AN EXAMINATION OF EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS IN UNDERGRADUATE MUSIC TEACHER EDUCATION AT SELECTED NASM ACCREDITED SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

by

BRANDON HAYES ROBERTSON

(Under the Direction of MARY LEGLAR)

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to develop a status report on current practices in music teacher education early field experience (EFE) programs in American universities accredited by National Association of Schools of Music. A 58-item questionnaire was completed by 88 selected respondents representing a cross-section of institutions of higher education from 40 states. In addition to the quantifiable data, personal opinions of emerging trends were collected to supplement information, to validate responses from the questionnaire, and to catalogue opinions to support the development of recommendations.

The study indicated EFE programs are dissimilar in four major aspects: 1. the length of the amount of hours/ experiences; 2. the number, regularity, depth, and chronological placement of early field experiences; 3. the number of observations for criticism and evaluation made by the college supervisor; 4. the type of experience the student receives. In addition, there are other practices in music EFE programs that have been universally adapted. Among these are: 1. formal written instructions for the cooperating teacher; 2. objectives and evaluative criteria for the EFE.

It is clear that the size and location of the university have a decided impact upon the administration and implementation of many aspects of the EFE program. There are several aspects of the programs which display marked national consensus: 1. EFE is a required experience tied to methods courses; 2. cooperating teachers are provided with some form of instruction; 3. excellent cooperation is shown by all those involved with placement of EFE students; 4. the attempt to diversify EFE experiences is difficult for schools in remote, sparsely populated areas; 5. observations and other on-site experiences are scheduled in a variety of settings, levels, and with several teachers; 6. observations and evaluations of EFE are completed by music professors; 7. observations are at least one period in length, include a discussion with the EFE student; 8. EFE evaluation is a joint effort of the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor; 9. general musicianship, aural perceptivity, and skill at classroom management are the most desirable attributes to be developed in a successful EFE.

INDEX WORDS: MUSIC TEACHER EDUCATION; EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCE

AN EXAMINATION OF EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS UNDERGRADUATE MUSIC TEACHER EDUCATION AT SELECTED NASM ACCREDITED SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

by

BRANDON HAYES ROBERTSON

B.S., Duquesne University, 2001

M.M., Southern Oregon University, 2006

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial

Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

ATHENS, GEORGIA

© 2016

BRANDON HAYES ROBERTSON

All Rights Reserved

AN EXAMINATION OF EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCE PROGRAMS IN UNDERGRADUATE MUSIC TEACHER EDUCATION AT SELECTED NASM ACCREDITED SCHOOLS OF MUSIC

by

BRANDON HAYES ROBERTSON

Major Professor: Committee: Mary Leglar Stephen Valdez Sally J. Zepeda

Electronic Version Approved:

Suzanne Barbour Dean of the Graduate School The University of Georgia December 2016

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to my family: my parents Keith and Diane Robertson, whose love and support gave me the strength to pursue my educational goals; my son Charles, who has brought untold joy to my life; and my wife, Rebecca, whose love and support has always been available, and who has always encouraged, comforted, and inspired me to push further.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This project would not have been possible without the support and encouragement of the following people: Dr. Stephen Valdez and Dr. Sally Zepeda for their guidance through the process of my doctoral program. My chair and mentor Dr. Mary Leglar, for setting high expectations and for teaching me perseverance and a love of knowledge. Dr. Roy Legette and Dr. "Skip" Taylor for allowing me to work with them organizing early field experiences, which was the catalyst for this research. Finally, to all of the colleagues and professors throughout my music teacher education who helped provide the foundation of my education and who helped me meet challenges along the way.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTSv
LIST OF TABLES
CHAPTER
1 INTRODUCTION1
Statement of the Problem7
Assumptions7
Definition of Terms8
Delimitations of the Study9
Limitations of the Study9
Overview of Design and Methodology10
Organization of the Document13
2 LITERATURE REVIEW14
Pre-service Teacher Attitude17
Field Site Locations
Coursework and Early Field Experiences
Field Experiences Participation22
Institutional Participation in Field Experiences
Rationale for Field Experiences25
Early Field Experience Activities27

	Outcomes of Early Field Experience in Skill Types	28		
	Role of Field Experience	32		
	EFE in Music Teacher Education Programs	36		
	Summary	38		
3	METHODOLOGY	40		
	Research Design	40		
	Data Collection	45		
	Data Analysis	47		
4	FINDINGS	49		
	Research Question One	50		
	Research Question Two	58		
	Research Question Three	62		
	Research Questions Four and Five	69		
	Conclusion	76		
5	DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE			
	RESEARCH	78		
	Conclusions and Implication	78		
	Summary	83		
	Recommendations	84		
REFEREN	NCES	90		
APPENDICES				
А	National Center for Education Statistics Locale Codes	106		
В	Questionnaire	107		

С	IRB Approval	.118
D	Informed Letter of Consent	.119
E	Electronic Invitation	.121
F	Follow-up Survey Message	.123
G	Final Announcement – Survey Window Closing	.125

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 3.01: Distribution and Rate of Return of All Questionnaires Delineated by
Demographic Characteristics
Table 3.02: Distribution and Rate of Return of all Questionnaires Delineated by
Accrediting Agency44
Table 4.01: University Partnerships with Cooperating School Site Locations
Table 4.02: Number of School Sites Used During a Typical Semester
Table 4.03: Number of Student Normally Placed with a Single Site Supervisor at One
Time
Table 4.04: Ranking of Criteria Used When Selecting EFE Sites (Most to Least
Important)
Table 4.05: Frequency and Percent of Responses Related to Field Site Characteristics54
Table 4.06: Number of Reported EFE Hours Required, Prior to Student-teaching,
Delineated by University Demographics
Table 4.07: Number of Reported EFE Hours Required, Prior to Student-teaching,
Delineated by Accrediting Agency57

Table 4.08: Frequency of Requirements Related to Program Elements: Non-Teaching
Experiences
Table 4.09: Frequency of Responses Related to Program Elements: Teaching
Experiences61
Table 4.10: Supervisory Responsibility Reported According to Accrediting Agency64
Table 4.11: Number of EFE Observations by Supervisors According to Institution
Demographics
Table 4.12: Number of EFE Observations by University Supervisors by Accrediting
Agency
Table 4.13: Ranking Qualities Most Desirable in a Successful EFE Student (Most to
Least Important)71
Table 4.14: Frequency of Responses Related to the Areas That Have Presented the Most
Frequent Problems for Students During EFEs73

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In 1954, the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was established and recognized by the Department of Health, Education, and, Welfare, which later became the U.S. Department of Education (ED), to accredit teacher certification programs at U.S. colleges and universities. The Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC), founded in 1997 and recognized by the ED as an accrediting agency for teacher certification programs, merged in 2013 with NCATE to create the Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). CAEP is now the only recognized accreditor of U.S. educator-preparation programs. Prior to the merger, NCATE released a report entitled, *Transforming Teacher Education Through Clinical Practice: A National Strategy to Prepare Effective Teachers* (2011), the report states teacher education must be "fully grounded in clinical practice and interwoven with academic content and professional courses" (ii). NCATE (2011) believes that a:

...clinically based approach will create varied and extensive opportunities for candidates to connect what they learn with the challenge of using it, while under the expert tutelage of skilled clinical educators. Candidates will blend practitioner knowledge with academic knowledge as they learn by doing. They will refine their practice in the light of new knowledge acquired and data gathered about whether their students are learning. (ii)

NCATE also recommends "sweeping changes" how teacher education is delivered monitored, evaluated, overseen, and how to staff clinically based teachers. The report calls for more rigorous accountability; strengthening candidate selection and placement; revamping curricula; incentives and staffing; supporting partnerships; expanding the knowledge base to identify what works; and supporting continuous improvement.

Field experiences are an established part of teacher education programs. Historically, student teaching has been the primary professional field experience. However, in the past 35 years the requirement of early field experiences (EFE), field experience prior to student teaching, has been common in many teacher education programs. Kay and Ishler (1981) found 99% of the 240 schools responding in a national survey included exploratory field experiences in their program. Howey, Yarger, and Joyce (1978) report the existence of field and clinical experience from the freshman to senior level. Webb (1981) confirms the wide prevalence of early field experiences in teacher education programs. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (2015) and National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASTEC) (2015) have established standards regarding the provision of field and clinical study for students. Pre-service teachers are involved in field experiences throughout their teacher education program.

Attention to field experience has greatly expanded and studies have increasingly found benefits of EFE. Accompanied by this growth, numerous educational reforms recognized EFE as an essential element in teacher education programs and organizations developed models such as professional development schools (PDS) and service learning to promote EFE practice (Bowers, 2001). Today, EFE in many states is no longer an

option, but a requirement mandated by states (e.g. Virginia's *Regulations Governing the Licensure of School Personnel*, requires 300 hours of EFE within the teacher education program). The following discussion presents those studies that appear in the literature.

Williamson and Mason (as cited in Heath, 1984) conducted a national survey of 1000 institutions and found early field experiences occurred in many areas of teacher education, field directors had varied support, and problems were varied. Kay and Ishler (1981) surveyed a national population regarding the provision of early field experiences, organizational considerations, and general types of practices used. Puckett (1983) expanded the Kay and Ishler (1981) study to include all field experiences in elementary teacher preparation. He found that 99% of the 459 responding institutions had early field experiences in their program. One half of these programs placed students in school classrooms no later than the sophomore year.

