results of the comparison of the responses from the MTQ and the MFQ.
Table 17
**MTQ and MFQ responses to the amount of time music students should ideally spend preparing for common music courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>MTQ Average Response</th>
<th>MFQ Average Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Music Education (3.50)</td>
<td>Music Education (3.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Ear Training/Aural Skills (4.05)</td>
<td>Private Study on Primary Instrument (3.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Conducting (4.54)</td>
<td>Ear Training/Aural Skills (3.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Private Study on Primary Instrument (5.01)</td>
<td>Music Theory (5.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Music Theory (5.15)</td>
<td>Performing Groups (5.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Performing Groups (5.60)</td>
<td>Conducting (6.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Secondary Instruments (5.90)</td>
<td>Secondary Instruments (6.62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>History and Literature (7.03)</td>
<td>Composition (7.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Composition (8.28)</td>
<td>History and Literature (7.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Orchestration (8.47)</td>
<td>Orchestration (7.85)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Education (8.47)</td>
<td>Education (9.31)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Responses** | 118 | 13

Table 18 shows the MTQ and MFQ responses to the current emphasis of time spent in music core and professional education with the ideal emphasis of time spent in music core and professional education courses.
Table 18
Synthesis of average responses on MTQ and MFQ to the current amount of time and the ideal amount of time devoted to common music courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Current Emphasis of Time</th>
<th>Ideal Emphasis of Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MTQ Average Responses</td>
<td>MFQ Average Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Private Study</td>
<td>Private Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td>Performing Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Performing Groups</td>
<td>Music Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conducting</td>
<td>Ear Training/Aural Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Music Theory</td>
<td>History and Literature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ear Training/Aural Skills</td>
<td>Music Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>History and Literature</td>
<td>Conducting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Secondary Instruments</td>
<td>Secondary Instruments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Orchestration</td>
<td>Orchestration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question Four

4. In what ways are teaching competencies developed in music teacher preparation programs?
**Class format.** The next section on both the MFQ and the MTQ dealt with the courses that are required for the music education degree at those colleges and universities selected to participate in the survey portion of this study.

The next survey question explored the format of the types of classes typically found in most music education degree programs. The formats typically found in college courses were: (a) lecture, (b) lecture with some class discussion, (c) large group discussion, (d) small group/cooperative learning, (e) a blend of all formats, or (f) other. These formats were determined by comparing the courses in the music core requirements and the professional education requirements from Phase One of the study. Tables 15 through 25 compare the courses, class format, and number of responses for participants of the MTQ or the MFQ.

Music education faculty and alumni differ in their opinions of the class format for music theory classes. While alumni mostly believe these classes are lecture based with some class discussion, faculty members believe music theory classes are mostly a blend of all the formats. Both sets of participants tend to acknowledge that music theory relies on a lecture format for the majority of classes (see Figure 16).
Music education alumni believe ear training and aural skills classes are primarily lecture based (37%), while music education faculty (46%) believe small group work and cooperative learning are the primary formats of these classes. Three percent of music education alumni responded with “other” stating that this class was blended with other music core courses in a comprehensive musicianship class, or that aural skills class consisted of a computer program. Eight percent of music education faculty responded with “other” stating that, aural skills class was taught primarily in a coaching lab situation (see Figure 17).

Figure 16. MTQ and MFQ comparison of class format: Music Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class Format: Music Theory</th>
<th>MTQ = 121</th>
<th>MFQ = 13</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture/Discussion</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Discussion</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Group</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blend</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Responses
More than half of the MTQ participants agree that history and literature courses are primarily lecture based. MFQ respondents also stated that history and literature courses are lecture based (31%) or lecture based with some class discussion (46%). Neither group of respondents reported that small group work and cooperative learning were a part of the history and literature class format (see Figure 18).

*Figure 17. MTQ and MFQ comparison of class format: Ear Training/Aural Skills*
Both music education faculty and alumni think that composition courses are primarily lecture based with some class discussion. Ten percent of alumni responded with “other” stating that their school did not have a specific class devoted to composition. Twenty-seven percent of music education faculty shared those thoughts after responding with “other” for the class format (see Figure 19).
MTQ and MFQ respondents agreed that orchestration classes are primarily lecture based with some class discussion. However, both sets of participants had a significant number of “other” responses. Music education alumni and faculty most often responded that they did not have orchestration classes at their school (see Figure 20).
Faculty and alumni have different perceptions of the format of conducting classes. Alumni believe conducting is primarily small group work and cooperative learning (37%), followed by a blend of all formats (28%). Most faculty members hold the view that conducting classes are a blend of all formats (31%) (see Figure 21).
Figure 21. MTQ and MFQ comparison of class format: Conducting

Music education faculty and alumni most often responded with “other” for the format of private study on primary instrument. The most common response for the format was one on one private instruction, which was not a choice on the original question list, followed by small group work (see Figure 22).
Similar to the responses for private study on primary instrument, “other” was a very common response for both music education faculty and alumni regarding ensemble class format. In this space, respondents most often stated that rehearsal format was the design of performing group classes. Thirty-four percent of respondents on the MTQ selected “a blend of all formats” (see Figure 23).
Music education faculty and alumni agree that music education courses are a blend of all formats. At 50% (MTQ) and 69% (MFQ), these responses demonstrated the strongest agreement of the course formats selected by the participants. Both groups felt that small group work and cooperative learning was the next most common format for music education courses (see Figure 24).
Small group work and cooperative learning was the most popular response for both music education faculty and alumni regarding secondary instrument courses. Both groups had a blend of all formats as the second most popular response of respondents (see Figure 25).

*Figure 24. MTQ and MFQ comparison of class format: Music Education*
Alumni and music education faculty varied the most on their assessment of the format of school of education courses. While 33% of alumni stated that lecture was the primary format of education courses, 55% of music education faculty believed that education courses are a blend of all formats. The second most popular response for alumni was a blend of all formats, while the second most popular response for faculty was lecture with some class discussion (see Figure 26).

Figure 25. MTQ and MFQ comparison of class format: Secondary Instruments

108
Summary of class formats. In general, respondents on both the MTQ and MFQ had similar beliefs about the formats of classes. Differences occurred with: (a) Music Theory- MTQ respondents most often stated these were lecture based, while MFQ respondents most often felt these classes were a blend of all formats; (b) Ear Training/Aural Skills- MTQ participants responded that these classes were most often lecture/discussion based, while MFQ responded thought these classes were small group/cooperative learning based; and (c) General Education- MTQ respondents replied that these courses were lecture based, while MFQ respondents believed these courses were a blend of all formats. The next section details the responses to questions about secondary instrument courses.
Secondary instrument courses. This section specifically addresses secondary instrument courses. When asked what type of instructor primarily teaches secondary instrument classes, alumni most often responded that the applied professor on that instrument taught the class (89 responses), followed by a music education professor (30 responses), and then an adjunct instructor (21 responses). According to the music education faculty, a graduate student in applied music most often teaches secondary instrument courses (eight responses), followed by the applied professor on the instrument (six responses), and then a music education professor (six responses). Class format responses showed that alumni and faculty both believe that cooperative learning and small group work are the primary configurations of these courses. Figure 27 shows how satisfied alumni and music education faculty are with the way secondary instruments are taught at their schools.
The first open-ended question for the participants of the MTQ and the MFQ was regarding the strengths and weaknesses of secondary instrument courses in their teacher preparation programs. No faculty members responded to the open-ended question about secondary instrument courses. The MTQ responses were coded and organized into the broad categories of (a) instructor and pedagogy, and (b) sequence of courses for secondary instruments. Instructor and pedagogy statements described specific qualities of successful and unsuccessful course instructors as well as the class format. Statements categorized under “sequence of courses for secondary instruments” describe the strengths and weaknesses of the courses as a whole and those changes participants would make if taking these courses again.
**Instructor and pedagogy.** Participants responded with many similar statements regarding “good” instructors and “bad” instructors of secondary instrument courses. Fourteen participants found that instructors who taught the secondary instrument classes from an adult perspective were “bad” instructors. Particularly frustrating for the respondents were instructors who did not modify instruction to meet the differing needs of the secondary instrument students. One participant described a class piano instructor:

> *My piano teachers didn’t understand that I was a perfectionist and not a pianist - so when I perfected the music they gave me, they assigned harder & harder pieces, so I spent more time learning them so that I’d go to class fully prepared...and the cycle would begin all over again. VERY frustrating to come to the realization that I’d have to go to a class underprepared so that I wouldn’t get swamped.*

Another participant described a woodwind methods instructor:

> *And my winds teacher was awful. He had been attempting a DMA for a long time, and was very bitter. When I couldn’t play a Bb scale on the flute, he insisted that it was my fault—later, I had a flute major friend take a look at the instrument, and within 30 seconds, she was able to diagnose that the flute was broken. He didn’t spend any time teaching us HOW TO TEACH the instrument.*

Still, another participant commented on an instructor’s lack of knowledge of appropriate method books to use with beginning students:
A little real-world advice on how to teach in schools would have helped. For example, one of my professors insisted that band methods were not acceptable, when we all know that they are necessary when you are going to have to teach classes with more than one instrument at a time. If he had ever taught anywhere but in a university he would have known that.

Additional poignant statements include: “In Tuba Class- Nothing from that experience has stuck with me except that I was a terrible Tuba Player;” and “Great, I can play scales and chords until I turn blue, but there is no way I can accompany my choirs when they are singing.”

Participants were also frustrated when instructors spent too much time discussing the history and inner workings of the instrument. They felt that this was not going to help them be better players on the instrument or help them to teach students how to be better players on the instrument. Some of the prominent responses regarding the practice of lecturing on the history of the instrument were:

- Some of the methods courses were taught by professors who were more interested in lecturing on the history of their instrument rather than helping the students understand how to teach the instrument.
- Others [instructors] were focused on the history and inner workings of the instruments themselves.
- More often than not we either were playing the instrument or learning history that would not pertain to teaching it to beginning students.
A full list of statements regarding instructors who taught from an adult perspective is found in Table 19.

Respondents found that those instructors who spent class time lecturing on the history of the instrument or emphasizing the aspects of playing the instrument similar to collegiate-level private study were the least effective. Some alumni had very specific and negative memories of their time in those courses, which could have an impact on the way those persons consequently teach those instrument to their students. Several MTQ participants had suggestions to help these instructors be more effective in teaching secondary instrument courses. One comment was to have music education instructors mentor the secondary instrument instructors through teaching the class in ways that are developmentally appropriate for pre-service teachers. Others commented that the instructors could spend more time allowing the students to play the instruments rather than lecturing.
Table 19
Statements regarding instructors teaching secondary instrument courses from an adult perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My piano teachers didn't understand that I was a perfectionist and not a pianist - so when I perfected the music they gave me, they assigned harder &amp; harder pieces, so I spent more time learning them so that I'd go to class fully prepared...and the cycle would begin all over again. VERY frustrating to come to the realization that I'd have to go to a class underprepared so that I wouldn't get swamped.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And my winds teacher was awful. He had been attempting a DMA for a long time, and was very bitter. When I couldn't play a Bb scale on the flute, he insisted that it was my fault- later, I had a flute major friend take a look at the instrument, and within 30 seconds, she was able to diagnose that the flute was broken. He didn't spend any time teaching us HOW TO TEACH the instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Tuba Class- Nothing from that experience has stuck with me except that I was a terrible Tuba Player.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the professors did not have us play very much at all. We need to play a lot in class. It might be helpful for some applied professors who have not taught methods before to have a faculty mentor so that they can learn how to make methods class meaningful and helpful. A private lesson would be helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the methods courses were taught by professors who were more interested in lecturing on the history of their instrument rather than helping the students understand how to teach the instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While some [instructors] focused on beginner basics and performance, others were focused on the history and inner workings of the instruments themselves. I found the first of these two to be the most useful in my field. It would benefit the students of the University if the program had a unified goal, outlining the expectations regarding every instrument that is[s] to be learned.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classes as a whole provided good background knowledge but more often than not we either were playing the instrument or learning history that would not pertain to teaching it to beginning students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would change some of the brass methods which quizzed about how big a brass bell was which is pretty irrelevant in teaching a student how to play the instrument. They should focus on how to teach a beginner and bad habits to look out for and how to fix them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my piano class, we learned how to play scales and chords. Retrospectively I think it would have been more beneficial to learn simple accompaniments, playing form choral scores and the like.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In some cases, the history of the instrument was looked at. While this might be interesting information, I believe that teachers are being held back when not being taught how to teach.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 19
*Continued: Statements regarding instructors teaching secondary instrument courses from an adult perspective*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In class, we mostly learned to play the instruments. We learned to form a solid embouchure and play a scale on each instrument. To me, this was primarily useless. I did not need anyone to teach me the fingerings, they are in the back of the book and easy to memorize.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I felt that piano was really rushed also and not applicable to actual teaching practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some secondary instrument classes were definitely better than others depending on the teacher and what they concentrated on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others were focused on the history and inner workings of the instruments themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We worked mainly on fingerings and breathing. However, in retrospect, I wish we had spent almost ALL of our time on how to make a good sound, and how to correct younger students on how to make a good sound. Anyone can learn fingerings, or look them up, and I don't remember most of the fingerings anyway. Fingerings are easy to teach. Embouchure and tone quality are not easy, and that's what I wish we had spent our time on.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We RARELY learned how to actually teach the instrument and I often felt very lost.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was not happy that the classes went so slowly. I wanted to play the instrument, not learn the theory behind the teaching of a particular book. ACK! More of a survey of the different books would have been helpful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Not all secondary instrument course instructors were ineffective. Participants also shared information about what made some of their instructors excel in these courses. Instructors who taught the students as beginners and modeled the appropriate instructional techniques were highly favored by participants.

*I think the most beneficial thing was watching our teacher teach us as beginners (as we should teach) - seeing the step by step process of teaching these instruments to students. It was very practical.*

Another respondent thought very highly of one brass methods instructor:

*HOW TO TEACH the instrument - to look for common pitfalls in beginners.*

*The brass class teacher was really good about that.*
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Other effective secondary instrument instructors had a balance between lecture and playing, which allowed for the students to not only learn how to play the instrument, but discuss with the instructor and each other common playing problems and how to fix them. Some remarks from the respondents included:

- Professors gave us lots of opportunities to ask questions and practice concepts, and we had a secondary instruments ensemble that we used to hone our skills.

- The classes that balanced the two (playing and teaching) were the most helpful.

- The best classes were those that combined lecture and learning about the anatomy of the instrument with actual playing time with feedback.

In addition to the classes that balanced lecture with playing the instruments, respondents wrote favorably of the classes that were geared toward a band setting where they could pretend to be beginning students in a band rehearsal. Table 20 highlights comments regarding the benefits of band settings for secondary instrument courses.
Table 20

The benefits of secondary instrument courses using a band setting to teach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The benefits of secondary instrument courses using a band setting to teach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C-band was very beneficial because it made you think on your feet and apply that knowledge that you learned weekly in secondary instruments classes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most beneficial part of the secondary instrument classes was when we would play together to just get used to the instrument.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have found that the better I can play the instrument the better I can help my students do the same.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We had secondary instruments ensemble that we used to hone our skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that having the opportunity to perform on secondary instruments more frequently could have helped me prepare for the real world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would have liked to playing the instruments in a secondary band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Secondary] band was also a beneficial experience, allowing us to participate on secondary instruments from the students' perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-on practice was the most beneficial for me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[It was] awesome having us meet to teach rote songs to each other in C-band. The opportunity to do this in smaller groups on the same instrument on the other days would most closely imitate the elementary band setting found in the school that I teach in now. In short, too much time spent on instrument skills and not enough time spent on developing audiation skills in our secondary instrument classes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants were very aware of the instructional differences of professors for each of their secondary instrument courses and found these differences to be a hindrance on learning as a whole. MTQ respondents suggested that different instructors find common outcomes for students in each of the secondary instrument courses so that the theory and practice of each instructor would transfer more easily across classes. One respondent wrote:

_I would also change the inconsistency in classes. While it is silly to say all secondary classes should be the same, some were more organized and provided more information in a lecture format while others were a "play and fix" class._
Another commented:

_The thing I would change is that most of my finals were based on my performance on the instrument, not my ability to teach the instrument. The best instrument classes [sic.] were bassoon, because I have to actually bring in a non-music friend and teach them to put the instrument together, my [woodwind] class because the entire final was based on problem issues with each instrument and I had to identify and solve each problem, and my string class in which my final was an instrument demonstration on all four string instruments. The classes where I had to be able to play all my major scales on the "instrument" were much less life-skill related._

Some suggestions for changes included:

- _It would benefit the students of the University if the program had a unified goal, outlining the expectations regarding every instrument that is to be learned._

- _It might be helpful for some applied professors who have not taught methods before to have a faculty mentor so that they can learn how to make methods class meaningful and helpful. A private lesson would be helpful._

Understanding how the respondents felt about these courses could be useful for music teacher educators to pinpoint specific strengths and weaknesses of music teacher preparation programs. The participants who shared information regarding secondary instrument courses not only identified teaching qualities that were effective
and ineffective, but also gave suggestions for improvement. These respondents wished to learn about how to teach an instrument and how to play it, but often felt that the instructors did not know what teaching competencies were needed to convey that information to them. As a result, many respondents commented that they feel unqualified to teach secondary instruments to their students (yet they are currently teaching music). Here statements regarding participants’ lack of qualification to teach secondary instruments are provided:

- *I found the classes frustrating. I had to spend a year in class violin, which to me was basically useless.*

- *The knowledge came full force in such a short amount of time. I crammed the important knowledge in when I needed it, but when I no longer needed it, I promptly forgot it.*

- *I do not use anything that I learned in these classes during my teaching.*

- *The secondary instruments classes hardly prepared me to teach those instruments.*

- *Methods were an absolute joke. I learned very little.*

In addition to commenting on specific instructor qualities and those pedagogical techniques that were effective or ineffective, MTQ participants also wrote about the sequence of secondary instruments courses and the time devoted to learning them in the scope of the complete undergraduate music education degree program.
Sequence of courses for secondary instruments. Twenty-eight alumni commented that they wished more time had been devoted to learning their secondary instruments in school. Many felt that only one instrument should be learned per semester; often two, three, and four instruments are included in one semester of secondary instruments. “I think secondary instruments classes cram too much information into a short period of time,” wrote one respondent. Respondents felt strongly about this when learning an instrument that was less familiar. “The string methods class was not enough instruction for me, a non string player. I needed two semesters of practice time and instruction instead of the one required- if I was going to actually be prepared to teach it.” To compensate for this, some suggested a more individualized plan for secondary instrument course sequence:

Perhaps focus more on the least comfortable areas for each individual. As a woodwind player I expected to do well on flute and clarinet since they came more naturally. Brass was a struggle though and I could have used more time on them.

Another suggestion for the secondary instrument course sequences at universities was to place more emphasis on identifying and fixing common playing problems for the beginning and intermediate musician. Some responses suggesting this range from “…we needed serious help addressing problems that kids have, not just people who were older and could already play instruments,” to “…not only how to basically play, but also how to problem solve issues with playing that instrument;”
and “I would also have liked more information on the best ‘exercises’ for beginning players.”

One of the most common themes that emerged from the alumni responses on secondary instruments was the desire to practice teaching these instruments within the courses. One participant wrote:

It would have been beneficial to have an opportunity to teach fellow music majors in small groups DURING our secondary instrument classes. The professor in each class could have observed each group and critiqued our error detection and correctional abilities.

Another theme was the desire to learn more about instrument repair in secondary instrument classes. “Being in high school, my main focus for secondary instruments is repairs” wrote one respondent. “Many music teachers must send instruments out for repair and this can get quite costly”. One participant noted, “There needs to be more emphasis on repair of instruments in secondary classes, especially since many districts are facing budget issues.”

A final theme that emerged from the comments about the sequencing of the secondary instrument courses in the music education degree program was the lack of emphasis on practical instruments. MTQ participants responded that they are required to teach courses on more practical instruments like guitar and piano in their jobs but did not receive training in these areas in their degree programs. Responses to this question included:
• Much more emphasis should have been placed on the piano (keyboard) as a secondary (almost primary) instrument.

• I think it would have been more beneficial to learn simple accompaniments, playing from choral scores and the like.

• There needs to be more emphasis on the DRUM SET!!! Less time needed on snare drum, more time needed on mallet percussion, timpani, and auxiliary percussion.

• Class guitar should be a requirement.

• I never got to take percussion but I teach a lot of that in my general music class now.

**Summarys of results of secondary instruments.** Based on the results from the open-ended question on secondary instrument courses the instructor and his pedagogical approach to teaching has a large impact (positive or negative) on what a student retains from these courses. In general, instructors should aim to blend lecture with more in-class playing and discussion of common beginner pit-falls. The more music education students are allowed to rehearse these instruments in a band setting with peer teaching, the more successful the respondents view the experience. Suggestions provided on the MTQ for improvement to the secondary instrument sequence were to: (a) use mentoring instructors to model effective teaching in these courses, (b) unify the courses with common outcomes for students who complete them, (c) individualize the sequence of courses to meet the strengths and weaknesses of each student, and (d) emphasize the importance of mastering the teaching
competencies needed to develop beginning and intermediate musicians on these instruments.

**Field experiences.** Concerning field experiences, alumni and music education faculty were asked to count how many courses have a field experience component not including student teaching. Alumni most often stated that four courses had field experience (28 responses), while music education faculty most often stated that five courses had field experience (five responses). The next most popular answers for alumni were five courses (22 responses), followed by six courses (20 responses). For music education faculty, the next most popular answers were seven or more courses (four responses), followed by three courses (three responses) (see Figure 28).
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**Figure 28.** MTQ and MFQ responses: number of music education classes with field experiences.
Participants of the MTQ and the MFQ were asked to describe the type of field experiences they have in their music education courses not including student teaching. Alumni most often responded with: (a) observed teachers in their classrooms (113 responses), (b) observed peers teaching lessons (98 responses), and (c) taught lessons to a class of children as the only teacher (78 responses). Music education faculty most often responded with: (a) observed teachers in their classrooms (15 responses), (b) observed peers teaching lessons (13 responses), and (c) teach lessons to a class of children as the only teacher (13 responses) (see Figure 29).
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*Figure 29.* MTQ and MFQ responses: types of music education field experiences.
Participants then answered questions regarding their general education courses. The first question was about the number of education courses that have a field experience component. Alumni responses were: (a) none (42 responses), (b) two courses (39 responses), (c) one course (29 responses), and (d) three or more courses (ten responses). Music education faculty responded most often with (a) none (five responses), (b) one course (five responses), (c) two courses (three responses), and (d) three or more courses (no responses). Figure 30 shows the comparison of responses on the MTQ and MFQ about the amount of field experience received in school of education courses.
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*Figure 30. MTQ and MFQ responses: Number of courses with field experience in the school of education.*
When asked to explain what type of field experiences students most often have in regular education courses, alumni answered: (a) observed teachers in their classrooms (66 responses), (b) no experience (41 responses), and (c) taught lessons to a small group of children with other peers (group teaching) (14 responses). Music education faculty responded most often with: (a) observed teachers in their classrooms (six responses), (b) no experience (five responses), and (c) observed peers teaching lessons (three responses) (see Figure 31).

**Figure 31.** MTQ and MFQ responses: types of field experiences in school of education courses.
For the next question, participants identified the type of feedback students receive after teaching in a field experience situation. Alumni responded with:

(a) written comments from the supervisor (109 responses), (b) discussion of teaching with supervisor (106 responses), (c) discussion of teaching with cooperating teacher (103 responses), (d) written comments from the cooperating teacher (96 responses), (e) discussion of teaching with peers (78 responses), (f) video of teaching (76 responses), and (g) written comments from peers (60 responses). Music education faculty responded with: (a) written comments from supervisor (13 responses), (b) video of teaching (13 responses), (c) discussion of teaching with supervisor (13 responses), (d) discussion of teaching with cooperating teacher (12 responses), (e) written comments from the cooperating teacher (10 responses), and (f) discussion of teaching with peers (nine responses) (see Figure 32).
Figure 32. MTQ and MFQ responses: type of feedback typically received during field experiences.

Figure 33 shows the level of satisfaction alumni and music education faculty have with the amount of time given in the schools to teach in music teacher preparation programs.
Figure 33. MTQ and MFQ responses: Level of satisfaction with the amount of time spent teaching in school settings.

In both the MFQ and the MTQ, the researcher defined field experience as *the time a student spends in the classroom observing, teaching lessons, tutoring, or any other activities that put them in real-life scenarios teaching*. Participants of both surveys responded to an open-ended question regarding field experience. Respondents were asked to describe the strengths and weaknesses of field experiences in their degree programs and identify qualities of an ideal field experience if these were not present in their experiences. Both music education faculty and alumni responded to this question, therefore, results will be described for each separately.
**MFQ: Positive aspects of field experience.** Cooperating teachers play a significant role in field experiences. Several respondents were extremely satisfied with the cooperating teachers used for their field placements. One school’s faculty wrote:

*We are pleased with all the experiences fabulous cooperating teachers, diversity of environment or placements, frequency of visits/observations, variety of opportunities (individual lessons, small groups, different grade levels, etc.) ... did we mention fabulous cooperating teachers?*

Another response was:

*Our students are placed in a variety of settings (urban, suburban...) and observe and collaborate with music teachers with varying levels of experience and specialization. They also spend time with classroom teachers to better understand the totality of a child's school experience.*

Some music education faculty were pleased with the amount of time and the type of experience students receive in *some* areas of concentration, but wish that other areas of concentration were as effective. Two of these responses were:

(a) “Videotaping is critical and happens in the general and choral music education classes but not the instrumental;” and (b) “Students in early childhood, elementary, and string music education courses receive the most opportunities for field experience at our school.”

Other positive aspects of field experience mentioned by music education faculty were: (a) collaboration with another organization to provide music lessons to students in the community in addition to regular field placements, and (b) the addition
of a new course in the music education methods sequence that will allow students to participate in field teaching for an additional semester.