Southall and Dumas (1981) conducted a regional survey in the Midwestern states of Missouri, Iowa, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska. The purpose of this study was to determine the extent to which early field experiences occurred and to assess organizational considerations associated with the provision of fieldwork at this level. This study presented some data regarding general types of activities included in programs. Thompson (1982) studied faculty and student perceptions of field experiences and found data regarding goals as perceived by students and faculty.

Generally, existing survey studies have focused on the availability of field components in teacher education institutions. While there is some information regarding the types of activities utilized in practice in early field experiences, these data do not provide an adequate information base for examining early field programs in music

teacher education.

The continued use of early field experiences in teacher education programs emphasizes the need to have an adequate knowledge base regarding current practice. Garland (1982) states:

Clearly, one of the first tasks to be undertaken in designing a pre-service program that provides a variety of clinical experiences is that of differentiating the experience in which students will participate. A clear sequence for acquiring these competencies must also be established so that students are provided with a gradual induction into the teaching role. The failure of program planners to address the need to differentiate and articulate clinical experiences will imply that students benefit from increased experiences out in the schools regardless of what they do while they are there. (p. 179)

Zeichner (1980) believes few researchers have actually looked at what takes place during the field experience. Bennie (1982) encourages research to examine what student teaching and field experiences offer and what they lack. Applegate and Lasley (1982) also support the articulation of field and clinical experiences to aid cooperating teachers in the performance of their roles with pre-service teachers. Lindsey, Hunter, and friends of Margaret Lindsey (1979) state, "There is perhaps no phase of professional laboratory experiences where practices are more confused and more in need of study and experimentation than that of experiences, which should precede student teaching" (p. 16).

Research centered on early field experience has been diverse. Studies to determine the effect of field experiences on a number of variables have been conducted (Haring & Nelsen, 1980; Heath, 1984; Ingle & Robinson, 1965; Kelly, 1970; Lux, 1973;

Melgrano, 1965; Silvernail, 1980). Problems with field placements identified by cooperating teachers have also been examined (Applegate & Lasley, 1982; Kapel, 1978). The relationships between fieldwork and academic achievement have been studied in relationship to various courses (Clark, 1974; Denton, 1981; Heath, 1984; Hedberg, 1979; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009; Ross, Raines, Cervetti, & Dellow, 1980). There are data from surveys that reported information about field experience activities (Chelsey & Jordan, 2012; Kay & Ishler, 1981; Puckett, 1983; Southall & Dumas, 1981). However, there is little information regarding the placement of these experiences in a program, the context of courses in which experiences are developed, the depth of each type of experience at various levels of a student's program, or the goals associated with experiences at various levels of preparation.

Recently, researches have noted that participants in field experiences generally offer high approval ratings, highlighting the benefits ranging from simple application of knowledge learned during the teacher education program to evaluation of its effectiveness leading to modification of one's teaching method (Campbell, 1999; Schmidt, 2010). The act of applying theoretical knowledge to a real life situation requires intellectual and emotional involvement of teaching and interacting with students, making decisions, and facing the resulting consequences of their decisions. Through these challenging processes, pre-service teachers gain the confidence and motivation necessary for career success after the student teaching experience (Hourigan & Scheib, 2009).

Since the 1980s, educational reforms from organizations such as The Holmes Group (1986), Music Teacher Education: Partnership and Process, the Task Force on Music Teacher Education for the Nineties (MTEPP). (1987), the National Commission

on Teaching & America's Future (1996) NCATE (2001, 2011), and others (Goodlad, 1990; National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) have all recommended pre-service teachers have a rigorous program with authentic experiences to allow them to recognize the complexities and challenges of the classroom.

With the far-reaching benefit of field experience and its effect on student achievement, teacher education programs have redefined the field experience by offering a variety of early field experiences throughout the degree program. The amount of EFE practiced in teacher education programs varies widely (Schmidt, 1989; Verrastro & Leglar, 1992). The fluctuation may be the result of unspecified, open-ended statements regarding field experience requirements by institutional governing agencies or from differing state requirements for EFE. Though varied in its implementation level, EFE has increasingly become an essential element of teacher education programs.

This study examines the types of field experiences used by music teacher educators and the goals associated with these experiences in selected music teacher education programs accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) in the United States. This study provides a database regarding the placement, amount of required hours, curriculum, modes of evaluation, a hierarchy of student outcomes, and areas for improvement of early field experience practice. Included in this study are emerging trends, problems, and needs of field experiences identified by music teacher educators related to that practice. The widely accepted provision of early field experience in teacher education programs and the limited knowledge of current music teacher preparation practices support the need to conduct further research in this area.

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this study is to (1) provide descriptive data about the nature of early field experiences provided in selected undergraduate music teacher education programs in the United States of America; (2) examine the context in which early field experiences are provided; and (3) determine if there are relationships between selected institutional variables and types of early field experiences.

Research Questions

- 1. What types of locations are used to support EFE in music teacher education programs?
- 2. What are the activities for an EFE in music teacher education programs?
- 3. What methods are used in documenting pre-service teacher activities for EFE in music teacher education programs?
- 4. What areas of student growth are most desirable as a result of EFE?
- 5. What areas have presented the most frequent problems for students in EFE?
- 6. Do the expectations and/ or actual experiences of students in music teacher education differ in relation to enrollment, geographic location, state, accrediting agency, and the number of hours completed?
- 7. What commonalities and discrepancies are present in music teacher education EFE programs in the United States of America?

Assumptions

Assumptions related to this investigation include:

1. There is a need to obtain accurate, relevant information regarding current field experiences practice in teacher education institutions.

- 2. The descriptive survey is the most appropriate method of obtaining the needed information.
- 3. The instrument used to collect data for this study is properly constructed and valid for its intended use.
- 4. There are statistical methods available, which allow for the type of comparisons and analyses sought in this study.

Definition of Terms

Early field experience. Early field experiences include those non-didactic experiences, clinical or field, that occur at the pre-student teaching level.

Field Experiences. Field experiences include all contacts with children, youth and adults in school and community, including observation, participation, teaching, and other leadership activities that make a direct contribution to an understanding of the teaching-learning process (Andrews, 1964). These occur under the supervision of college-university programs of teacher education.

College instructor. A college instructor is an individual employed by the college or university who is designated to provide educational experiences for student learning.

Cooperating teacher. A cooperating teacher is an experienced teacher who provides guidance to college students during field experience and is employed as a music teacher in an elementary or secondary school.

Professional education course. Professional education courses include those courses required specifically for the music teacher education degree in a music teacher education program of a college. Generally these are recognized as courses taken after admission to the teacher education program.

Activities. Activities are those experiences designed for field settings. In this study activities and field experiences are used interchangeably.

Clinical experience. Clinical experience refers to those experiences in teacher education that provide students opportunities to apply theory to practice involving diagnosis and prescription of situations which related to teaching and learning.

Delimitations of the Study

- The study is limited to colleges and universities that are accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music, and that provide undergraduate music education degree programs.
- 2. All music teacher education course EFEs in a music teacher education program of an institution are represented in the sample. General teaching courses outside of the music teacher education program are not included.
- All faculties who teach courses are not included in the sample. The sample includes a faculty member at each institution who oversees the music education department or who facilitates music teacher education, and EFEs.

Limitations of the Study

The scope of this study was limited to exploring the state of early field experience programs in schools of music in the United States of America. Participants were identified based on enrollment, funding, school setting, and other geographical considerations. Due to the size of the sample and response rates, any attempts to generalize the findings of this study were approached with caution.

Overview of Design and Methodology

Participants

To provide a representative national view of early field experience activity, universities from each of the 50 states were selected based on 1) undergraduate enrollment, 2) undergraduate music education enrollment, and 3) geographic setting of the institution. A minimum of two universities from each state were invited to participate, with one being the institution enrolling the highest number of undergraduate students and the other being the institution enrolling the highest number of music education majors as reported to (NASM). In those states covering larger geographic areas and supporting dense populations, more than three institutions were contacted.

Three sources were used to identify possible participants. The *National Association of Schools of Music Accredited Institutional Members Directory* (2016) was used to obtain the names, addresses, and program offerings of all accredited universities offering music education programs. The National Center for Education Statistics "Common Core of Data" (2016) was used to obtain undergraduate enrollments, sources of financial support, and to identify "urban-centric locale codes" indicating whether the school was located in a city, a suburb, a town, or a rural area. Each of these categories are classified further with three subcategories: city and suburb are further classified as large, midsize, and small; town, and rural areas are further classified by distance from an urbanized area: fringe, distant, or remote (see Appendix A). Data from the Higher Education Arts Data Service's 2013-2014 HEADS survey (2015), a division of the Council of Arts Accrediting Association, was used to identify the university with the largest undergraduate music education enrollment.

Data Collection

Because this study examined the current practices in music education early field experiences across a large number of institutions, a cross-sectional survey design was used to gather data (Fink, 2009). A researcher-authored survey was developed based upon (a) a review of the professional literature on early field experiences in music teacher education, (b) suggestions from professionals in the field of music teacher education.

Data were collected using an electronic web-based survey instrument accessible through the *Qualitrics* survey tool software, provided by the University of Georgia. The survey instrument was chosen because of ease of administration and availability of the software to faculty and graduate student researchers. The format of the questionnaire (Appendix B) avoided, wherever possible, questions that required open-ended written responses.

The questionnaire was divided into 6 subdivisions: (a) general information about the university; (b) EFE administration and placement practices; (c) procedures and requirements during the EFE; (d) observation and evaluation of the EFE; and (f) openended questions regarding personal observations and opinions of participants, by phone interview if necessary.