**MFQ: Negative aspects of field experience.** Music teacher educators remarked that there never seems to be enough field experience for pre-service teachers. “*We have field components to several courses, but it's never enough.*” There seem to be constraints due to university-required courses and credit overload for music education majors that keep faculty from implementing more teaching experiences for their students. “*I am pleased with all the experiences--I would wish we could have more, but the number of hours in the program is limited by the University.*”

Another problem with field experiences mentioned by one faculty member is each institution’s inability to provide field experiences that align with the scope and age-levels for certification in music. This respondent wrote:

*Currently, instrumental music education and secondary choral music education students do not receive optimum opportunities for field experiences. Moreover, instrumental music education majors receive K-12 instrumental and elementary general music certification; however, they are not required to take an early childhood or elementary music education course. We hope to change that inadequacy soon.*

Music education faculty also find it difficult to balance teaching time with time in the field and find that students are not receiving an adequate blend of theory to practice and development of reflection skills. One faculty member wrote:
[We need to] change our own teaching schedule allowing them longer periods of time in the classroom for a given visit and an ability to actually meet on the school site (professional development school), allowing us to discuss [and] then apply in the classroom directly, or, ideally, a professional partnership like a Professional Development School.

Another wrote:

*I think we could do a better job linking the in-class (collegiate) learning with the field experiences.*

A final comment on the lack of time to link theory and practice was:

*I am displeased with the amount of teaching I am able to do (lack thereof) in comparison to my students’ time in the field and time in their other courses. I am pleased that there is time allotted in the schedule for field experiences.*

While some faculty members rave about cooperating teachers, others find the cooperating teacher situation to be a source of frustration when organizing field experiences. One wrote, “I would like to have a better coop situation and coordinate on materials and methods.” Another participant corroborated this sentiment, “I wish we had fewer and more controlled sites for field experience.”

Music teacher educators feel that the cooperating teachers have a large impact on the quality of the field experience for students. On one hand, faculty find their cooperating teachers to be assets and on the other hand, cooperating teachers hinder the merging of theory and practice for students. In general, faculty believe that the more field experience students have the better prepared they are to teach upon
graduating. Faculty members also recognize that it is crucial to allow time to facilitate the development of those teaching competencies necessary to succeed. This could happen through class meetings in a school setting rather than on campus, or by allowing more time for methods courses in the sequence of the music education degree program. A primary result from the responses on field experience is that the philosophical and pedagogical beliefs of music education faculty do not always align within each school. Several respondents noted that while some concentrations receive adequate experiences, other concentrations in the same school are not so well prepared.

**MTQ: Positive aspects of field experience.** MTQ participants were very pleased with the amount of time given to field experience at the undergraduate school. One person wrote:

> Compared to all of the student teachers I have had and all of my friends and colleagues in the music field, I had more pre-student teaching classroom experience than anyone I know. I felt so comfortable going into student teaching, it felt like I had been teaching a very long time.

Another person from the same school corroborated this sentiment:

> I think [my school's] music department stands above most schools with field-experience opportunities. Now in my 7th year of teaching, I frequently think back to my time at [my school] and remember how many different schools I observed or was able to actively participate in student learning. The music department made sure we were prepared.
Table 21 outlines all of the positive comments regarding the amount of time given to field experience at the participants’ alma maters.

Another key factor to field experiences was having a supportive cooperating teacher. Some of the statements about positive cooperating teacher experiences included: (a) “My student teaching co-ops were extremely helpful in terms of feedback and guidance;” (b) “I was fortunate to work with an exceptionally gifted band director. He skillfully applied elements of theory, composition, orchestration, history, instrumental performance, and basic good classroom management in every class;” and (c) “The teachers we observed were good teachers, and knew their subjects well.”

Specific traits of good cooperating teachers were individuals who could “hand over the reigns [sic.]” to the classroom or were excellent models for students to observe and learn from. One respondent remembered:

When I arrived for my first day of student teaching, my cooperating teacher told me he was going to take the sink or swim approach for me. He threw me in right away, and honestly, it was an incredibly beneficial experience.

A memory for a different participant was:

My cooperating teacher had a plan for me to gradually teach more and more on my own. My cooperating teacher was there to give me suggestions, help me with planning and getting ideas, give me feedback on my teaching.
Table 21

*MTQ positive comments on the amount of time devoted to field experience*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I felt like I was given ample teaching opportunities throughout my entire college career.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had the opportunity to work in many different types of classes, with all age groups, in a variety of settings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We had so much experience in the classrooms in the music education courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really appreciate that I was able to get out into the schools as a sophomore. It really helped to cement my desire to be a music educator. I know so many other degree programs where their students do not have the opportunity to get out into the classroom until they student teach and they then discover that teaching isn't for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I loved how much field experience we were given. It’s so important to get into an actual classroom and start teaching!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was happy with the fact that I got to do some observing during my freshman year. I think a lot of students go into the education field and have no idea what really to expect unto their 2nd or 3rd year of college. I think that [my school] provides a good amount of field experiences for its students overall.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I found just about every aspect of [my school’s] field experience to be positive. I felt that immersion starting as a sophomore undergrad really gave us the (right) impression... While many don't get placed until junior or senior year, we actually taught groups of students during each semester our sophomore year (and all subsequent years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of my field placements were very positive. I was given a large amount of time with students at each placement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe that the participating in field placements by sophomore year was a fantastic experience. I really became immersed in the mindset of a teacher. By the time student teaching arrived, I had a clear idea of what was expected of me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I felt that we had a great deal of field experiences before student teaching, which was great.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of field experience I received in my undergraduate program was excellent. It was the experience that prepared me the best.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel that my student teaching and other field experience was a great experience that made me feel very prepared to start a career as a teacher. The music education courses gave us all the tools we needed to start working with students and the actual student teaching took it to the next level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The positive aspect was that I had so many opportunities (prior to student teaching) to be in the classroom working with students. The amount of time allowed for working in the field was one of the most helpful aspects of the music education courses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The progression of practicum courses throughout student teaching was well designed. I really appreciate the field experiences I received, and feel that they prepared me well for teaching.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Not only were the cooperating teachers incredibly important to the MTQ participants, but realistic teaching situations made a large impact on them as well.

*My first teaching job was exactly like my field experience, which was great. I was in a number of different buildings, traveling between them each day. I had to set up my own schedule & figure out concerts. I had a wonderful cooperating teacher.*

Participants also noted that in early field experiences, observing a wide range of realistic teaching situations was very helpful. One alumnus wrote:

*Having placements at elementary, middle, and high school before student teaching was a very good thing because I did not student teach in all of these levels and I am certified to do everything.*

For MTQ participants, seeing a broad range of teaching situations was important for the broad K-12 certification they received; it also helped them to determine effective and ineffective teaching practices. One person wrote,

“...sometimes I learned what to do and other times what not to do, but I appreciated seeing what is truly out there.”

Determining *what to do* and *what not to do* was a key part of participants’ comments on field experience. Participants appreciated the guidance through reflecting not only on teaching but also on observing “good” and “bad” practices in teaching. One person attributed this development to the music education faculty at his school:
My music education professor took great care in finding and assigning student teachers to schools that would provide them with the learning opportunities that best fit their needs. At one of my placements, I received daily feedback on my teachings in both written form and through discussion.

Another recognized the care music education faculty took in choosing field placements for students as well:

I appreciated the time my professors invested in me and because of their input both during and after my years as a student, I have discovered skills that I never knew I had and have been better prepared to face challenges that have unexpectedly come up in my current teaching situations.

Table 22 outlines the positive comments respondents had regarding the development of self-reflection techniques and the feedback they received during field experiences.
### Table 22

**MTQ positive comments regarding reflection and feedback during field experiences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It was easy to meet with my supervisors to discuss my progress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was given a large amount of time with students at each placement and lots of feedback that helped me better my rapport and teaching... Waiting until the teaching is over to critique was very helpful and not counter-productive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciated the honest feedback from my peers and [professor]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I had instructor feedback, teacher feedback, and peer feedback.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videotapes of myself teaching was very difficult to watch, esp[ecially] with peers, but I found that later to be extremely valuable as a reflective educator. An ideal field experience would be a teaching segment without a cooperating teacher or supervisor interrupting. Lesson is video recorded. Afterwards, having an opportunity to debrief with the cooperating teacher as well as later debriefing with professor and/or peers (maybe watching video) and critiquing, focusing on positive, but giving 1 or 2 suggestions for improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a fabulous supervisor(s) and cooperating teacher who trusted our abilities but were available when needed. Ideal field experience would include more learning community time, peer evaluation as well as supervisory comment. More time to reflect on the practice of peers and cooperating teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The feedback from my supervisor, peers, and cooperating teachers was very helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing teachers in their classes gave constructive ideas of what worked and what didn't, what kind of music department I would want to be part of and what not. I loved student teaching, and was offered permanent positions in both school systems where I student taught.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MTQ: Negative aspects of field experience.** As mentioned under positive aspects of field experience, the cooperating teacher also had a negative impact on MTQ participants as well. Some of these comments included: (a) “My elementary practicum placement was with a very weak music teacher;” (b) “I received little to no feedback from my cooperating teacher;” and (c) “They just want to sit back and relax while you do their job.” One respondent vividly described a negative student teaching experience that had a large impact on her decision to leave the profession:
I had a negative experience in which I was used as the band secretary by a male teacher who made a practice of limiting [sic] female student teachers to that role and not allowing them to teach.

Similarly, some participants felt as though the cooperating teacher did not want to give control over to the pre-service teachers. “My [cooperating] teacher hardly gave me anything to do.” Others were frustrated by the lack of guidance from both cooperating teachers and supervisors through the field experiences:

- More guidance from supervisor on what works well/what doesn’t. Lessons on classroom management [sic].

- I would have enjoyed more opportunities to sit down with them [cooperating teacher and supervisor] one on one in meetings to de-brief rather than just getting written comments.

- There should have been more advice, info, practice geared to training for the tedious aspects of teaching (ie: [sic.] organizing a long term curriculum, record keeping, grading papers and time management, grade averaging/weighting, etc.)

Other complaints were geared more specifically to supervisors of practicum experiences and student teaching. Two comments regarding supervisors’ lack of guidance were: (a) “Our lesson plans were never read or approved before we stood in front of the actual children. This led to some very horrible experiences;” and (b) “More observations by supervising teacher with feedback would have helped.”
While some praised their schools for the development of reflective practices in field experiences, others felt there was not enough emphasis on reflection and de-briefing of teaching experiences. Some of the comments about the lack of reflection-oriented practices are included below:

- **All placements**: at least a little bit of time to talk with the classroom teacher during the placement. Frequent videotaping and reflections [sic].

- **The experience may not expose students to every possible teaching environment, but it should provide the necessary tools and teaching skills to adapt one's knowledge and experiences to fit into any placement in which he or she should land.**

- **I wish we had more time to teach and could learn how to reflect on lessons.**

- **More time to reflect on the practice of peers and cooperating teachers.**

MTQ participants found the amount of time in field experience extremely valuable and although many were pleased with the amount of time spent in field experiences, there were many requests for participants to have more time in the classroom.

- **As far as I am concerned, you can never have enough experience teaching alone and getting feedback.**

- **We needed more time in observation, small group teaching and classroom work at EVERY level. "Student teaching" (done in the senior year and at the high school level) was not NEARLY long enough. There should also be**
classroom teaching (music theory, music appreciation) in the field experience

- The more time you can spend in the classroom as a student, the better prepared for your own classroom you will be. I think it's extremely important to be able to go to as many different schools and teachers as possible to get a well-rounded experience.

In addition to the desire for more time teaching, several participants noted that although they had ample time in field experiences, it was not always valuable or practical without guidance on developing teaching competencies. One person wrote: “I wish I could have done more "actual teaching" at the elementary level. I observed the classroom teacher and teaching a group of college students like they are elementary students is embarrassing and not idealistic. [Practicum] was far too overloaded.”

Another person had a similar feeling: “I did get a great deal of observing in my first three years, but I didn't actually teach in a real classroom until I student-taught.”

One emergent theme was the negative attitude of alumni toward school of education field placements. All participants who wrote about the school of education placements had negative feelings about their experiences. Some of these comments are included below:

- School of education: my placements were generic and completely unhelpful. I was purely observing teachers, not doing anything hands-on.

- The field experiences in the non-music education classes were a waste of time. Looking back on what I was taught about race, class, diversity and
classroom discipline from the [school of education] classes, I've realized how off the mark they were and how pointless that experience was.

- My [school of] education classes were, for the most part, a huge waste of my time.

Many participants also described the anxieties and nervousness they felt when teaching. These issues were not addressed in their field placement settings and were sometimes enhanced based on the number of their peers that were in the same practicum school as them. One alumni wrote: “It was always scary to teach in front of our peers and teacher. I don't feel like I did a very good job in these situations.” Another corroborated that feeling, “I think for me I was often so nervous when we would teach in front of peers I would just dread it!”

Some alumni suggested that the ratio of peers to teacher in early practicum experiences was a contributing factor to their social anxiety and nerves:

I did not enjoy the high ratio of peers to teacher. I was in a group where 11 of my peers were seemingly judging me at every turn. I didn't enjoy the pressure of getting comments from students who know the same amount as me—especially when the comments were not always constructive. I feel that even with the high volume of feedback, I was only able to get a little constructive, growth criticism out of it. A large volume of students in the class also made for short teaching time.

Others agreed that the number of pre-service teachers in each practicum school should be smaller.
Similar to the secondary instrument comments about individualized plans, respondents wished for this care when planning student teaching placements. “I wish I only had to student teach at the elementary level because I knew I did not want to ever teach middle school or high school. It would have been nice to have had a longer experience teaching at the elementary level.” Another suggestion was to individualize plans for pre-service teachers to allow for a yearlong student teaching experience.