Since no single format was appropriate for all questions, each was treated individually. Common to most questions were an analysis of the responses from publiclyfunded versus privately-funded schools, a further breakdown of the data related to university location, number reports of total undergraduate enrollment and undergraduate music education enrollment, and pertinent information regarding regional accrediting.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the collected data of closedresponse questions. The online survey program provided calculations for some of the survey item responses, but this information was insufficient. The survey responses were subsequently sent to a Microsoft *Excel* spreadsheet program to generate more meaningful data, including means, frequencies, and standard deviations for each closed-response survey item. In addition, percentages were calculated for each Likert-type scale item in questions 48 through 52. Because respondents were given the opportunity to provide additional information when selecting "other" in many of the closed-response items, text responses were categorized. For example, if a respondent checked "other" in survey item 6 and typed "cooperating teacher" in the text box, a new category was created and the frequency of that response was calculated and presented if statistically significant. Tables were constructed for a number of survey items in order to present a large amount of information efficiently and to make the data more comprehensible.

Open-ended responses were analyzed using a three-part procedure for examining qualitative data—assigning codes, combining codes into themes, and displaying the data (Creswell, 2007). Interpretations and quotations from participant responses were included in the presentation of the findings to provide a rich description of each emergent category. To establish reliability a music education expert, who had experience analyzing qualitative research data, reviewed responses to the open-ended survey items. The percentage of agreement on coding between the research and the statistician was 84.3%. After discussing the coding differences with the expert, an agreement was reached to achieve 100% agreement.

Organization of the Document

The dissertation has five chapters. This chapter contains an introduction and general overview of the study. Chapter two presents a review of relevant literature in the area of early field experience; the review includes an overview of the role of field experiences in teacher education; the effect of field work on a variety of variables; including attitudes; the development of teaching skills; effect on course work; and an examination of surveys related to early field experiences. Chapter three describes the design of the study; outlines the development of the instrumentation; describes the population and sample; discusses data collection; and reports how the data were analyzed. Chapters four and five present the findings and provide a discussion of the implications of the results and for further research.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

Field experiences have long been an element in teacher education programs. Field experiences were initially based on acquisition of knowledge through an apprenticeship model (Bennie, 1972; Johnson, 1968). Later, normal schools used field experiences to model lessons and to involve students in limited teaching assignments (Johnson, 1968). These limited experiences were sometimes called practice teaching. When normal schools became teachers' colleges, field experiences were often provided in laboratory schools settings. These experiences provided varied learning opportunities for the preservice teacher. The sequence of experiences generally included observation, participation and finally involvement in the full responsibilities of teaching (Garland, 1982). As the number of pre-service teachers enrolled in colleges and universities increased, laboratory schools could no longer provide for all field requirements (Johnson, 1968). Environments were sought for pre-service teachers that would more nearly approximate teaching environments in school assignments.

Social awareness also influences teacher education. Educators were faced with the problems of integrating schools, working in urban environments and attending to the realities that children come from varied cultural backgrounds in the late 1950s and 1960s. Smith, Cohen, and Pearl (1969) and Gehreke (1981) spoke of a need to study actual behavioral situations and then interpret them with concepts where they are to be learned and subsequently used in teaching. Liston and Zeichner (1991) furthered these studies by

suggesting an early field experience was a chance to identify a teaching strategy with regards to a student's cognitive and social background. An American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education task force (Denemark, 1983) supported field and clinical experiences in real, but controlled environments. Field experiences that contribute to the socialization of the beginning teacher also require reality environments (Haberman, 1978).

Other influences have contributed to an increase in field experiences in teacher education. The amount of experience provided in a program has been based on the following: competency-based movement; a concern for student performance and success; a teacher surplus; and a demand by practitioners to become more involved in teacher education (Henry, 2001). Accreditation agencies continue to place a high priority on field and clinical experiences in program standards and norms (Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation, 2014; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, 2015; National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education [NCATE], 2015; Teacher Education Accreditation Council, 2009). Professional organizations are calling for fieldbased experiences beginning with the first education course and continuing throughout the teacher education program (National Education Association of the United States, 1982). Changes that have occurred in the profession have had an influence on field experiences in teacher education programs.

Field experiences in the past primarily consisted of student teaching. Today, early field experiences prior to student teaching occur regularly in pre-service teacher education (Aiken & Day, 1999; Butler, 2001; Mendoza & Webb, 1981; Reynolds &

Conway, 2003). These experiences occur from freshman through senior levels (Howey, Yarger, & Joyce, 1978).

Researchers have recorded multiple benefits of early field experience for preservice teachers. Studies showed that EFE provided future music teachers an understanding of actual classroom settings (Bergee, 2006; Butler, 2001; Colwell, 1995; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009), opportunities to assess their potential as teachers (Aiken & Day, 1999; Reynolds & Conway, 2003), teacher confidence (Bergee, 2006; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009; Reynolds & Conway, 2003), and motivation to teach (Aiken & Day, 1999). Additionally, students in teacher education programs developed specific skills necessary for student teaching (Anderson & Graebell, 1990; Wolfgang, 1990), such as a better understanding of children (Anderson & Graebell, 1990) and the teaching environment (Aiken & Day, 1999), and increased professional knowledge through EFE (Paul, 1998). Researchers have also reported heightened commitments toward students and the teaching profession (Aiken & Day, 1999; Bergee, 2006; Reynolds & Conway, 2003), as well as academic and teaching improvements among pre-service teachers engaged in EFE (Maheady, Jabot, Ray, & Michielli-Pendl, 2007).

Colwell (1995) identified off-campus (actual classroom) experience as a source that "provide[s] components not available in a university simulation" (p. 7). Gregory (1995), in his investigation of college and university educators regarding collaborations with K-12 schools reported a list of benefits. Among the top ten were better field experiences for college students, graduates that become effective music teachers, raised awareness of K-12 school realities among the higher education faculty, enhanced music

education curricula, and improved college student musical achievements (Gregory, 1995).

Efforts to extend the quality of teacher education programs also include internships. This further emphasized the perceived importance of field experiences for teacher education. While fieldwork is strongly supported by the profession in practice, little information exists regarding the current state of EFE in music teacher education programs. An examination of early field experiences is essential in establishing knowledge of current practice and developing a perspective on possible roles that field experience might assume in teacher education programs of the future.

Pre-service Teacher Attitude

Research relating to early field experience focuses on changes in attitudes, development of teaching skills, effects on course work, work with field personnel, and descriptions of institutional participation (NCATE, 2008). Silvernail (1980) found a preservice internship combined with methods courses reduced the anxiety level of students. However, the experience did not decrease teacher concerns of these students after they became teachers. King and Martin (1981) examined the anxiety levels of students who had varying amounts of previous contact with children. Initially, the level of anxiety was high for students who had minimal contact with children; however, this was reduced as participation in field experience progressed. Haring and Nelson (1980) compared student ratings of field and campus based teacher education programs. Graduates who completed field-based programs rated their experience higher than in those with a campus based experience. However, in a later assessment of these same graduates, it was found that the attitude of these students did not remain as positive as when they first completed the

program. Weaver, Hounshell, and Coble (1979) measured the effect of courses with a field component on student attitudes toward science and teaching science. They found more positive attitudes in the group who had participated in field experiences. Kulm (1975) compared the attitudes of two types of field experiences. One group observed only in classrooms and the other group engaged in teaching activities in junior high school classes; he found that students who only had observation experiences help a more modern and open attitude towards teaching. Ingle and Robinson (1965) found observation experiences in conjunction with educational psychology resulted in an increase in the level of positive attitudes toward children.

Elmore and Cromartie (1975) investigated teacher perceptions of and reactions to field-based programs; they found both of these to be positive. Gantt and Davey (1972) also found that the pre-student teacher's reactions to courses with field experiences were positive. Hoffman and Gellen (1981) compared the self-evaluation of pre-student teaching students in an early field program with the classroom teacher's evaluations of these students. It was found that male students in an elementary education program rated their performance higher than did the classroom teachers. Female elementary education students rated themselves lower than did their cooperating teachers. At non-elementary levels the results were reversed. Females rated themselves more favorably than did the cooperating teachers, and males rated themselves lower then did the cooperating teacher; however, the difference between the male and females groups were not significant.

Marso and Reed (1971) compared self-ratings of students early field experiences with those without fieldwork. It was found that students with field experiences rated themselves higher on teaching skills than did students without field experience. Wasicsko

(1981) measured the attitudes of students with and without field experiences toward coursework about American public schools, mainstreaming, and human development, and the teacher preparation program. The group with fieldwork had more positive attitudes toward mainstreaming and human development and more negative attitudes toward public schools and teacher preparation. The campus-based group had more positive attitudes toward American education and mainstreaming and more negative attitudes toward teacher education and human development. It can be concluded that while the data from early field experience research generally support the development of a positive attitude toward children and teaching, these data suggest that experiences may result in negative attitudes toward schools and teacher preparation.

Field Site Location

There are several studies, which encompass field experiences in urban and suburban settings. Melograno (1976) conducted a study to understand the effects of urban and suburban experiences at different grade levels. The students indicated no significant difference on personality or choice of teaching style as the variety or level of field setting changed. There was an increase, but not a significant one, for semi and non-variable groups in the degree of authoritarianism. Harty and Smith (1977) compared the acceptance of others during placements in multiethnic community centers. They found pre-service teachers became less accepting of others as a result of interacting with children and other adults. Awareness training increased the acceptance of others before the field experience. However, after pre-service teachers taught, they became less accepting of others. Grossman (1980) compared the effectiveness of student teacher competencies with and without early field experiences. He found that students with less

early field experience were rated higher by supervisors on specific competencies than were those with extensive fieldwork. In general the research indicated that early field placements in suburban and urban settings result in positive experiences for students and some types of experiences change student perceptions on specific variables.

Coursework and Early Field Experiences

Studies that investigate the effect of field experience on various aspects of course work have shown varying results. Hedberg (1979) found achievement was not adversely affected by the addition of a field component to course requirements. Clark (1974) found that students enrolled in an education psychology course with EFEs demonstrated no differences in achievement, however, philosophical values were affected by the experience. Denton (1982) found no immediate effect of early field experiences on the cognitive achievement of students. However, Denton suggested that teacher candidates might be alerted to the importance of techniques and processes in subsequent methods courses.

Ross, Raines, Cervetti, and Dillon (1980) compared tutorial and apprenticeship programs. No significant differences in student perceptions were found. However the data show that some students had a less positive attitude toward tutoring. Lux (1973) examined the development of teacher competencies through different amounts and types of field experiences. He found that both the experimental and control groups developed competencies. He reported that the experiment group, which learned concepts in field context, scored higher on specific teaching skills and that changes in instructional behaviors in the group were developed in a shorter period of time.

Anderson, Frager, and Boling (1982) compared the use of protocol experiences with role-play simulations to develop questioning skills. They found mean scores for selected questioning skills were higher for students exposed to protocols. A study of field placement characteristics and students' potential field performance abilities indicated feedback was the only field characteristic significantly related to student performance (Becher & Ade, 1982).

Kelly (1970) compared two types of field arrangements with student teacher performance. There was no significant difference found between groups with fieldwork and those who worked primarily on campus. Donofrio (1980) found that older students with prior knowledge of children perceived fieldwork to be less important than were studies of learning theory.

Henry (2001) examined the effect of increased exploratory field experiences upon the perceptions and performance of student teachers. Results of the study indicated that increased fieldwork had little or no effect on student teachers' evaluations or perceptions of their ability to perform designated teaching tasks. However, the data did indicate a significant difference in three of the 20 teaching skills measured. Students with less field experience were more successful in writing and teaching with a behavioral objective while students with more field experience were more confident in their ability to assist pupils with reading difficulties. The research studies presented here suggest that the acquisition of academic and professional competencies by pre-service teachers is not adversely affected by field experiences and, in some instances, field experiences contribute to competency development.

Field Experiences Participation

The effect of field experiences on the public school participants has been examined in a number of studies in an attempt to determine difficulties and problems encountered in varying aspects of field experience programs. Souter and Bartos (1981) found the pre-service teacher's presence in the classroom had an impact on school environment. Pupils were motivated, received additional help from adults, small group work was encouraged, and cooperating teacher's involvement with field students did not reduce instructional time available to children. Harste (1973) studied the effect of fieldbased teacher education participation on student test performance and found third grade children who were involved in field-based programs had a decrease in mean scores while sixth grade students with future teachers had an increase in mean scores. Boyd, Grossman, Lankford, Loeb, and Wyckoff (2009) studied 31 teacher education programs, and determined programs with stronger field experience components produced more effective first year teachers:

Teacher preparation that focuses more on the work of the classroom and provides opportunities for teachers to study what they will be doing as first-year teachers seems to produce teachers who, on average, are more effective during their first year of teaching. (p. 434)

Specifically, teachers who received greater student teaching oversight and obtained actual classroom experience showed higher student outcome.

Applegate and Lasley (1982) identified the problems of cooperating teachers. They found that students were not always ready to assume professional responsibilities and cooperating teachers did not always know what roles they were expected to perform.

Martin and Wood (1983) studied cooperating teacher's problems. The data from this study indicated that teacher problems included a lack of time to spend with field students, a lack of specific teaching skills held by pre-service teachers, and low student interest in getting to know other classroom teachers. Kapel (1978) found that cooperating teachers did not perceive their role or level of involvement in the same way, as did college teachers. Cooperating teachers wanted more involvement with the development of objectives and evaluations of EFE students, but not an extensive involvement in field experiences. Results of the research on problems with field experience show that cooperating teachers have a significant role in the implementation of field experiences. These studies indicate that cooperating teachers are willing to participate in fieldwork, but the establishment of stronger communication between parties involved should be a priority.

Institutional Participation in Field Experiences

The objective of some research studies relating to the curriculum of field experiences have been the investigation of participation and the degree of involvement by institutions. Kay and Ishler (1981) found 90% of the 240 institutions responding to a national survey included early field experiences in their programs. Student participation begins, for 50% of students, their freshman year with 82% becoming involved by their sophomore year.

Activities identified as a part of the early field curriculum encompassed 14 general areas of involvement. Puckett (1983) surveyed American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) member institutions regarding early field experiences. He found 99% of the 483 reporting institutions had professional field experiences in their

programs which span a continuum from brief experiences to multiple, long-term carefully planned and guided experiences. Southall and Dumas (1981) conducted a regional survey and found early field experiences in over half of the 85 institutions responding. Activities identified as a present practice included 12 areas of involvement. These include such activities as: assisting teachers in non-teaching tasks, attending seminars, observation, analysis, instructional planning, and developing materials.

The impact of insufficient or inadequate field experience often results in increased stress and frustration especially among beginning teachers. Chesley and Jordan (2012) interviewed a group of 30 novice teachers with experiences ranging from three months to three years representing 17 teacher education programs to discuss the teaching difficulties they faced. The teachers professed that their personal teacher education program did not adequately prepare them for the "physical and mental stress that they experienced in their classrooms" (Chesley & Jordan, 2012, p. 42). The teachers identified various deficiencies including classroom management, content pedagogy, lesson planning, understanding student engagement and motivation, alternate instruction methods to address diversity, and general professional management skills such as multi-tasking. Participants and researchers acknowledged that the majority of these issues stemmed from insufficient field experience and recommended universities offer collaborative programs with K-12 schools (Chesley & Jordan, 2012). Further recommendations proposed that pre-service teachers engage in observations and practicum beginning in the first year of the teacher education program.

Rationale for Field Experiences

The rationale supporting the need for field experience is provided by a number of teacher educators. Dewey (1938) referred to field experience as including two approaches. The early, pre-practice experience was to develop an attitude of reflective criticism of teaching and education, which would result in students becoming a student of teaching. The apprenticeship was to develop the practical aspects of teaching that would occur after the student had acquired an attitude of inquiry. In a course description Flowers (1927) described field experience in a course description as facilitating modeling, encouraging the application of theory to practice, and developing skills. He stated:

We general teach as we see others teach. Our habits of teaching are formed through observation and study followed by practice in those things we have learned.

...imitation is an important factor in the training of teachers for the service... It is assumed that the students in this course have already weighed the matter of selecting a field for teaching... The aim of this course is to concentrate on one of these fields.

In this course contacts with children will be made almost daily. This application offers an excellent opportunity for the application of principles learned while studying psychology. (pp. 7-8)

A list of skills was created by Flowers (1927) that were to be developed through EFE, which include: following the steps of the lesson, reflecting upon previous discussions, considering goals, and criticizing methods freely if better methods can be suggested.
Flowers (1948) defined professional laboratory experiences as those that: "include all those contacts with children, youth, and adults which make a direct contribution to an understanding of individuals and their guidance in the teaching-learning process" (p. 90). Conant (2001) described laboratory experiences as including the observation of children and the practical activity in the classroom in conjunction with professional instruction. He described these experiences as involving not only principles of teaching, but also an understanding of children developing individually and in groups. Cottrell (1956, p. 184) identified professional laboratory experiences as "all those contacts with children, youth, and adults through observation, participation, and teaching which make a direct contribution to the understanding of individuals and their guidance in the teachinglearning process." These direct experiences were said to involve the total organism. Andrews (1964) further differentiated field experience by including clinical experience. Clinical activities are, "[c]arefully planned student contact with individuals and very small groups of learners under the direct supervision of skilled practitioners with the student making diagnoses, prognosis, and projecting treatment plans for individuals with learning problems" (p. 12). Bennie (1972) described clinical experiences as "[t]hose experiences that enable the prospective teacher to participate in aspects of teaching in an active or passive role. ... the emphasis in all clinical experience is diagnostic and analytical" (p. 18).

Justifications of early field experience influence on pre-service teachers continue to be at the forefront of educational reform and lead to an inclusion of early field experiences in teacher education programs and the development of guidelines. In 1970, the Music Educators National Conference's (MENC) Commission on Teacher Education

task force recommended the inclusion of early field experiences in teacher education programs. MENC later created a task-force that outlined a more detailed recommendation for early field experiences with K-12 students emphasizing videotaped observations, micro-teaching, peer-teaching, private instruction, and socialization (Music Teacher Education: Partnership and Process, the Task Force on Music Teacher Education for the Nineties, 1987).

Early Field Experience Activities

EFE activities, the practical or observed application of principles acquired during the teacher education program prior to student teaching (see terms), vary among programs with core pursuits focused on teaching and observing (DeLorenzo, 1990; Paese, 1996). In Southall and Dumas' research (1981), 12 EFE activities in categories including: teaching, observation, evaluation, and others were identified:

- Teaching One to one, small group, and large group instructions;
- Observation classroom and school activities;
- Evaluation written analyses or descriptions of experiences;

Others – assistance of teachers in non-teaching tasks, instructional planning, teaching materials development, periodic seminars, and activities unspecified.
(Southall & Dumas, 1981, p. 206)

Similarly, Applegate listed six EFE activities with an emphasis on teaching and observing, they included: "tutoring, teaching small groups and classes, observing classes and other school activities, and providing assistance to the teacher" (Applegate, 1985, p. 61). Rozmajzl (1992), in a study of an elementary methods course, mentioned video and on-site observations and micro and macro teaching in schools and preparatory programs.