As a cooperating teacher now, I would like to see my school be a part of the field experience for any possible student teachers I may have. I believe it will make the student teaching experience more of a success if the college students had to come in for a field experience to my school so they can begin to establish relationships with the students prior to their student teaching. It will then help make student teaching a real experience.

Respondents wrote that a yearlong student teaching experience would also help to address the classroom management techniques, establishment of routines, the development of positive relationships with students, and learn about the administrative duties of being a music teacher.

Summary of field experience results. Participants of the MFQ and the MTQ had a variety of statements to add to the open-ended question regarding field-experience. Music education faculty and alumni shared the same perception that cooperating teachers have a very large impact on the development of pre-service music teachers. This impact can be both positive and negative depending on the care in which students were placed with cooperating teachers. Both groups of participants
mentioned wanting more time in field experiences that foster an understanding of theory to practice and to develop meta-cognitive skills. Music education alumni also expressed a desire for more individualized field experiences that are directly related to the areas they are interested in teaching. While faculty expressed the desire for a professional development school or partnership, alumni wrote about having yearlong student teaching or internship placements. Both shared the value of field experiences and a desire to see more of these experiences implemented in music teacher preparation programs. Several alumni noted that their schools of education practicum experiences were not valuable.
**Teaching competencies.** In section four of the MTQ and the MFQ, participants were asked to rate their level of preparation in those teaching competencies identified by NCREST (1997) and confirmed by Imbimbo and Silvernail (1999). Figure 32 shows the MTQ responses to the level of preparation for these teaching competencies.

*Figure 34.* MTQ responses to level of preparation in teaching competencies. N = 117-118
Figure 35 displays the MFQ responses to student level of preparation in teaching competencies upon completion of a music education degree program at their institution.

Music education faculty and alumni stated that their music teacher preparation programs adequately develop certain teaching competencies. Alumni agreed (56%)
that they were very prepared to “teach subject matter concepts, knowledge, and skills in ways that enable students to learn”; music teacher educators agreed (80%) that their students were very prepared to “teach subject matter concepts, knowledge, and skills in ways that enable students to learn” as well.

The participants of the MFQ felt that students were somewhat prepared in most of the teaching competencies on the list. The only competencies that received a very prepared rating from participants of the MFQ were: (a) Evaluate and reflect on your practice to improve instruction (60%), (b) Use instructional strategies that promote active student learning (53%), (c) Use effective verbal and nonverbal communication strategies to guide student learning and behavior (47%), and (d) Assume leadership responsibilities in your school (47%).

Participants who took the MTQ were divided in their feelings of being very prepared and somewhat prepared in the teaching competencies on the list. Alumni felt very prepared in these teaching competencies: (a) Teach subject matter concepts, knowledge, and skills in ways that enable students to learn (56%); (b) Evaluate curriculum materials for their usefulness and appropriateness for your students (40%); (c) Use instructional strategies that promote active student learning (42%); (d) Relate classroom learning to the real world (37%); (f) Use effective verbal and nonverbal communication strategies to guide student learning and behavior (37%); and (g) Assume leadership responsibilities in your school (39%).

Several teaching competencies were not so readily prepared in school according to MTQ and MFQ responses. Figure 36 shows the MTQ and MFQ
responses to the level of preparation to understand how different students in the classroom are learning.

![Graph showing responses to level of preparation](image)

*Figure 36. MTQ and MFQ responses: Understanding how different students in the classroom are learning.*

Figure 37 shows the MTQ and MFQ responses to level of preparation in developing curriculum that builds on students’ experiences, interests, and abilities. Both faculty and alumni felt that graduates are only somewhat prepared in this teaching competency.
Another competency that faculty and alumni felt that graduates were only somewhat prepared for was helping students to become self-motivated and self-directed (see Figure 38).

Figure 37. MTQ and MFQ responses: Developing curriculum that builds on students’ experiences, interests, and abilities.
Help students become self-motivated and self-directed.

Figure 38. MTQ and MFQ responses: Helping students become self-motivated and self-directed.

Figure 39 highlights the MTQ and MFQ responses to the level of preparation in developing the teaching competency: Develop a classroom environment that promotes social development and group responsibility.
Develop a classroom environment that promotes social development and group responsibility.

Figure 39. MTQ and MFQ responses: Developing a classroom environment that promotes social development and group responsibility.

Another competency where faculty and alumni thought graduates were only somewhat prepared was helping students learn how to think critically and problem solve. Figure 40 shows the MTQ and MFQ responses to this teaching competency.
Help students learn to think critically and solve problems.

Figure 40. MTQ and MFQ responses: Helping students learn to think critically and solve problems.

The final teaching competency that faculty and alumni felt graduates were only somewhat prepared for was using a variety of assessments (e.g. observation, portfolios, tests, performance tasks, anecdotal records) to determine student strengths, needs, and programs. Figure 41 shows the MTQ and MFQ responses to the level of preparation for this teaching competency.
Summary of Results of Research Questions Three and Four

The purpose of Phase Two was to identify specific strengths and weaknesses of music teacher preparation programs from the perspectives of music education faculty and alumni. Upon analysis of the formats of classes in music core and professional education courses, the researcher determined that:

1. Music theory and aural skills are primarily lecture based according to alumni, but faculty members stated that these courses were either a blend of all formats or small group and cooperative learning;

2. History and literature, composition, and orchestration have lecture based formats with some class discussion;
3. Private study and performing groups primarily use one-on-one and rehearsal formats; and

4. Music education and secondary instrument courses are a blend of all formats or small group and cooperative learning, while general education courses are primarily lecture format with some class discussion.

Alumni stated that they most often used the knowledge and skills from conducting, performing groups, music education courses, and aural skills courses. Music education faculty are most satisfied with instruction in private study, ensembles, and music education courses at their schools. According to the responses to both the MFQ and the MTQ, undergraduate music education students currently spend the most amount of time preparing for private study and performing groups and the least amount of time on general education courses, composition, orchestration, and secondary instrument courses.

Regarding secondary instrument courses, MTQ respondents were mostly neutral with how these courses were taught, while MFQ respondents were satisfied. Both music education faculty and alumni are satisfied or very satisfied with field experiences at their institutions.

The researcher wished to determine the strengths and weaknesses of teaching competency development in these NASM accredited schools. Results of the MTQ responses indicated that graduates are most prepared to (a) teach in their content area, (b) evaluate and reflect on teaching, and (c) use instructional strategies to promote
student learning. MFQ responses showed that, faculty believe graduates are most prepared to (a) teach in their content area, (b) evaluate and reflect on teaching, (c) use effective verbal and non-verbal communication strategies, and (d) assume leadership responsibilities in the school. Areas of weakness according to alumni were: (a) helping students become self-motivated, (b) creating a classroom environment that promotes social development and responsibility, and (c) understanding how different students learn. Music education faculty determined that the areas of weakness for graduates most often are: (a) using a variety of assessments, (b) helping students to become self-motivated, (c) relating classroom learning to the real world, and (d) helping students learn to think critically and problem-solve.

**Question Five**

5. Do music teacher educators and graduates of teacher preparation programs agree about the success of their programs in preparing future music teachers?

**Results.**

*Additional comments on music teacher preparation programs.* The researcher provided space for participants of the MFQ and the MTQ to add additional comments about their music teacher preparation programs. This was an opportunity for participants to highlight unique parts of their programs that had not been addressed in the survey, or to contribute suggestions for change to these programs. Alumni of music teacher preparation programs were the only respondents to use this space. Their responses were read to identify trends. Then these comments were coded and themes emerged.
The following themes emerged from the alumni responses:

1. The need for alignment of theory and practice in music teacher preparation programs;

2. The need for more time in the music education degree program versus an emphasis on core music content knowledge; and

3. The limitations of an undergraduate music education degree program to successfully prepare music teachers.

The first theme was that music teacher preparation programs do not always align theory to current best practice in teaching. As a result, some alumni felt they gained more practical knowledge on the job than from their degree programs. One person wrote:

I feel as though my mentor in my first year of teaching was the most beneficial to me. She is the one who prompted me to ask divergent questions, to help them think critically. There were a lot of issues with the music ed faculty in my time, and many of us felt as though the professors didn’t have enough connection with "real" teaching, nor were they using ANY current materials (in 2000, the most current reading assignments in our elementary methods class were from the mid-70s).

Another felt that the program was geared more toward music listening and did not have enough hands on experience in teaching to realize she did not want to be a music teacher.
The Music Ed program was programmed instruction in music listening. It was not a good fit for how I view music. Secondly, we didn’t get a lot of chance to observe. And when I finally started student teaching, I realized that I really didn’t like teaching music in the way that I had learned to teach it, and so I didn’t do classroom teaching. I returned to classroom teaching as a substitute teacher when my son was in school...but it was as a regular classroom teacher, and not for music.

Some described the transition into the first job as completely overwhelming. One participant shared her experience moving from her undergraduate music education program to her first real teaching job:

*The difference between the university environment and the classroom environment was a complete shock. No one prepared us for the difficulties of a) obtaining a job in the first place (it took me a year, while I subbed and waitressed), b) teaching in horrible situations, c) the politics of dealing with other teachers when you are constantly taking students out of their classes but not given the opportunity to be in their school long enough each week to establish a relationship with any of them, and d) the problems of teaching music in a classroom where 35 kids are trying to punch each other while you're asking them to sing. I’d say my undergraduate program did well in teaching music performance and knowledge but completely failed in preparing us to teach in schools. Maybe that is because we graduated in the middle of the worst recession ever before this one, and teaching music in schools became*
extremely difficult. But barely anyone from my graduating class taught more than a year or two before giving up and that says something.

Another respondent felt that she faced many challenges that were not addressed in her undergraduate program, so she was unprepared and not equipped with the skills to manage these issues:

_I find my undergraduate classes were extremely inadequate to prepare me to face today's classes of challenging and varied students. I have taken graduate classes to help me in areas where I feel weak- general music (making it come alive and be "hands on"), dealing with differentiated learning situations, teaching guitar._

A final comment on the lack of alignment between theory and practice in music teacher preparation programs was "_It is because of the answers given on the last page [the teaching competencies] that I am no longer teaching. I felt woefully unprepared to do anything but conduct a high school band._"

Another theme that emerged from the final comments on the MTQ was regarding the amount of time spent in music core courses like music theory and music history compared to the amount of time spent developing the skills needed to be successful teachers. Many respondents felt that, although they were music education majors, there was a distinct focus on mastering skills in the music core classes that have not been used in their current careers as music teachers. One respondent suggested decreasing the time devoted to theory and history to allow more time to study secondary instruments:
Sadly, theory and history are not as necessary in a time-crunched high school setting, so possibly cutting back on either/both would allow more time for secondary methods.

Others realized that by the time they were able to teach lessons in the schools, they were thinking so much about musical goals that they neglected to understand the needs of their students or to understand that there are teaching competencies outside of the music domain that must be developed as well.

*I think for the most part my peers and I were way too high strung in placements. We know the music concepts and theories, so much less focus on the material and more focus on the kids and adapting to different situations would be great. Break down our goals into sets: like, your first lesson you have to teach music, but your goal is rapport. Always having intense expansive musical goals (we have high goals in the beginning of real-world placements and have a hard time not getting to them) hinders us from concentrating on other things— we just simply can't do it all at once in the beginning!*

Other statements describing the need for change in the amount of time spent in music core courses included:

- [I wish] less time had been spent on music history/theory and more time had been spent in the classroom.

- I think that our music history classes, ear training and theory classes could have been better designed with the teacher in mind. I have to admit that they were not my strongest classes but I feel that with music history, my
being able to identify the slow movement of a Mendelssohn quartet in thirty seconds has never had any effect on my ability to teach. I would have been much better learning what the resources were for me to teach music history to H[igh] S[chool] or elementary students in a fun and interesting way. I feel the same way with ear training and music theory. I have never had to identify by ear or theory a borrowed chord teaching high school or elementary school. I am glad that I understand it so I could teach it.

Similar to the sentiments about music theory and history courses were statements suggesting that music education programs have too much emphasis on performing on a primary instrument. Comments that addressed this were:

- *Performance majors should be trained primarily on one [instrument], not future educators. We need to be much more well rounded.*

- *Now that I am teaching, I rarely play my primary instrument. I feel that we should be challenged more on secondary instruments.*

Alumni also wrote about the inherent limitations of undergraduate programs. Some of these comments include:

- *There is only so much time during a 4-year undergraduate time frame to do field work and complete course work.*

- *I realize now how unprepared I was for the real world classroom. While in college, I felt ready, but I was not. I feel my foundation in college was fair. I learned how to be an effective teacher while on the job.*
I feel like there's only so much that a teacher preparation program can provide because the small scope and the control placed on the experiences.

Those music teacher preparation programs that focused on developing the tools necessary to succeed in the classroom had the most positive responses from music education alumni. As one participant wrote,

The things that have allowed me to succeed in difficult circumstances have been a solid foundation as a musician (theory, ear training, playing experiences, etc.), the ability and willingness to analyze my own teaching and my students’ learning, and the ability to think creatively to find solutions that are ‘out of the box.’