Other EFE activities included mentorship and involvement with an on-site children's choir (Rozmajzl, 1992).

Paese (1996) described three types of field experiences pre-service teachers' encounter within teacher education programs: abstract, vicarious, and concrete. Abstract experiences occur when pre-service teachers study and discuss various aspects of teaching in their education courses. Vicarious experiences are observations made through video or simultaneous (live) internet video casts. Concrete experiences refer to observations (indirect concrete experience) and actual teaching sessions and/or engagements in teaching related activities (direct concrete experience). Paese posits that these types of field experiences occur as a continuum in a teacher education program. In a typical methods course instructors engage students in an abstract experience by discussing classroom procedures and scenes. Once familiarized with teaching processes—such as lesson plan development, learning outcomes, assessment, and basic classroom managements skills-pre-service teachers are introduced to actual classrooms through observations and learn to determine appropriate action in their own lessons and incorporate these points in their teaching sessions. In Reynolds and Conway's study of field-based experience (2003), methods course students prepared for their eventual direct concrete (teaching) experience first discussing and planning.

Outcomes of Early Field Experience in Skill Types

The value of early field experience extends to various types of skills viewed most relevant to teaching. While acknowledging the limitations of teacher training institutions, such as time, inadequate conditions and resources, and lack of societal attention to teacher training which currently exists, Dewey identified two basic areas that pre-service

teachers should master during their course of teacher education: subject matter proficiency and classroom management skill (Dewey, 1964).

In 1970 a MENC task force outlined effective teaching qualities in a slightly different manner by dividing classroom management skill into two separate qualitiespersonal and professional-in addition to musical competencies. Personal qualities involve inspiring others, maintaining intellectual curiosity, displaying empathy, collaborating with other disciplines, developing and assessing new ideas, and understanding the teacher's role. Other traits identified with personal qualities included enthusiasm (Baker, 1982; Brand, 1985; Culpepper, 1956; Mills & Smith, 2003; Minor, Onwuegbuzie, Witcher & James, 2002; Teachout, 1997), motivation/inspiration (Baker, 1982; Doyle, 1997; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997; Veenan, 1984), care for students (Baker, 1982; Brand, 1985; Doyle, 1997), patience (Mills & Smith, 2003; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout, 1997), and the desire to improve (Baker, 1982, Brand, 1985, Doyle, 1997). Additionally, Shulman (2004) emphasized value, purpose, and philosophy while Culpepper (1956) stressed the importance of dependability, initiative, and self-confidence. More recent studies identified maturity, leadership, stress management, and a sense of humor as essential qualities among personal skills (Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Teachout 1997).

The 1970 MENC recommendation for professional qualities focused on communication, commitment to music, knowledge of educational trends and the means to convey it to students, an awareness of a broad range of repertoire and culture, an ability to demonstrate leadership, and a dedication to teaching music (MENC, 1970). In teacher education studies, professional qualities generally involved teaching skills. Classroom

management (Baker, 1982; Brand, 1985; Doyle, 1997; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009; Minor et al., 2002; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Shulman, 1987; Veenan, 1984) received most mention in this category, followed by student-centered teaching (Doyle, 1997; Lofgren, 1974; Mills & Smith, 2003; Minor et al., 2002; Shulman, 1987; Teachout, 1997; Veenan, 1984), pacing or time efficiency (Brand, 1985; Doyle, 1997; Gumm, 1993; Teachout, 1997; Rohwer & Henry 2004; Yarbrough, 1975), organization (Brand, 1985; Culpepper, 1957; Doyle, 1997; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009; Rohwer & Henry 2004; Teachout 1997; Veenan, 1984), and delivery or communication skill (Culpepper, 1957; Doyle, 1997; Hamann, Baker, McAllister, & Bauer, 2000; Rohwer & Henry 2004; Yarbrough 1975). Physical attributes such as eye contact, voice inflection, and facial expression were also commonly mentioned (Hamann, et al., 2000; Rohwer & Henry 2004; Yarbrough, 1975).

Various efforts have been made to discover characteristics of effective teaching employing the categorizations of skill types mentioned above: personal, professional, and musical/subject. Among the three skill types, professional (teaching) and personal skills—techniques of classroom management skill—were generally regarded as the most beneficial and highly recommended skill for teachers across disciplines (Baker, 1982; Brand, 1985; Dewey, 1964; Doyle, 1997; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009; Minor et al., 2002; Rohwer & Henry, 2004; Shulman, 1987; Veenan, 1984). Teachout (1997) had pre-service and experienced teachers' rank 40 pre-selected characteristics of the most essential skills needed in the first three years of teaching. Among these, traits pertaining to personal and teaching (professional) skills were ranked higher by both pre-service and experienced teachers than were characteristics related to musical competencies. Hamann et al. (2000) employed lecture videos with different teaching techniques to examine students'

perceptions of good teaching. Student rankings illustrated teaching skill and personal attributes as more consequential than subject matter proficiency in determining effective teaching. Mills and Smith (2003) examined 134 instrumental teachers to observe effective teaching techniques and found personal traits most favored, followed by pedagogical skills and musical competencies as the least important. Rohwer and Henry (2004) surveyed 416 university music professors of various disciplines (instrumental, choral, and general) on requisite skills and characteristics of effective teaching and concluded teaching skill was the most crucial followed by personal and musical traits.

Researchers have highlighted the importance of classroom management skills; however, Jackson (2008) reported that teaching classroom management skills is often undermined in many pre-service programs. Dillon (2004) also identified classroom management skills as one of the top deficiencies in pre-service programs. Often the deficiency stems from lack of contact with actual classroom settings, which may be garnered through field experience. Participants in Hourigan and Scheib (2009) listed three major benefits of early field experience: (a) increased ability to "apply methods to real-life teaching scenarios," (b) enhanced understanding of the teaching environment, and (c) heightened confidence in working with K-12 students (p. 56).

Personal, professional, and musical (content) skills were the three skill types identified as most relevant to teaching (MENC, 1970). Personal and professional skills refer to skills generally related to teaching and classroom management skills. Personal skills focused on traits reflected through a teacher's personality, such as empathy towards students, confidence, leadership, and motivation. Professional teaching skills include communication, organization, pacing, and physical attributes. Musical skill pertained to

subject matter knowledge. Researchers comparing these three skill types found personal and professional skills to affect student learning more than content (musical) skill. Interestingly, teacher education programs traditionally emphasize content skill over personal and professional skills, which are largely gained through experience.

Role of Field Experience

The roles or purposes of fieldwork aid in a description of the subject. Some authors have stated that field experiences should provide the learner with opportunities to solve problems (Cottrell, 1956; DeLorenzo, 1990). Lindsey (1979) describes the role of laboratory experiences "to verify, and to test the meaning of the key concepts that make up the discipline of education (and/or teaching) and to do this by using those modes of inquiry appropriate to the discipline" (p. 35). The Association of Teacher Educators (ATE) guidelines (1973) support the concept of direct laboratory experiences. It is stated in these guidelines that these experiences "will enable the student to broaden and deepen his understanding of principles and apply them to practical problems of teaching" (p. 10). This experience has also been described as "useful direct experience, with simultaneous study of useful knowledge, divided into achievable goals for beginners and gradually increasing the difficulty of the role" (Howsam, 1985, p. 90).

Smith (1969) describes a situational approach for "studying actual behavioral situations and interpreting them with the concepts which are to be learned and subsequently used in teaching" (p. 51). AACTE encourages observation and practice in "real, but controlled" environments in supervised, structured experiences that relate theory and practice through increasingly demanding clinical and field experiences (Scannel, 1983, p. 18). Garland (1982) described field experience as supervised, direct

experiences in teaching provided for teacher education students in elementary, middle, and secondary schools. Webb (1981) used the term exploratory field experiences in referring to pre-service activities which are sponsored by the training institution, occur typically in non-university environments, and precede student teaching.

Field experiences, whether labeled professional laboratory experience, clinical, or fieldwork, involve the interaction of the pre-service teacher with professional knowledge in a professional setting. The use of direct involvement is related not only to the concept of active learning, but also the concepts of applying theory to practice in an appropriate environment. Teacher education involves the engagement of a student in intellectual interactions, while simultaneously utilizing theoretical knowledge, in an ever-changing teaching-learning environment.

Guidelines or goals of field experience serve as a means of further defining the field dimension of teacher education. Accrediting organizations have established standards for field and clinical experiences. NCATE (1982) described laboratory and clinical experience as:

...experiences through which the student may conceptualize principles and interpret their application to practical problems...

The study of teaching and learning theory provides the prospective teacher with principles of practice, and laboratory experiences, which include field experiences early in the student's program of study, illuminate and demonstrate these principles. Clinical experience confronts the student with individual cases or problems, the diagnosis, and solution of which involve the application of principles and theory. (p. 18)

NASTEC (1981) established guidelines for field and clinical experiences. Field and clinical experiences are to be established by the institutions as a part of the administration or in cooperation with elementary or secondary schools. These may occur at many levels; however, the experiences are to be based on principles of teaching and learning, including child development, learning theory, curriculum development, and community relations. Field-based experiences are to apply theory to practice in a variety of settings, under special conditions (e.g. urban, suburban, and multicultural).

Flowers (1948) wrote that the goals for field experiences provide "an opportunity to implement basic concepts discussed in classes, to allow a student to see personal and professional needs, to study with students in actual teaching/ learning environments" (p. 90). These experiences should be implemented throughout the teacher education program in integrated approaches and allowing experiences to be flexible to allow for the readiness and interests of the individual student.

Guidelines set by AACTE committees influenced field experiences for years. One group (Lindsey, 1979) listed assumptions derived from:

- 1. Direct experiences facilitate learning.
- 2. The need for direct experience applies at all levels of maturity.
- ...the need for direct experience to develop problems, to give meaning to ideas and to develop functional understanding that leads beyond verbalization to ability to implement ideas in action applies equally to academic and to professional courses. (p. 16)

Howsam (1976) described fieldwork as a continuous interlocking relationship between theory and practice that is achieved by direct experience along with simultaneous study of knowledge. He stated that the study should be divided into achievable goals for beginners and gradually increasing in level of difficulty. Scannel (1983) spoke of real, but controlled environments, and supervised structured experiences that relate theory and practice in a mix of campus and field learning. The reports published by various AACTE groups indicate changes in goals or perceptions of field experiences over the years. It may be concluded while direct involvement with students and teaching learning situations has remained constant, the concepts of skill development, professional socialization, and environments for fieldwork have expanded.

Researchers and professional groups have identified goals and organizational considerations for EFE programs. ATE (1970) established the function for field experiences as, "[a]pplication and testing of teaching and learning theory, providing opportunities for developing competency in the full range of teacher tasks, and illustrate and demonstrate principles of practice (p. 10). ATE also states these experiences are to occur in a variety of contexts in order to offer the student opportunities to make judgmental decisions (p. 11). Others (Cottrell et al, 1956; Lindsey, 1978) also state that a goal of field experience is to provide problem-solving opportunities. Seiforth (1979) and Andrews (1964), include skill development as goals for field experience.

NASDTEC and the American Association for the Advancement of Science guidelines (1963) support observation and student teaching with experienced elementary school teachers in a laboratory setting. However, it states that these experiences should be with a teacher competent in the subject area, skilled in nurturing the spirit of inquiry, and effective in helping children benefit from the study of science and mathematics. The college practice of using evaluations of students in field experience situations to identify

strengths and weakness has been indicated as an indirect goal (Andrew, 1979). The goals and guidelines of field experience both describe and to some extent govern practice.

Field experiences are provided for students to experience opportunities to explore teaching as a career (Aiken & Day, 1999; Paese, 1996), develop teaching skills in authentic environments (Bergee, 2006; Butler, 2001; Colwell, 1995; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009), encourage the acquisition of professional knowledge particularly regarding roles of teachers, and assist in the application of theoretical knowledge to practical situations (Reynolds & Conway, 2003). Theoretical considerations relate to the concept of active learning as a means of developing and practicing teaching skills. It should be increasingly apparent that an understanding of present practice in the United States of America is enhanced by an understanding of historical views about what field experiences are expected to achieve in the context of teacher education programs.

EFE in Music Teacher Education Programs

The importance of early field experience, as echoed by various educational reform leaders, accelerated EFE's frequency in teacher education programs and brought changes in EFE curriculum (Schmidt, 1989). A typical music teacher education curriculum in the United States is comprised of three major areas of studies: general, music, and professional (Meaux, 2004; National Association of Schools of Music [NASM], 2012). The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) curriculum requirements for a bachelor's degree in music education consist of at least 50% of the total program being dedicated to music studies, 30-35% to general studies, and 15-20% to professional education (NASM, 2012). In this context, music studies (50% of the total program) contained all courses related to music (e.g., theory, history, applied lessons, and

ensembles) as well as methods courses. Professional courses referred to courses related to education without specific music references. Examples of these courses may be educational foundations, educational psychology, or special education.

NASM listed field experience (student teaching) as a part of the professional core; however, no specific course requirements were detailed other than brief statements for each specialized category. For vocal/choral music curricula/programs NASM recommended "laboratory experience in teaching beginning vocal techniques individually, in small groups, and in larger classes" (p.113). These music education curricula guidelines leave ample room for each institution to design and implement field experience according to their needs. Verrastro and Leglar (1992) investigated the amount of time institutions dedicated to field experience in music education programs and discovered significant variation in field experience supervision frequency as well as student exposure to the number of terms and credits of EFE. Similarly, Schmidt (1989) reported a range of 0 to 300 hours of EFE requirements among undergraduate music education curriculum program requirements.

Aside from the varied time frames for EFE requirements, implementation formats varied. Some institutions offered EFE as a course with a specific number of required hours while others incorporated EFE within methods courses. In Schmidt's study (2008), students in instrumental methods courses participated in EFE activities, which offered opportunities to implement the theoretical material learned in their methods course, assess the result of the experiences, and modify teaching methods according to those assessments.

Accounts of EFE activities in methods courses were also found in Conkling's (2001) examination of methods course students participating in professional development schools and in Bergee's (2006) study of EFE involving an instrumental methods class collaborating with a large middle school band. These researchers concurred that participants generally reported positive experiences based upon early field experiences, in part from having their methods instructors involved in the activity and during the follow-up evaluation process.

Summary

The literature clearly supports the importance of providing field experience in music teacher education. Exemplary teacher education early field experience programs have been identified. It has been shown in reports of research on student attitudes that early field experiences are generally positive experiences. In addition, teacher education standards continue to emphasize the field component in programs, yet there are critics. Haberman (1979) suggested the role of socialization should be included in field experience goals. Nolan (1972) implied that the theoretical basis for field experience might not relate to socialization of pre-service teachers. Zeichner (1980) suggested that an insufficient theoretical base about field experiences should prompt educators to assess practices related to the field. Possible negative effects of field experiences have been reported in some studies. Smith (1969) stated, "proximity does not always guarantee useful knowledge" (p. 71). An examination of early field experience practices and goals should provide more information about present practices in specific areas of teacher education and answer questions about early field experiences.

Field experiences have long been a part of teacher education. Educators have reexamined the theoretical aspects of fieldwork over the years. While conclusions derived from a review of the literature suggest that the theoretical base of field experience has not changed substantially since Dewey's work in the early 1900s, there are indications that the goals for fieldwork have increased. Teacher education institutions have increased the use of fieldwork for early experiences. This trend increasingly emphasized the need for an adequate knowledge base regarding present practices. Such a knowledge base would not only help identify various levels of experiences but would also provide direct assistance in the development of curriculum. There are indications from the results of research that field experiences make a contribution to teacher education. However, the diversity of research does not provide a clear view of the scope and sequence of early field experience curriculum. The primary purpose of this study is to provide specific data on this topic.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

This study was designed to provide data pertaining to the goals and characteristics of early field experiences (EFE) in selected music teacher education programs accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). Because no specific recommendations concerning EFE have been outlined by NASM, a report on current practices seemed warranted.

Research Design

The study was descriptive in design. A researcher-authored online survey instrument was used to gather data. An electronic format was chosen because of feasibility for gathering information from a population spread across the United States (Fink, 2009). Although mixed findings have been reported regarding the effects of electronic versus paper surveys, "it seems that e-survey methods potentially may yield more complete and detailed information than paper survey methods" (Miksza, Roeder, & Biggs, 2010, p. 368). The online survey software provided ease of communication and the ability to download data directly into an electronic database for analysis. The software also allowed participants to upload electronic files for subsequent examination.

Participants

To provide a representative national view of early field experience activity, universities from each of the 50 states were selected based on 1) undergraduate enrollment, 2) undergraduate music education enrollment, and 3) geographic setting of the institution. A minimum of two universities from each state were invited to participate, with one being the institution enrolling the highest number of undergraduate students and the other having the highest number of music education majors as reported to (NASM). In those states covering larger geographic areas and supporting dense populations, more than three institutions were contacted.

Three sources were used to identify possible participants. The *National Association of Schools of Music Accredited Institutional Members Directory* (2016) was used to obtain the names, addresses, and program offerings of all accredited universities offering music education programs. The National Center for Education Statistics "Common Core of Data" (2016) was used to obtain undergraduate enrollments, sources of support, and to identify "urban-centric locale codes" indicating whether the school was located in a city, a suburb, a town, or a rural area. Each of these categories are classified further with three subcategories: city and suburb are further classified as large, midsize, and small; town and rural areas are further classified by distance from an urbanized area: fringe, distant, or remote (see Appendix A). Data from the Higher Education Arts Data Service's 2013-2014 HEADS survey (2015), a division of the Council of Arts Accrediting Association, was used to identify the university with the largest undergraduate music education enrollment.

After potential participating universities were identified, search results from the NASM online database (NASM, 2015), returned point of contact for the department chair/director and the internet address for each program. Using the listed web address, faculty members responsible for field experiences or department chairs of music education were identified and contact information was collected. Faculty members'

names, institutions, teaching positions, and email addresses were collected in an electronic database for upload to send electronic email invitations with a specific link connected to the institutions' demographic statistical information. From the total number of music education departments surveyed (N = 184), 88 participants responded to the online survey, resulting in a response rate of 47.8%. Although the response rate was relatively low, it was determined to be acceptable because, with one exception, the distribution of response rate among the multiple categories was relatively even, the within-category and within-accrediting agency responses were representative of the total usable response rate. Private universities had a response rate of 37.3%; thus private universities were underrepresented in this sample. Table 3.01 lists the distribution and rate of return according to institution demographics. Table 3.02 reports distribution and rate of return delineated by accrediting agency.