Respondents of the qualitative aspects of these surveys believed that developing these skills determine the success of music teacher preparation programs.

Summary

In chapter four, the researcher shared the results of the two phases of the present study. In Phase One, curricular information was collected from 51 schools accredited by NASM, this information was recorded and analyzed and then interpreted based on the research questions for the study.

Research question one addressed how curricula is divided in music education programs. The researcher examined the 51 schools based on their enrollment size in schools of music. Very Large, Large, Medium, and Small schools had little variance in the average amount of time devoted to music core courses, general education courses, and professional education courses. Upon further examination into the types of
courses included in professional education courses, the researcher determined that most of the time is spent in music education related courses. The courses included in music core were also analyzed. The average of each course was taken and it was determined that the majority of credits in music core are devoted to private study on primary instrument (27.75%), followed by music theory (21%), history and literature (16.25%), ensembles (16%), aural skills (10.25%), piano (6.75%), and composition and orchestration (3.75%).

The percentage of time devoted to music core, general education, and professional education was compared to the NASM standards for curricular division in music education. Based on the average percentages for each of the 51 schools, it was determined that generally schools do not meet the 50% standard for music core or the 30-35% standard for general education courses. Music education programs tend to exceed the 15-20% standard for professional education courses determined by NASM.

For Phase Two, the researcher analyzed the data collected from the MFQ and MTQ both quantitatively and qualitatively to determine how teaching competencies are developed, what skills are most useful to music teachers, and whether faculty and alumni agree about the success of their music teacher preparation programs. Data from both phases of the study were synthesized to highlight the results regarding common courses found in music core and professional education areas of the music education degree program. Based on the results from Phase One, the researcher determined that, schools devote most of the music education curriculum to music core, followed by professional education and general education. Results also indicate that schools
accredited by NASM adhere to the curricular framework provided by the organization.

In Chapter 5, the researcher will discuss the delimitations of the study, conclusions, implications, and recommendations for future research.
Chapter 5

Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations for Future Research

With the intent of improving music teacher preparation, the purpose of this research was to examine the efficacy of music teacher preparation programs in the United States. Specific research questions for this study were:

1. How much time do music education majors spend in classes devoted to the acquisition of: (a) general education knowledge, (b) music content knowledge, and (c) professional education knowledge?
2. To what degree do music teacher preparation programs align with the NASM structural guidelines for music education curricula?
3. In what ways are teaching competencies developed in music teacher preparation programs?
4. What components of a music teacher preparation program are most useful to new music teachers?
5. To what extent do music teacher educators and graduates of teacher preparation programs agree about the success of their programs in preparing future music teachers?

The researcher reviewed the literature to develop an understanding of the history of music teacher preparation programs, the qualities needed to be a successful music teacher in today’s society, and to determine areas of dormancy and growth in the evolution of the music education degree in the United States. Related research studies were consulted, reviewed, and critiqued. The research design and method of
data collection emerged from the researcher’s review of related literature and identification of the theoretical lens for the present study. Curricular information was gathered about music teacher preparation programs across the nation and two surveys were created, vetted, and distributed to randomly selected faculty and alumni of these programs. The analysis and results of these methods of data collection were explained in the previous chapter.

**Delimitations of the Study**

Although the research was developed with the highest aspirations to examine as many music teacher preparation programs as possible, time constraints and participatory constraints inhibited some aspects of this study. First, in order to graduate on time, the researcher adjusted the scope of the study and examined 51 music education degree programs of the 600 schools accredited by NASM. To examine 100 as originally planned would have set the calendar of events back several months.

Another delimitation of the present study was the number of participants who took the MTQ and the MFQ. Originally, the researcher desired to send the survey to each of the 51 schools selected for Phase One of the study, but this would have created more data than would have been possible to analyze and interpret during the length of time allotted for the study. Instead, twelve schools representing four size categories were randomly selected. Schools where the researcher’s advisor had personal contacts were weighted higher than schools that had no connections because personal contacts may have created a higher response rate. Although twelve schools were contacted,
only nine elected to participate and the range of music education faculty who participated from any one school varied from one to four members. This erratic response rate limits the validity of the results, however the qualitative aspects of this study allowed for an inductive look at music teacher preparation programs from those schools that chose to participate in Phase Two of the study.

Similar challenges were faced when garnering participation for the MTQ. Initially, the researcher requested faculty to send the MTQ and cover letter to alumni of their music education programs by email. The researcher learned that few faculty members keep accurate and up to date lists of alumni. The next step was to contact alumni relations offices of the schools. Upon calling each of the schools’ office of alumni relations, the researcher learned that many schools were unwilling to send the cover letter and the MTQ link to alumni due to privacy issues. However, using the University of Delaware as a pilot school, the researcher was able to send the survey to alumni of this school because it is her alma mater.

Upon starting the research process for this study, the researcher hoped to survey alumni of only those schools selected for Phase Two through the random sampling process. Although the participants represented a small sampling of the original schools, the researcher determined that the MTQ could be geared toward alumni of any music teacher preparation program. It did not matter if both music education faculty and their graduates of the same school responded. In hindsight, a better sampling would have been a selection of faculty who are employed by schools accredited by NASM and a selection of alumni who graduated from schools accredited
by NASM. The researcher found that rousing participation for the MTQ would have been much easier if it had been open to all graduates of NASM accredited music teacher preparation programs.

Despite these delimitations, the quantitative data illuminated the similarities and differences between schools of all sizes and geographical regions in the way they prepare students to become music teachers. Qualitative findings highlighted strengths and weaknesses of music teacher preparation programs and brought forth areas for future research.

Conclusions and Discussion

The reader is to be cautioned that the generalization of the findings from this study are limited due to low participation rates for both the MTQ and the MFQ. MTQ and MFQ qualitative responses strengthen some aspects of the findings in Phase One and indicate the need for a closer examination of the competencies taught in a music education degree program and whether those competencies are transferable to a position as a music teacher in society today.
**Conclusion one.** Music content is the primary focus of NASM accredited instrumental music teacher preparation programs with a secondary emphasis on professional education and general education. Results from Phase One show that music core courses encompass the largest amount of time in the total degree program. This aligns with NASM’s recommended guide for curricular percentage division. The present study corroborates the conclusions of Funk (1977), Schmidt (1985), Wollenzien (1999), and Keeler (2008).

Analysis of the surveys in Phase Two indicate that, music teachers feel very prepared in to teach in the content area of music. This finding is supported by the results from Phase One, that music content is the primary focus of music education degree programs.

**Conclusion two.** Teaching competencies are not clearly defined within music teacher preparation programs. The results of the present study indicate that there is much variation in the level of preparation of pre-service teachers regarding teaching competencies. When and how college students develop these competencies is not clearly outlined in music education degree programs. Research in the education field demonstrate that there are specific competencies needed to be a successful teacher, regardless of the area of expertise (Darling-Hammond, Chung, & Frelow, 2002; Imbimbo & Silvernail, 1999).

The lack of clarity in outlining the points in which teaching competencies are developed in the music education curricula was a topic of much discussion in the qualitative responses for the present study. MTQ and MFQ respondents expressed that
most teaching competencies are developed through field experiences. This corroborates previous research by Burton and Greher (2010), Conkling and Henry (2002), and Moore and Sampson (2008), all of which expresses the need for authentic teaching experiences and proper guidance to develop teaching competencies. Through professional development partnerships, teaching competencies may be clearly outlined by all parties involved so that pre-service teachers may hone these skills in authentic and nurturing learning environments.

**Conclusion three.** Quality music teacher preparation programs should focus on the content and pedagogical content knowledge and skills most directly applicable to the particular field. Results of this study indicate that music education faculty and alumni value courses where music teaching and learning is an active and evolving process. These types of courses have objectives that are clear and directly applicable to classroom teaching.

Previous research regarding professional development schools (Moore & Sampson, 2008), and professional development partnerships (Burton & Greher, 2007; Conkling & Henry, 1999, 2002) indicate that students gain the best understanding of applying content and pedagogical content knowledge and skills to classroom teaching in these settings. Results from the present study suggest that few schools have converted to a professional development partnership paradigm despite the research that indicates their success in developing high quality music educators.
Conclusion four. Faculty and alumni need to collaborate on curriculum reform. The point of curricular reform in music teacher education should emerge from alumni feedback on the strengths and weaknesses of music teacher preparation programs and faculty implementation of these changes. Although many research studies have extolled the value of alumni feedback in reforming and refining teacher education programs (Madsen & Hancock, 2002; Simpson & Sandidge, 1994), not enough change has resulted locally, or on the national front (Kratus, 2007; Myers & Wang, 2010; Webster & Campbell, 2010). This study highlights the lack of change in the division of courses in music teacher preparation programs as well as alumni realities about the strengths and weaknesses of their undergraduate music education degrees.

As early as 1886, music professionals have been subjects of studies examining what they know upon completion of a music degree (Ambrose, 1994). In general education, follow-up assessments of teacher education programs are used to determine the strengths and weaknesses of the curricula of these institutions (Madsen & Hancock, 2002; Simpson & Sandidge, 1994). Simpson and Sandidge (1994) described the use of a survey to determine the strengths and weaknesses in teaching competencies of graduates of Kentucky institutions of higher education. Results from the present study are confirmed by the findings of their study, in which they found that, graduates wish that: (a) they could have more field experiences, (b) better cohesion between the professional sequence of courses and instructors would occur, (c) learning theory would be directly related to practice, and (d) more emphasis on the
administrative and political duties that are included in the teaching position would be highlighted (Simpson & Sandidge, 1994). The present study substantiates the need for alumni feedback in order to modify and update music teacher preparation programs to meet the evolving needs of society.

**Conclusion five.** Field experiences, feedback, and reflection are crucial to the development of high quality music educators. Participants in this study expressed the need for field experiences, but noted that feedback and guidance from cooperating teachers, supervisors, and faculty served as a springboard for growth as a music teacher. This guidance helped participants develop as reflective practitioners upon completion of their degree programs.

According to Berliner (1986) and Schön (1983, 1987), reflective practice is a crucial aspect of teacher development. Reflective practice enables teachers to examine their own teaching to recognize strengths and diagnose areas for improvement. This is not a natural skill for pre-service teachers and must be developed through careful guidance in teacher preparation programs (Kagan & Tippins, 1991; Moore & Sampson, 2008; Woolfolk & Hoy, 1990). Research on professional development partnerships in music education corroborates these findings. Burton and Greher (2010) suggest that through these partnerships, pre-service teachers gain valuable feedback and guidance from many experienced individuals. The qualitative responses in the present study affirm previous research about the value of guidance and feedback for pre-service music teacher development.
Conclusion six. Authentic contexts for teaching are the single most important aspect of music teacher preparation programs. Not only did participants value the amount of time spent teaching in the schools, but the diversity and reality of these teaching experiences were directly related to their level of satisfaction with their overall preparation as music teachers at their alma maters.

Previous research demonstrates similar conclusions as well. Conway (2002) found that student teaching was the single most effective use of time in undergraduate music teacher preparation programs. Conkling and Henry (1999, 2002) expressed the need for professional development partnerships because they provide an authentic context for pre-service music teachers to develop and hone their skills. Previous research also indicates the need for extended student teaching experiences. Participants agreed, commenting frequently about the need for more time in student teaching. Authentic teaching experiences allow pre-service music teachers to merge theoretical knowledge and practice in a safe and nurturing environment (Burton & Greher, 2010).

Ballantyne (2007) discussed praxis-shock, the alarming feeling new music teachers have when they emerge from school and embark on their teaching careers, as being especially unique in the music field. She suggests that a lack of authentic teaching experiences prior to graduation may be an indicator of the level of praxis-shock that a new music teacher will feel (Ballantyne, 2007). Findings from the present study confirm this idea and show that authentic teaching experiences are a primary need for pre-service music teacher preparation.
Implications for Music Teacher Education

Upon completion of the work on the present study, the researcher has determined the following implications for music teacher education:

1. Music teacher educators must be aware of the challenges of K-12 music education in the 21st century. Faculty need to address the issue of curricular relevancy and those outcomes most important for graduates to achieve at the end of their degree in music education.

2. Secondary instrument courses must be taught with pedagogical intent. Qualitative findings suggest the way these courses are taught is a matter of great concern; over half of the participants chose to respond to the open-ended question regarding secondary instrument courses. Instructors should relay the value of these courses more clearly, so alumni may use the knowledge and skills from these courses beyond the scope of the degree program. This is a matter that needs serious discussion by all music faculty at institutions of higher education.

3. Faculty and alumni need to work together to discuss the best ways to: (a) weight courses according to the amount of time students spend preparing for and participating in these classes, (b) implement field experiences which foster evaluation, feedback, guidance, and reflection, and (c) enable standardization of objectives for music education students upon completing music core and secondary instrument courses.
4. Schools of music should define the importance of the active and inactive information they provide to their students and weight these courses accordingly. Active information, as achieved through field experiences, as opposed to inactive information found in lecture-based courses, is valued much more by music education faculty and alumni. Active information is relevant to today’s society and is directly applicable in daily classroom activities for music teachers.