Table 3.01

Description of Institution	Receiving Questionnaire	Returning Questionnaire	Percentage of Return (within	Percentage of Total Return
	<u>n</u> *	<u>n</u>	category)	(88)
State University	117	63	53.8%	71.6%
Private University	67	25	37.3%	28.4%
Enrollment over 10,500	92	48	52.2%	54.5%
Enrollment under 10,500	92	40	43.5%	45.5%
Located in Urban Setting	140	66	47.1%	75.0%
Located in Rural Setting	44	22	50.0%	25.0%
Densely Populated Area	89	48	53.9%	54.5%
Sparsely Populated Area	95	40	42.1%	45.5%

Distribution and Rate of Return of All Questionnaires Delineated by Demographic Characteristics

*<u>*n*</u> is number within the category in this and subsequent tables

Table 3.02

Distribution and Rate of Return of all Questionnaires Delineated by Accrediting Agency	
--	--

Description of Institution	Receiving Questionnaire <u>n</u> *	Returning Questionnaire <u>n</u>	Percentage of Return (within category)	Percentage of Total Return (88)
Middle States Commission on Higher Education	17	7	41.2%	8.0%
New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education	12	8	66.7%	9.1%
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, The Higher Learning Commission	73	31	42.5%	35.2%
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities	20	11	55.0%	12.5%
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges	54	25	46.3%	28.4%
Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Senior College and University Commission	8	6	75.0%	6.8%

*<u>*n*</u> is number within the category in this and subsequent tables

Data Collection

Survey Instrument

Because this study examined the current practices in music education early field experiences across a large number of institutions, a cross-sectional survey design was used to gather data (Fink, 2009). A researcher-authored survey was developed based upon (a) a review of the professional literature on early field experiences in music teacher education, (b) suggestions from professionals in the field of music teacher education.

Data were collected using an electronic web-based survey instrument accessible through the *Qualitrics* survey tool software, provided by the University of Georgia. The survey instrument was chosen because of ease of administration and availability of the software to faculty and graduate student researchers. The format of the questionnaire (Appendix B) avoided, wherever possible, questions that required open-ended written responses.

Content validity of the survey instrument was established by: (a) information reported in the research literature pertaining to the structure and content of both teacher and music-teacher education early field experience programs, and extant literature documenting the evolution and current status of early field experiences in teacher certification; (b) review of content and structure by music teacher education faculty and graduate students; (c) pilot study by a panel of experts with extensive experience creating/managing/supervising EFE programs for music teacher education.

Data collection followed Dillman's (2014) electronic survey plan, which includes multiple contacts and a special contact. For this study, the special contact was a phone call to non-respondents.

The questionnaire was divided into 6 subdivisions: (a) general information about the university; (b) EFE administration and placement practices; (c) procedures and requirements during the EFE; (d) observation and evaluation of the EFE; (f) open-ended questions regarding personal observations and opinions of participants, by phone interview if necessary.

Since no one format was appropriate for all questions, each was treated individually. Common to most questions were an analysis of the responses from publiclyfunded versus privately-funded schools, a further breakdown of the data related to university location, number reports of total undergraduate enrollment and undergraduate music education enrollment, and pertinent information regarding regional accrediting.

Procedures

Prior to distributing the survey, the participant invitation letter, an informed consent letter, and the survey instrument were submitted to the university's Internal Review Board (IRB) for approval (see Appendix C). In both the invitation letter and the informed consent letter, participants were assured that all reported data would remain confidential when findings were reported. The informed consent letter (see Appendix D) also served as the opening page to the online survey. By clicking to enter the survey, respondents confirmed their informed consent to participate in the study.

An electronic mail invitation to join the study (See Appendix E) was sent to each potential participant. The message explained the purpose of the research; the minimal risks involved, the protection of personal and institutional information, and included a unique Uniform Resource Locator (URL) link to the online survey. To maximize response rate, e-mail invitations were sent individually through the use of the mail merge

function in the online survey system. The process minimized the chance that invitations would be routed to participants' junk mail as a mass-message list.

The online survey remained available to participants for eight weeks. Beginning one week after the initial invitation to participate, a follow-up message was sent weekly (see Appendix F) with a final reminder message delivered seven days prior to the closing of the survey (see Appendix G). Reminder messages were sent to all potential participants, except those who opted out of receiving communications via a URL link. Course documents that were submitted by the participants were printed and kept in a secure location.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the collected data of closedresponse questions. The online survey program provided calculations for some of the survey item responses, but this information was insufficient. The survey responses were subsequently sent to a Microsoft *Excel* spreadsheet program to generate more meaningful data, including means, frequencies, and standard deviations for each closed-response survey item. In addition, percentages were calculated for each Likert-type scale item in questions 48 through 52. Because respondents were given the opportunity to provide additional information when selecting "other" in many of the closed-response items, text responses were categorized. For example, if a respondent checked "other" in survey item 6 and typed "cooperating teacher" in the text box, a new category was created and the frequency of that response was calculated and presented if statistically significant. Tables were constructed for a number of survey items in order to present a large amount of information efficiently and to make the data more comprehensible.

Open-ended responses were analyzed using a three-part procedure for examining qualitative data – assign codes, combining codes into themes, and display the data (Creswell, 2007) Interpretations and quotations from participant responses were included in the presentation of the findings to provide a rich description of each emergent category. To establish reliability, a music education expert, who had experience analyzing qualitative research data, reviewed responses to the open-ended survey items. Percentage of agreement on coding between the research and the statistician was 84.3%. After discussing the coding differences, agreement was reached to achieve 100% agreement.

CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to (1) provide descriptive data about the nature of early field experiences in selected undergraduate music teacher education programs in the United States of America; (2) examine the context in which early field experiences (EFE) are provided; and (3) determine if there are relationships between selected institutional variables and types of early field experiences. The research was guided by the following questions:

- 1. What types of locations are used to support EFE in music teacher education programs?
- 2. What are the activities for an EFE in music teacher education programs?
- 3. What methods are used in documenting pre-service teacher activities for EFE in music teacher education programs?
- 4. What areas of student growth are most desirable as a result of EFE?
- 5. What areas have presented the most frequent problems for students in EFE?
- 6. Do the expectations and/or actual experiences of students in music teacher education differ in relation to enrollment, geographic location, state, accrediting agency and the number of hours completed?
- 7. What commonalities and discrepancies are there in music teacher education EFE programs in the United States of America?

Music education department chairs from 184 universities offering a regionally

accredited music teacher education program recognized by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) were invited to participate in the study. The response rate of useable surveys was 47.8% (*N*=88).

Research Question One

The first section of the survey gathered information on the influences that determine choice of school sites for EFE, including regulations and practices of both the universities and the schools. Questions and findings are as follows.

Question: Does your institution consistently use designated laboratory or partner schools/districts for EFE? Are you limited to using these schools/districts?

Fifty-six universities (63.6%) responded "yes" to the first question. However only 9 universities (10.2%) reported that they were limited to using the designated sites, while 32 (36.4%) had no formal partnerships established for site locations. (See Table 4.01).

I	able	4.01	

Type of Partnership		Percent of all Respondents
	n	N = 88
Designated Lab, Partner Schools/ Districts	56	63.6%
Limited to Only Designated Lab, Partner Schools/ Districts	9	10.2%
No Formal Partnerships Established	32	36.4%

University Partnerships with Cooperating School Site Locations

Question: What is the approximate number of school sites used during a typical semester?

While answers were quite evenly distributed among the choices (see Table 4.02), most chose number 1-4.

Table 4.02

Number	of School	l Sites	Used	During	a T	<i>Cypical</i>	Semester
						~ 1	

Number of School Sites	n	Percent of All Respondents		
		N = 88		
1 - 4	26	29.5%		
5 - 9	22	25.0%		
10 - 14	18	20.5%		
15+	22	25.0%		

Question: How many students are normally placed with a single site supervisor at one time?

The response, by a large margin, was 1-2 students (see Table 4.03). Four respondents submitted no numerical data, commenting that this decision was dependent on the location of the placement, experience of the school supervisor, level of the students, and other related factors.

Table 4.03

Number of Students	n	Percent of All Respondents		
		N = 87		
1 - 4	54	62.1%		
5 - 9	18	20.7%		
10 - 14	11	12.6%		
15+	4	4.6%		

Number of Students Normally Placed with a Single Site Supervisor at One Time

Question: From most to least important, rank the criteria used to select EFE sites.

Nine respondents submitted suggestions for additional criteria: 7 mentioned the quality of site supervisor/teacher; 1 identified schedule; and 1 suggested proximity of location. The remaining 79 respondents assigned each attribute a numerical ranking indicating order of importance, which produced some interesting results (see Table 4.04). Note that if each rank is given a numerical value (with the first rank given the value of 8, the second the value of 7, etc.,), the order of all the respondents' ranks can be established by multiplying the rank value by the number indicating that ranking from Table 4.04. The ranks, listed in order of importance are as follows: (1) instructional area (general music, band, choral, etc.) with a value of 504; (2) quality of music program, with a value of 462; (3), instructional level (preschool, elementary, high school, etc.), with a value of 458; (4), proximity to campus, with a value of 385; (5), availability of site supervisor, with a value of 372; (6), socioeconomic profile of school, with a value of 225.