5. Music educators need to make curriculum reform a priority for institutions of higher education. Results from this study indicate that the curricular structure for music education degrees has not changed in at least 70 years. As early as 1921, music teacher educators documented music education curricula as being devoted 50% of the time to music core courses, 25% to education courses, and 25% to general education courses (Baird, 1958). Although NASM was established three years later (in 1924), these percentages outlined by Baird (1958) are similar to the NASM established percentages for music education degrees in their latest handbook, 2009-2010.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Based on the results of this study, the researcher makes the following recommendations for future research:
1. A replication of the present study using a larger number of participants in the MFQ and MTQ would be helpful to further validate or negate the conclusions drawn from the present study.

2. Further research is needed on the instructional methods and techniques of higher education faculty to determine if they are modeling best practices for future music educators of the 21st century.

3. Future research is needed to uncover the music teaching competencies that are valued by both faculty and alumni. This research should also investigate how music teachers are implementing these teaching competencies in daily classroom instruction.

The purpose of this study was to examine the efficacy of music teacher preparation programs. Music content is the primary focus of music teacher preparation programs, and the outcomes for music majors are clearly defined. However, teaching competencies are not clearly outlined in music education degree programs. Quality music teacher preparation programs merge theory and practice in ways that are directly applicable in the classroom, particularly through authentic contexts that include guidance and feedback, and develop reflective practice. Still, music teacher preparation programs have changed very little in the past century. To that end, faculty and alumni should share their beliefs about the way music teachers should be prepared in an effort toward curricular reform. By reforming music teacher preparation curricula, music educators will be able to meet the musical needs of a 21st century society.
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Appendix A
National Association of Schools of Music

Requirements for a Baccalaureate Degree in Music Education

NASM Competencies Summary

Degree: The Baccalaureate Degree in Music Education, a professional undergraduate degree

Only the Handbook in its entirety contains all standards and guidelines applicable to and used by all phases of NASM membership reviews. In the text below “H.” indicates the location of the excerpted text in the Handbook; the term “(All)” indicates standards applicable to all professional undergraduate music degrees including music education; “(Music Education)” indicates specific standards for that major.

Item 1. (All)

Common Body of Knowledge and Skills (H.VIII.B.)

1. Performance. Students must acquire:

   a. Technical skills requisite for artistic self-expression in at least one major performance area at a level appropriate for the particular music concentration.

   b. An overview understanding of the repertory in their major performance area and the ability to perform from a cross-section of that repertory.

     ________________________________

8 Essential Note: Items below are excerpts from the NASM Handbook. Items 1 through 4 indicate the content and natures of the competencies expected of those graduating with the above degree. Items 5 and 6 indicate recommendations for competency development.
c. The ability to read at sight with fluency demonstrating both general musicianship and, in the major performance area, a level of skill relevant to professional standards appropriate for the particular music concentration.

d. Knowledge and skills sufficient to work as a leader and in collaboration on matters of musical interpretation. Rehearsal and conducting skills are required as appropriate to the particular music concentration.

e. Keyboard competency.

f. Growth in artistry, technical skills, collaborative competence and knowledge of repertory through regular ensemble experiences. Ensembles should be varied both in size and nature.

Normally, performance study and ensemble experience continue throughout the baccalaureate program.

2. **Musicianship Skills and Analysis.** Students must acquire:

a. An understanding of the common elements and organizational patterns of music and their interaction, the ability to employ this understanding in aural, verbal, and visual analyses, and the ability to take aural dictation.

b. Sufficient understanding of and capability with musical forms, processes, and structures to use this knowledge and skill in compositional, performance, analytical, scholarly, and pedagogical applications according to the requisites of their specializations.

c. The ability to place music in historical, cultural, and stylistic contexts.
3. **Composition and Improvisation.** Students must acquire a rudimentary capacity to create derivative or original music both extemporaneously and in written form; for example, the imitation of various musical styles, improvisation on pre-existing materials, the creation of original compositions, experimentation with various sound sources, and manipulating the common elements in non-traditional ways.

4. **History and Repertory.** Students must acquire basic knowledge of music history and repertories through the present time, including study and experience of musical language and achievement in addition to that of the primary culture encompassing the area of specialization (see Section III.L.).

5. **Technology.** Students must acquire the ability to use technologies current to their area of specialization.

6. **Synthesis.** While synthesis is a lifetime process, by the end of undergraduate study students must be able to work on musical problems by combining, as appropriate to the issue, their capabilities in performance; aural, verbal, and visual analysis; composition and improvisation; history and repertory; and technology.

**Item 2. (All)**

*Results (H.VIII.C.*) Upon completion of any specific professional undergraduate degree program:

1. Students must demonstrate achievement of professional, entry-level competence in the major area, including significant technical mastery,
capability to produce work and solve professional problems independently, and a coherent set of artistic/intellectual goals that are evident in their work. A senior project or presentation in the major area is required in many concentrations, and strongly recommended for all others.

2. Students are expected to have the ability to form and defend value judgments about music, and to communicate musical ideas, concepts, and requirements to professionals and laypersons related to the practice of the major field.

Item 3. (Music Education)

*Essential Competencies, Experiences, and Opportunities (H.IX.L.3.)*

(In addition to those stated for all degree programs):

a. Desirable Attributes

The prospective music teacher should have:

(1) Personal commitment to the art of music, to teaching music as an element of civilization, and to encouraging the artistic and intellectual development of students, plus the ability to fulfill these commitments as an independent professional.

(2) The ability to lead students to an understanding of music as an art form, as a means of communication, and as a part of their intellectual and cultural heritage.

(3) The capability to inspire others and to excite the imagination of students, engendering a respect for music and a desire for musical knowledge and experiences.
(4) The ability to articulate logical rationales for music as a basic component of 
general education, and to present the goals and objectives of a music 
program effectively to parents, professional colleagues, and 
administrators.

(5) The ability to work productively within specific education systems, 
promote scheduling patterns that optimize music instruction, maintain 
positive relationships with individuals of various social and ethnic groups, 
and be empathetic with students and colleagues of differing backgrounds.

(6) The ability to evaluate ideas, methods, and policies in the arts, the 
humanities, and in arts education for their impact on the musical and 
cultural development of students.

(7) The ability and desire to remain current with developments in the art of 
music and in teaching, to make independent, in-depth evaluations of their 
relevance, and to use the results to improve musicianship and teaching 
skills.

The following competencies and procedures provide means for developing 
these attributes:

b. **Music Competencies.** The profession of school music teacher now encompasses a 
wide range of traditional, emerging, and experimental purposes, approaches, 
content, and methods. Each institution makes choices about what, among many 
possibilities; it will offer prospective specialist music teachers. Institutions may 
offer a comprehensive curriculum involving two or more specializations and/or
focus on one or more particular specializations. The following standards provide a framework for developing and evaluating a wide variety of teacher preparation program goals and achievements. Items b.(1), (2), (3), and (4) apply to all programs that prepare prospective music teachers. Items c.(1), (2), (3), and (4) apply to specializations singly or in combination as determined by the focus and content of specific program offerings determined by each institution.

In addition to those basic competencies outlined in Sections VI. and VIII. above, the following apply to the preparation of music teachers:

(1) **Conducting and Musical Leadership.** The prospective music teacher must be a competent conductor, able to create accurate and musically expressive performances with various types of performing groups and in general classroom situations. Instruction in conducting includes score reading and the integration of analysis, style, performance practices, instrumentation, and conducting techniques. Laboratory experiences that give the student opportunities to apply rehearsal techniques and procedures are essential. Prospective teachers in programs with less focus on the preparation of ensemble conductors must acquire conducting and musical leadership skills sufficient to teach effectively in their area(s) of specialization.

(2) **Arranging.** The prospective music teacher must be able to arrange and adapt music from a variety of sources to meet the needs and ability levels of individuals, school performing groups, and in classroom situations.
(3) **Functional Performance.** In addition to the skills required for all musicians, functional performance abilities in keyboard and the voice are essential. Functional performance abilities in instruments appropriate to the student’s teaching specialization are also essential.

(4) **Analysis/History/Literature.** The prospective music teacher should be able to apply analytical and historical knowledge to curriculum development, lesson planning, and daily classroom and performance activities. Teachers should be prepared to relate their understanding of music with respect to styles, literature, multiple cultural sources, and historical development, both in general and as related to their area(s) of specialization.

c. **Specialization Competencies.** Institutions and other educational authorities make decisions about the extent to which music teachers will be prepared in one or more specializations. The following competencies apply singly or in combination consistent with the specialization objectives of each teacher preparation program in music.

(1) **General Music.** Listed below are essential competencies and experiences for the general music teaching specialization:

(a) Musicianship, vocal, and pedagogical skills sufficient to teach general music.

(b) Knowledge of content, methodologies, philosophies, materials, technologies, and curriculum development for general music.

(c) The ability to lead performance-based instruction.
(d) Laboratory and field experiences in teaching general music.

(2) Vocal/Choral Music. Listed below are essential competencies and experiences for the vocal/choral teaching specialization:

(a) Vocal and pedagogical skill sufficient to teach effective use of the voice.

(b) Knowledge of content, methodologies, philosophies, materials, technologies, and curriculum development for vocal/choral music.

(c) Experiences in solo vocal performance, as well as in both large and small choral ensembles.

(d) Performance ability sufficient to use at least one instrument as a teaching tool and to provide, transpose, and improvise accompaniments.

(e) Laboratory experience in teaching beginning vocal techniques individually, in small groups, and in larger classes.

(3) Instrumental Music. Listed below are essential competencies and experiences for the instrumental music teaching specialization:

(a) Knowledge of and performance ability on wind, string, and percussion instruments sufficient to teach beginning students effectively in groups.

(b) Knowledge of content, methodologies, philosophies, materials, technologies, and curriculum development for instrumental music.

(c) Experiences in solo instrumental performance, as well as in both small and large instrumental ensembles.

(d) Laboratory experience in teaching beginning instrumental students individually, in small groups, and in larger classes.
(4) **Specific Music Fields or Combinations.** Listed below are essential competencies and experiences for music teaching specialization(s) focused on either one or a combination of areas such as composition, electronic and computer music, ethnic music, guitar, small ensembles, jazz, keyboard, orchestral music, music history and theory, music in combination with other disciplines, music technologies, and popular music; or combinations of one or more of these types of content with aspects of the general, vocal/choral, or instrumental specializations:

(a) **Knowledge and skill in the selected area(s) of specialization sufficient to teach beginning and intermediate students effectively.**

(b) **Knowledge of content, methodologies, philosophies, materials, technologies, and curriculum development for the area(s) of specialization.**

(c) **In-depth experiences with the creative and/or performance and/or scholarly aspects of the selected area of specialization as required by the nature and content of that specialization.**

(d) **The ability to use instruments, equipment, and technologies associated with the area(s) of specialization.**

(e) **Laboratory experience in teaching beginning students in the area(s) of specialization, individually, in small groups, and in larger classes.**

**d. Teaching Competencies.** The musician-teacher must be able to lead students to competency, apply music knowledge and skills in teaching situations, and
integrate music instruction into the process of P–12 education. Essential competencies are:

(1) Ability to teach music at various levels to different age groups and in a variety of classroom and ensemble settings in ways that develop knowledge of how music works syntactically as a communication medium and developmentally as an agent of civilization. This set of abilities includes effective classroom and rehearsal management.

(2) An understanding of child growth and development and an understanding of principles of learning as they relate to music.

(3) The ability to assess aptitudes, experiential backgrounds, orientations of individuals and groups of students, and the nature of subject matter, and to plan educational programs to meet assessed needs.

(4) Knowledge of current methods, materials, and repertories available in various fields and levels of music education appropriate to the teaching specialization.

(5) The ability to accept, amend, or reject methods and materials based on personal assessment of specific teaching situations.

(6) An understanding of evaluative techniques and ability to apply them in assessing both the musical progress of students and the objectives and procedures of the curriculum.
e. **Professional Procedures.** In order to implement programs to achieve the competencies identified in the foregoing sections, the following standards and guidelines apply:

(1) Program purposes and requirements must be clear to prospective students, the profession, potential employers of graduates, and the public.

A program may focus on an area of specialization as listed above in items c. (1), (2), (3), and (4). A program may focus on the traditional vocal / choral / general / instrumental combination. A program may have a unique focus or purpose that combines two or more of the many possible specializations as listed in item c.(4). Whatever choices are made about purpose and focus, degree titles and descriptions must be consistent with curricular content and requirements. The following information must be clearly stated for each music teacher preparation program offered by an institution:

(a) The specific area(s) included in a comprehensive or specialization-focused program;

(b) The subject matters to be addressed in the program and in supportive areas;

(c) Expectations regarding breadth and depth of study and engagement;

(d) Expectations for the development of artistic, intellectual, and pedagogical competencies, and specifically, what students must know and be able to do in order to graduate from the program; and
(e) The relationship of program purposes, content, and graduation expectations to licensure requirements.

(2) Music education methods courses should be taught or supervised by the institution’s music education faculty who have had successful experience teaching music in elementary and/or secondary schools, and who maintain close contact with such schools.

(3) Institutions should encourage observation and teaching experiences prior to formal admission to the teacher education program; ideally, such opportunities should be provided in actual school situations. These activities, as well as continuing laboratory experiences, must be supervised by qualified music personnel from the institution and the cooperating schools. The choice of sites must enable students to develop competencies consistent with standards outlined above, and must be approved by qualified music personnel from the institution.

(4) Institutions should establish specific evaluative procedures to assess students’ progress and achievement. The program of evaluation should include an initial assessment of student potential for admission to the program, periodic assessment to determine progress throughout the program, and further assessment after graduation.

(5) Institutions should provide opportunities for advanced undergraduate study in such areas as conducting, composition, and analysis.

Item 4. (All)
General Studies Competencies (H.VIII.A.6.)

(a) Competencies.

Specific competency expectations are defined by the institution. Normally, students holding a professional undergraduate degree in music are expected to have:

(1) The ability to think, speak, and write clearly and effectively.

(2) An informed acquaintance with fields of study beyond music such as those in the arts and humanities, the natural and physical sciences, and the social sciences.

(3) A functional awareness of the differences and commonalities regarding work in artistic, scientific, and humanistic domains.

(4) Awareness that multiple disciplinary perspectives and techniques are available to consider all issues and responsibilities including, but not limited to, history, culture, moral and ethical issues, and decision-making.

(5) The ability to identify possibilities and locate information in other fields that have bearing on musical questions and endeavors.

Item 5. (All)

Recommendations for Professional Studies (H.VIII.D.)

Students engaged in professional undergraduate degrees in music should have opportunities to:

(1) Gain a basic understanding of the nature of professional work in their major field. Examples are: organizational structures and working patterns; artistic,
intellectual, economic, technological, and political contexts; and development potential.

(2) Acquire the skills necessary to assist in the development and advancement of their careers.

(3) Develop teaching skills, particularly as related to their major area of study.

(4) Continue to develop improvisational skills whether as an aspect of composition, musicianship, or performance studies.

(5) Experience a broad range of repertory through attendance at events such as recitals, concerts, opera and music theatre productions, and other types of performances.

(6) Explore areas of individual interest related to music in general or to the major. Examples are music bibliography, notations, aesthetics, acoustics, performance practices, specialized topics in history, musicology, ethnomusicology, analysis, and technology.

(7) Explore multidisciplinary issues that include music.

(8) Practice synthesis of a broad range of musical knowledge and skills, particularly through independent study that involves a minimum of faculty guidance, where the emphasis is on evaluation at completion (see Section III.G.)

*Please Note:*

For specific information regarding curricular structure, see H.IX.I.1. Normally, approximately 50% of a 120 semester hour program is in music studies to ensure that
time is available to develop the requisite competencies. For a table of contents for all
standards, see NASM Handbook (2009-2010).
Appendix B
Music Teacher Questionnaire

Music Teacher Preparation Programs

This questionnaire investigates the perspectives of alumni on their undergraduate music education programs. The study is being conducted by Jacquelyn Seaborg, master’s student, at the University of Delaware and under the advisement of Dr. Suzanne Burton, Associate Professor of Music Education. Survey results will be available only to Ms. Seaborg and Dr. Burton and used as part of a research project on the status of undergraduate music education programs in America.

The questionnaire will take you approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Individual responses will be collected on a secure web server. These data will remain confidential and viewed only by the researchers. To protect confidentiality, personally identifiable information in the downloaded data files will be stored separately and securely from the rest of the survey response data. The data will be destroyed after 1 year.

Your participation is entirely voluntary. To leave the study at any time, close the web browser before you press the final submission button at the end of the survey. Any responses you previously made will not be saved.

If you have questions concerning the study, contact the principal investigator, Jacquelyn Seaborg at jseaborg@udel.edu. For questions about your rights as a subject or about any issues concerning the use of human subjects in research, contact Christine Cook, the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board, University of Delaware, (302) 831-2136.
Thank you for participating. Please press the "Next" button to continue.

**Part I: Demographics**

1. Please state your gender
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. What college or university did you attend for your undergraduate degree?
   Scroll down to find your school and click on it to select it.
   a. See Appendix D for the list of schools used in the survey

3. In what year did you finish your undergraduate degree from the music program at your university?
   a. 2004
   b. 2005
   c. 2006
   d. 2007
   e. 2008

4. What degree did you obtain? BS, BA, or BM in Music Education
   a. Bachelor of Music Education (BME)
   b. Other

5. What was your Primary Concentration?
   a. Instrumental Music (Wind Instruments, Percussion)
   b. Instrumental Music (Strings, Guitar, Piano)
   c. Choral Music
d. General Music

e. Other- Please Explain

6. Are you currently teaching music?
   a. Yes
   b. No

7. How many years have you been teaching music?
   a. Less than 1 year
   b. 1 year
   c. 2 years
   d. 3 years
   e. 4 years
   f. 5 years

8. What age-levels and areas of music did you teach in your first (or current) position? Check all answers that apply.
   a. Early Childhood Music
   b. Elementary General Music
   c. Middle School General Music
   d. High School General Music
   e. Elementary Band
   f. Middle School Band
   g. High School Band
   h. Elementary Strings
i. Middle School Strings
j. High School Strings
k. Elementary Chorus
l. Middle School Chorus
m. High School Chorus

Part II: Music Teacher Preparation Program

9. How many semesters did it take you to complete your music education degree?
   a. Fewer than 8 semesters
   b. 8 semesters
   c. 8 semesters with some summer/winter coursework
   d. 9 semesters
   e. 9 semesters with some summer/winter coursework
   f. 10 semesters
   g. More than 10 semesters

10. Please check the primary format of your music related courses in your undergraduate program.

   Lecture; Lecture with some class discussion; Large group discussion; Small group work/cooperative learning; A blend of all formats; Other
   a. Music Theory
   b. Ear Training/Aural Skills
   c. History and Literature of Music
   d. Composition
e. Orchestration
f. Conducting
g. Private Study on Primary Instrument
h. Performing Groups
i. Music Education Courses
j. Secondary Instruments Courses
k. Education Courses

11. If you answered "Other" in the previous question, please describe the format of the class here:

12. How often do you use skills and content taught in these areas in your first (or current) teaching position? Think in terms of a usual week or month in your job.

Never; Rarely; Occasionally; Frequently; Regularly

a. Music Theory
b. Ear Training/Aural Skills
c. History and Literature of Music
d. Composition
e. Orchestration
f. Conducting
g. Private Study on Primary Instrument
h. Performing Groups
i. Music Education Courses
j. Secondary Instruments Courses

k. Education Courses

13. Think about how often you studied/practiced skills and content in each of these areas. Prioritize these areas in order of importance to you during your undergraduate years as a whole. (How did you value these areas back then?)

1= Most important ........ 11= Least important

a. Music Theory

b. Ear Training/Aural Skills

c. History and Literature of Music

d. Composition

e. Orchestration

f. Conducting

g. Private Study on Primary Instrument

h. Performing Groups

i. Music Education Courses

j. Secondary Instruments Courses

k. Education Courses

14. If you could be an undergraduate music education student again rank these areas in the order of importance they would be to you now. (How would you value these areas now?)

1= Most Important ....... 11= Least Important
a. Music Theory  
b. Ear Training/Aural Skills  
c. History and Literature of Music  
d. Composition  
e. Orchestration  
f. Conducting  
g. Private Study on Primary Instrument  
h. Performing Groups  
i. Music Education Courses  
j. Secondary Instruments Courses  
k. Education Courses  

Part III: Secondary Instruments and Field Experiences

15. Please respond to questions about your secondary instruments courses.

What type of instructor primarily taught your secondary instrument classes?

Check all that apply.

a. The applied professor on that instrument.  
b. A music education professor.  
c. A graduate student majoring applied music on that instrument.  
d. A graduate student majoring in music education on that instrument.  
e. An adjunct instructor who also teaches in K-12 schools.  
f. Other- Please explain
16. Please rate how satisfied you are with your preparation on secondary instruments based on your experience in these classes as an undergraduate student.
   a. Very Dissatisfied
   b. Dissatisfied
   c. Neutral
   d. Satisfied
   e. Very Satisfied

17. Use this space to provide additional comments about your secondary instruments classes. Use these questions to guide your answer:

   What parts of the classes were beneficial?
   What would you change about your secondary instrument classes?

18. Field Experience is defined as the time a student spends in the classroom observing, teaching lessons, tutoring, or any other activities that put them in real-life scenarios teaching. Think back to your undergraduate field experience and answer the following questions.

   How many courses had a field experience component? (count student teaching as one experience even if you had two or more placements)
   a. None
   b. 1 course
   c. 2 courses
   d. 3 courses
e. 4 courses
f. 5 courses
g. 6 courses
h. 7 or more courses

19. What type of field experience did you have in your music education courses?

*(do not count student teaching)* Check all answers that apply.

a. Observed teachers in their classrooms.
b. Observed peers teaching lessons.
c. Taught lessons to a small group of children with other peers in my class (group teaching).
d. Taught lessons to a small group of children as the only teacher.
e. Taught lessons to a class of children with other peers in my class (group teaching).
f. Taught lessons to a class children as the only teacher.
g. Taught class periods as the only teacher with peers observing and giving feedback.
h. Other- Please Explain
i. Did not have field experiences.

20. How many of your regular education courses had field experiences? *(do not count student teaching)*

a. None
b. 1 course
21. What type of field experience did you have in your regular education courses? (do not count student teaching) Check all answers that apply.

a. None
b. Observed teachers in their classrooms.
c. Observed peers teaching lessons.
d. Taught lessons to a small group of children with other peers in my class (group teaching).
e. Taught lessons to a small group of children as the only teacher.
f. Taught lessons to a class of children with other peers in my class (group teaching).
g. Taught lessons to a class children as the only teacher.
h. Taught class periods as the only teacher with peers observing and giving feedback.
i. Other- Please Explain

22. What type of feedback did you receive after you taught in your field placements in both music education and regular education? (Include student teaching) Check all that apply.

a. Written comments from my supervisor
b. Written comments from my peers
c. Written comments from the cooperating teacher
d. Video of my teaching

e. Audio of my teaching (like a voice recorder)

f. Discussion of my teaching with my supervisor

g. Discussion of my teaching with my peers

h. Discussion of my teaching with the cooperating teacher

i. Other- Please Explain

j. None

23. Looking back on your field experiences in your undergraduate program, how satisfied are you with the amount of time you spent teaching in school settings?

   a. Very Dissatisfied

   b. Dissatisfied

   c. Neutral

   d. Satisfied

   e. Very Satisfied

24. In the space below please write about the positive aspects of your field-experiences and any aspects you wish were different. Describe an ideal field experience.

**Part IV: Teaching Competencies**

25. When you first started teaching, how prepared did you feel to do the following:

   Very Prepared; Prepared; Neutral; Unprepared; Very Unprepared

   a. Evaluate and reflect on your practice to improve instruction.
b. Teach subject matter concepts, knowledge, and skills in ways that enable students to learn.

c. Understand how different students in your classroom are learning.

d. Develop curriculum that builds on students’ experiences, interests, and abilities.

e. Evaluate curriculum materials for their usefulness and appropriateness for your students.

f. Use instructional strategies that promote active student learning.

g. Relate classroom learning to the real world.

h. Help students become self-motivated and self-directed.

i. Develop a classroom environment that promotes social development and group responsibility.

j. Use effective verbal and nonverbal communication strategies to guide student learning and behavior.

k. Help students learn to think critically and solve problems.

l. Use a variety of assessments (e.g. observation, portfolios, tests, performance tasks, anecdotal records) to determine student strengths, needs, and programs.

m. Assume leadership responsibilities in your school.

26. Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. If there is any more information you would like to add about your undergraduate program's ability
to prepare you as a music educator, please feel free to do so in the space provided.
Music Faculty Questionnaire

Music Teacher Preparation Programs

This questionnaire surveys the prospects of music faculty on their undergraduate music education programs. The study is being conducted by Jacquelyn Seaborg, master’s student at the University of Delaware, under the advisement of Dr. Suzanne Burton, Associate Professor of Music Education. Survey results will be available only to Ms. Seaborg and Dr. Burton and used as part of a research project on the status of undergraduate music education programs in America. This questionnaire will be distributed to a population of music faculty based on a random sampling of colleges.

The questionnaire will take you approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Individual responses will be collected on a secure web server. These data will remain confidential and viewed only by the researchers. To protect confidentiality, personally identifiable information in the downloaded data files will be stored separately and securely from the rest of the survey response data. The data will be destroyed after 1 year.

Your participation is entirely voluntary. To leave the study at any time, close the web browser before you press the final submission button at the end of the survey. Any responses you previously made will not be saved.

If you have any questions concerning the study, please contact the principal investigator, Jacquelyn Seaborg at jseaborg@udel.edu. For questions about your rights as a subject or about any issues concerning the use of human subjects in research,
please contact the Chair, Human Subjects Review Board, University of Delaware, (302) 831-2136.

Thank you for participating. Please press the "Next" button to continue.

**Part I: Demographics**

1. Please state your gender
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. What college or university are you currently employed by? Scroll down to find your school and click on it to select it.
   a. See Appendix D for the list of schools used in the survey

3. How many years have you worked as faculty at your college or university?
   a. 1 through 40 years

**Part II: Music Teacher Preparation Program**

4. How many semesters does it typically take your students to complete your music education degree?
   a. Fewer than 8 semesters
   b. 8 semesters
   c. 8 semesters with some summer/winter coursework
   d. 9 semesters
   e. 9 semesters with some summer/winter coursework
   f. 10 semesters
   g. More than 10 semesters
5. Please check off the primary format of your music related courses in your undergraduate program. Lecture; Lecture with some class discussion; Large group discussion; Small group work/cooperative learning; A blend of all formats; Other
   a. Music Theory
   b. Ear Training/Aural Skills
   c. History and Literature of Music
   d. Composition
   e. Orchestration
   f. Conducting
   g. Private Study on Primary Instrument
   h. Performing Groups
   i. Music Education Courses
   j. Secondary Instruments Courses
   k. Education Courses

6. If you answered "Other" in the previous question, please describe the format of the class here.

7. Please rate your level of satisfaction of the emphasis put on material in these classes based on what your music education students know and are able to do and your own knowledge of best practices of teaching.
   Very Dissatisfied; Dissatisfied; Neutral; Satisfied; Very Satisfied
   a. Music Theory
b. Ear Training/Aural Skills

c. History and Literature of Music

d. Composition

e. Orchestration

f. Conducting

g. Private Study on Primary Instrument

h. Performing Groups

i. Music Education Courses

j. Secondary Instruments Courses

k. Education Courses

8. Looking at your degree as a whole, please rank the amount of time your students tend to devote to each of these areas. This includes time in the class and time preparing outside of the class.

1= Most Amount of Time ...... 11= Least Amount of Time

a. Music Theory

b. Ear Training/Aural Skills

c. History and Literature of Music

d. Composition

e. Orchestration

f. Conducting

g. Private Study on Primary Instrument

h. Performing Groups
9. Now, please rank these courses according to the amount of time you think an undergraduate student in music education should spend preparing in that area. This includes time in the class and time preparing outside of class.

1= Most Amount of Time ..... 11= Least Amount of Time

a. Music Theory
b. Ear Training/Aural Skills
c. History and Literature of Music
d. Composition
e. Orchestration
f. Conducting
g. Private Study on Primary Instrument
h. Performing Groups
i. Music Education Courses
j. Secondary Instruments Courses
k. Education Courses

Part III: Secondary Instruments and Field Experience

10. Please respond to questions about your institutions secondary instruments courses.
What type of instructor primarily teaches your secondary instrument classes?

Check all that apply.

a. The applied professor on that instrument.
b. A music education professor.
c. A graduate student majoring applied music on that instrument.
d. A graduate student majoring in music education on that instrument.
e. An adjunct instructor who also teaches in K-12 schools.
f. Other- Please Explain

11. Please rate how satisfied you are with your students' preparation on secondary instruments based on the way these courses are taught at your school.

a. Very Dissatisfied
b. Dissatisfied
c. Neutral
d. Satisfied
e. Very Satisfied

12. Field Experience is defined as the time a student spends in the classroom observing, teaching lessons, tutoring, or any other activities that put them in real-life scenarios teaching. Answer the following questions about field experiences at your school.

How many courses have a field experience component? (count student teaching as one experience.)

a. 1 course
b. 2 courses
c. 3 courses
d. 4 courses
e. 5 courses
f. 6 courses
g. 7 or more courses
h. None

13. What type of field experience do you have in your music education courses? (do not count student teaching) Check all answers that apply.

   a. None
   b. Observe teachers in their classrooms.
   c. Observe peers teaching lessons.
   d. Teach lessons to a small group of children with other peers (group teaching).
   e. Teach lessons to a small group of children as the only teacher.
   f. Teach lessons to a class of children with other peers (group teaching).
   g. Teach lessons to a class of children as the only teacher.
   h. Teach class periods as the only teacher with peers observing and giving feedback.
   i. Other- Please Explain

14. How many of your regular education courses have field experiences? (do not count student teaching)
15. What type of field experiences do your music education students have in regular education courses? (do not count student teaching) Check all answers that apply.

a. None  
b. Observe teachers in their classrooms.  
c. Observe peers teaching lessons.  
d. Teach lessons to a small group of children with other peers (group teaching).  
e. Teach lessons to a small group of children as the only teacher.  
f. Teach lessons to a class of children with other peers (group teaching).  
g. Teach lessons to a class of children as the only teacher.  
h. Teach class periods as the only teacher with peers observing and giving feedback.  
i. Other- Please Explain

16. What type of feedback do you give students after they've taught in field placements in both music education and regular education? (Include student teaching) Check all that apply.

a. None
b. Written comments from supervisor

c. Written comments from peers

d. Written comments from the cooperating teacher

e. Video of teaching

f. Audio of teaching (like a voice recorder)

g. Discussion of teaching with supervisor

h. Discussion of teaching with peers

i. Discussion of teaching with the cooperating teacher

j. Other- Please Explain

17. Looking at your field experiences for your undergraduate music education program, how satisfied are you with the amount of time your school gives students to teach in school settings?

   a. Very Dissatisfied
   b. Dissatisfied
   c. Neutral
   d. Satisfied
   e. Very Satisfied

18. In the space below, describe field experience at your school.

   What aspects are you pleased with?

   What parts would you change?

Part IV: Teaching Competencies

19. How prepared are your students to do the following:
Very Prepared; Prepared; Neutral; Unprepared; Very Unprepared

a. Evaluate and reflect on their practice to improve instruction.

b. Teach subject matter concepts, knowledge, and skills in ways that enable students to learn.

c. Understand how different students in their classrooms are learning.

d. Develop curriculum that builds on students' experiences, interests, and abilities.

e. Evaluate curriculum materials for their usefulness and appropriateness for students.

f. Use instructional strategies that promote active student learning.

g. Relate classroom learning to the real world.

h. Help students become self-motivated and self-directed.

i. Develop a classroom environment that promotes social development and group responsibility.

j. Use effective verbal and nonverbal communication strategies to guide student learning and behavior.

k. Help students learn to think critically and solve problems.

l. Use a variety of assessments (e.g. observation, portfolios, tests, performance tasks, anecdotal records) to determine student strengths, needs, and programs.

m. Assume leadership responsibilities in their schools.
20. Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey. If there is any more information you would like to add about your undergraduate program's ability to prepare students as a music educator, please feel free to do so in the space provided.
Appendix C
Request for Participation in the Music Faculty Questionnaire (MFQ)

Date: October 31, 2009
Dear Department of Music Chair,

My name is Jacquelyn Paglialonga and I am a master’s student at the University of Delaware. I am beginning the data collection portion of my study, which is under the direction of Dr. Suzanne Burton, my advisor. My research is focused on the efficacy of undergraduate music teacher preparation programs at colleges and universities in the United States. To achieve my objective I am seeking the input of music education faculty, instructors, and alumni at colleges and universities. Your assistance is critical to the success of my thesis.

I am requesting that, by November 20, 2009, you send this survey link to (a) music education faculty at your school and (b) alumni of your music teacher preparation program. Participation in this study is anonymous and no identifiers will be required.

Thank you for helping me to complete this important work. Enclosed for your convenience is a letter and survey link for music education faculty and instructors and a letter and survey link for music education alumni.

Click here to take the Music Teacher Questionnaire (MTQ).
Click here to take the Music Faculty Questionnaire (MFQ).

Sincerely,
Jacquelyn (Seaborg) Paglialonga
Graduate Student
University of Delaware
Amy E. DuPont Music Building
Newark, DE 19716
Request for Completion of the Music Faculty Questionnaire (MFQ)

Date: October 31, 2009

Dear Music Education Faculty and Instructors,

My name is Jacquelyn Paglialonga and I am a master’s student at the University of Delaware. I am beginning the data collection portion of my study, which is under the direction of Dr. Suzanne Burton, my advisor. My research is focused on the efficacy of undergraduate music teacher preparation programs at colleges and universities in the United States. To achieve my objective I am seeking the input of music education faculty, instructors, and alumni. Your assistance is critical to the success of my thesis.

I am requesting that, by November 20, 2009, you complete the Music Faculty Questionnaire by following this link: Click here to take the Music Faculty Questionnaire (MFQ). Your participation in this study is anonymous and no identifiers will be required.

In order to reach music education alumni I need your help. Please forward this link to alumni of your music teacher preparation program: Click here to take the Music Teacher Questionnaire (MTQ).

Thank you for helping me to complete this important work.

Sincerely,
Jacquelyn (Seaborg) Paglialonga
Graduate Student
University of Delaware
Amy E. DuPont Music Building
Newark, DE 19716
jseaborg@udel.edu
Request for Completion of the Music Teacher Questionnaire (MTQ)

Date: October 31, 2009

Dear Music Teachers,

My name is Jacquelyn Paglialonga and I am a master’s student at the University of Delaware. I am beginning the data collection portion of my study, which is under the direction of Dr. Suzanne Burton, my advisor. My research is focused on the efficacy of undergraduate music teacher preparation programs at colleges and universities in the United States. To achieve my objective I am seeking the input of music education faculty, instructors, and alumni at colleges and universities. Your assistance is critical to the success of my thesis.

I am requesting that, by November 20, 2009, you complete the Music Teacher Questionnaire. The link is enclosed below. Participation in this study is anonymous and no identifiers will be required.

Thank you for helping me to complete this important work. Please forward this information to other alumni of your music teacher preparation program.

Link to the Music Teacher Questionnaire: Click here to take the Music Teacher Questionnaire (MTQ).

Sincerely,

Jacquelyn (Seaborg) Paglialonga
Graduate Student
University of Delaware
Amy E. DuPont Music Building
Newark, DE 19716
jseaborg@udel.edu
Appendix D
## Colleges Selected for Phase One of the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University of North Texas</td>
<td>1608</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston University</td>
<td>1123</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida State University</td>
<td>1105</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Cincinnati</td>
<td>973</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastman School of Music</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Michigan</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brigham Young University</td>
<td>706</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State University of New York, Fredonia</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California State University, Long Beach</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas State University - San Marcos</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan State University</td>
<td>635</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peabody Institute of the Johns Hopkins</td>
<td>620</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>FL</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>Code</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont University</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Chester University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Colorado, Boulder</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Missouri, Kansas City</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Choir College of Rider University</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia State University</td>
<td>493</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartt School</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota, Twin Cities</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appalachian State University</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>NC</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Iowa</td>
<td>458</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>GA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>443</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Michigan University</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Memphis</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Akron</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oregon</td>
<td>401</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Kentucky</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baylor University</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Washington</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>WA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| University Name                        | Rank | State | Rank
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stephen F. Austin State University</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DePaul University</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nevada, Las Vegas</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>NV</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne State University</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital University</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Illinois University</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montclair State University</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>NJ</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland State University</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Tennessee State University</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at El Paso</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E
Thank you for your submission of New Project materials for this research study. The University of Delaware IRB has determined this project is EXEMPT FROM IRB REVIEW according to federal regulations.

We will put a copy of this correspondence on file in our office. Please remember to notify us if you make any substantial changes to the project.

If you have any questions, please contact Elizabeth Peloso at 302-831-8619 or epeloso@udel.edu. Please include your study title and reference number in all correspondence with this office.
## Colleges Selected for Phase Two and Projected Response Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampled Unit</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>RR .2</th>
<th>RR .3</th>
<th>RR .4</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Choir College of Rider University</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Miami</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Minnesota Twin Cities</td>
<td>Large</td>
<td>470</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Georgia</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Madison University</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Delaware</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia University</td>
<td>Small</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>1554</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastman School of Music</td>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>946</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>Very Large</td>
<td>687</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Total Sample Size</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1165</strong></td>
<td><strong>1748</strong></td>
<td><strong>2331</strong></td>
<td><strong>3496</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Expected Response rate</th>
<th>0.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Contact Factor</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

241
### MTQ Survey Question Origins

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What college or university did you attend for your undergraduate degree?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In what year did you obtain your degree?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What degree did you obtain? (BS, BA, BM, BME)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What was your primary concentration?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Are you currently teaching music?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How many years have you been teaching music?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What age-levels and areas of music did you teach in your first (or current) position?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How many semesters did it take you to</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complete your degree?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Primary format of your music related courses? (Teaching format)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. How often do you use the skills taught in these courses think in terms of a usual week or month in your job?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Rate these areas in terms of importance while you were in school.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How would you rate them now if you were an undergrad again?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What type of instructor taught your secondary instrument courses?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How satisfied are you with your preparation level on your secondary instruments?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How many courses had a field experience component (w/ student teaching)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. What type</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of field experience did you have in your music education courses?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How many of your regular education courses had field experiences (without student teaching)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. What type of field experience did you have in your regular education courses?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. What type of feedback did you receive after you taught in your field placements both in music education and regular education?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How satisfied are you with the amount of time you spent teaching in school settings?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. When you first started teaching, how prepared did you feel to do the following: (teaching competencies)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Gender</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. At what college or university are you currently employed?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How many years have you worked as faculty at your college?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. How many semesters does it typically take your students to complete their degree?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Primary format of your music related courses? (Teaching format)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What is your level of satisfaction with the emphasis put on these areas?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Rate these areas in terms of importance while your students in school.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. How would you rate them now if you had the program ideally?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What type of instructor taught your secondary instrument courses?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How satisfied are you with your</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>preparation level on your secondary instruments?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How many courses have a field experience component (with student teaching)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. What type of field experience do you have in your music education courses?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. How many of your regular education courses have field experiences (without student teaching)?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. What type of field experience do you have in your regular education courses?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. What type of feedback did you give after your students taught in field placements both in music education and regular education?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. How satisfied are you with the amount of time spent teaching in school settings?</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. How prepared are your students to do the following: (teaching competencies)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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