Table 4.04

Ranking of Criteria Used When Selecting EFE Sites (Most to Least Important)

	Ranking Established by Respondents							
Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
Proximity to Campus	7	11	7	21	18	8	2	5
Instructional Level (Preschool, Elementary, High School, etc.)	10	17	24	13	10	2	1	2
Availability of Site Supervisors	10	8	11	12	13	11	11	3
Socioeconomic Profile of School	2	0	4	9	9	23	24	8
Academic Performance of School	1	1	2	7	7	22	30	9
Instructional Area (General Music, Band, Choral, etc.)	19	31	9	8	8	2	1	1
Quality of Music Program	22	10	20	6	11	5	2	3
Other	8	1	2	3	3	6	8	48

Question: With which of the following do you require EFE students to have experience: Title 1 schools, Special needs students, Urban schools, Rural schools, Suburban schools, Public schools, Private schools?

Frequencies for field site characteristics appear in Table 4.05. Experience in a "Title 1 School" was identified by 19 (25%) and "Special Needs Students" was identified by 39 (51.3%). "Urban Schools" was checked in 28 surveys (36.8%) as a required location for fieldwork. "Suburban Schools" were next in frequency with 23 (31.5%), and "Rural experience" was selected 14 times (19.4%). Experience in "Public Schools" was selected 60 times (75.9%) while "Private Schools" was selected only twice (2.9%). Comments on the questionnaire mentioned the following as additional considerations for field site placements: teacher/ location/ experience quality, proximity to students' location, and the type of schedule used by the school.

Table 4.05

School Setting Description	Yes	Yes %	No	No %	Total
	n		n		
Title I School	19	25.0%	57	75.0%	76
Special Needs Students	39	51.3%	37	48.7%	76
Urban Schools	28	36.8%	48	63.2%	76
Rural Schools	14	19.4%	58	80.6%	72
Suburban Schools	23	31.5%	50	68.5%	73
Public Schools	60	75.9%	19	24.1%	79

Frequency and Percent of Responses Related to Field Site Characteristics

Private Schools	2	2.9%	68	97.1%	70
Comment	5	25.0%	15	75.0%	20

Question: Are minimum clock-hour requirements for EFE specified in the undergraduate music education curriculum?

Eighty-one participants (92%) indicated "yes" in response to this question; 66 (75%) of those indicating minimum clock hours reported that institutional requirements exceeded state requirements. Thirty-three respondents (37.5%) reported they met both, the state and the university requirements. Nineteen (21.6%) indicated that the university established the minimum, and 13 (14.8%) indicated that the minimum was established by the state.

Participants provided information regarding the total number of clock hour minimums for EFE in the undergraduate music education curriculum. For clarification, the data is shown in two separate tables. Table 4.06 presents the information according to description of the institution, while Table 4.07 presents information based on the institution's accrediting agency. It is also important to note that these findings represent clock hours for music education courses, omitting those that may be required in educational psychology, special learners, etc.

Table 4.06

Description of Institution

Number of Reported EFE Hours Required, Prior to Student-teaching, Delineated by University Demographics

	Ν	High	Low	Mean	Median	Mode	SD
State University	47	225	5	90.8	85	100	54.6
Private University	15	135	36	83.1	90	90	26.4
Enrollment over 10,500	37	225	5	91.1	85	100	56.6
Enrollment under 10,500	25	170	25	85.8	90	100	36.4
Located in Urban Setting	45	225	15	91.9	90	100	51.7
Located in Rural Setting	17	170	5	81.1	75	100	42.3
Densely Populated Area	31	225	15	91.6	90	100	53.5
Sparsely Populated Area	31	216	5	86.3	80	100	45.2

Reported Number of Hours

*One isolated instance has been omitted from the calculations in this table, in the following categories: Private University, Enrollment under 10,500, Located in Urban Setting, and Densely Populated Area. One university reports 580 hours for EFE.

Table 4.07

-

Number of Reported EFE Hours Required, Prior to Student-teaching, Delineated by Accrediting Agency

Institution's Accrediting Agency

Reported Number of Hours

	Ν	High	Low	Mean	Median	Mode	SD
Middle States Commission on Higher Education	5	160	15	83.80	100	#N/A	57.29
New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education	4	180	44	89.00	66	#N/A	61.74
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, The Higher Learning Commission	23	225	5	102.43	100	100	53.41
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities	8	160	30	76.63	70	90	39.70
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges*	18	200	25	88.28	90	100	45.92
Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Senior College and University Commission	4	55	36	45.25	45	45	7.76

*One isolated instance has been omitted from the calculations in this table. One university that receives accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges indicates a total of 580 hours for EFE.

Table 4.06 indicates that large state universities and ones located in urban areas tend to require more EFE minimum clock hours than is necessary to obtain state certification, while rural colleges with smaller enrollments tend to enforce only the state requirements. Private colleges are almost equally divided on this point; nearly half indicate their requirements are equal to, but do not exceed, the state requirements. Finally, any implication drawn from these data is tenuous, as a majority of the institutions report requirements that exceed state certification standards.

Research Question Two

The next section of the survey collected information about the experiences required in early field experience programs. The survey items were designed to answer Research Question 2, "What are the activities for an EFE in music teacher education programs?"

Question: Do you use some form of syllabus (written goals, etc.) for EFE courses or program?

Sixty-seven universities (83.75 %) reported using a specific syllabus for EFE, five (6.25%) did not use a specific syllabus, and eight (10%) indicated "other." Six universities in the latter category reported following guidelines, but did not use a standalone syllabus. Rather, the guidelines were embedded in the course syllabus of which the EFE was a part. The remaining two universities used guidelines required by the college of education. One institution reported that although EFEs are routinely embedded in methods coursework, a course devoted specifically to EFE was also offered in the sophomore year.

Non-teaching Experiences

Question: In the chart below, please indicate which of the descriptors are specifically required.

Non-teaching requirements are specified for all students in early field experiences by 90% of the schools. No specific non-teaching experiences are required in 6 publicly funded universities and 3 privately funded universities. Via "comments," two additional non-teaching experience requirements were cited: (1) students must be involved in other professional activities outside of the classroom, including festivals, meetings, and duties; (2) students must keep a weekly reflective teaching log of their experiences.

Considerable agreement was found among the respondents who required EFE students to participate in designated non-teaching requirements. Non-teaching experiences receiving the highest concurrence were: observation of teaching methods (84.1%), observation of specific teaching and classroom management techniques (83%), and individual observations at an elementary, middle, or a high school (81.8%) (See Table 4.08).

Table 4.08

Non-Teaching Experience	C	Percent of All Respondents	Percent of All Reporting a Requirement
	n	N = 88	<i>N</i> = 79
Observation of physical classroom environment (e.g. arrangement, student seating)	69	78.4%	87.3%
Examination of student learning styles.	55	62.5%	69.6%

Frequency of Requirements Related to Program Elements: Non-Teaching Experiences

Observation of teaching methods	74	84.1%	93.7%
Observation of student behavior	68	77.3%	86.1%
Interviews with teachers or administrators	36	40.9%	45.6%
Observation of classroom social environment (e.g., peer or teacher-student relationships, etc.)	67	76.1%	84.8%
Observation of specific teaching and classroom management techniques (e.g. discipline techniques, questioning, teacher talk, etc.)	73	83.0%	92.4%
Preparation of teaching aids, materials (e.g., bulletin boards, transparencies, study aids)	49	55.7%	62.0%
Group/ class observations at an elementary, middle, or a high school	56	63.6%	70.9%
Individual observations at an elementary, middle, or a high school	72	81.8%	91.1%

Teaching Experiences

While teaching experience requirements are specified for all EFE students by 88% of the schools, no specific requirements for teaching experiences are made in 9 of the publicly funded universities and 3 privately funded universities. One respondent

stated that although the program emphasizes the listed elements, it does not require students to participate in all of them. One respondent reported that the site supervisor assigns student activities. Eleven respondents checked all the options.

Among the respondents who report that each student in EFE must participate in specific teaching requirements, there is considerable agreement regarding which are most important. Teaching experiences that received the highest concurrence were: lesson plan construction (93.5%), micro-teaching (83.1%), and full class instruction (80.5%) (See Table 4.09).

Table 4.09

Frequency of Response	es Related to Program Elements:	Teaching Experiences
-----------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------

Teaching Experience	n	Percent of All Respondents N = 88	Percent of All Reporting a Requirement N = 77
Micro-teaching	64	72.7%	83.1%
Reflective participation in seminars or individual conferences with supervisors	61	69.3%	79.2%
Video recordings of lessons	48	54.5%	62.3%
One-on-one instruction	33	37.5%	42.9%
Small-group instruction	51	58.0%	66.2%
Full-class instruction	62	70.5%	80.5%
---	----	-------	-------
Special-needs instruction	26	29.5%	33.8%
Lesson plan construction	72	81.8%	93.5%
Construction and/ or administration of assessment tools	52	59.1%	67.5%

Research Question Three

This section addresses Research Question 3, "What methods are used in documenting pre-service teacher activities for EFE in music teacher education programs?" A number of survey items referenced the written reflections of EFE students about their non-teaching or teaching experiences.

Question: Are EFE students required to submit written reflection/reports of nonteaching experiences?

Of the reporting institutions, 73 require written reflections for non-teaching experience and 74 institutions require written reflections for teaching experiences. Of those indicating a requirement, 90.4%, and 91.8% of institutions reported that written reflections were submitted to university supervisors for non-teaching and teaching experiences, respectively.

University Supervisor EFE Observation

Question: Who assumes the duties of the university supervision? Forty-four (56.4%) of the 78 responding institutions use music education professors to observe student teachers. A combination of music education professors and other university representatives (graduate students, retired teachers, retired professors) are used in 31 (39.7%) of the reporting universities, while only 3 (3.8%) report that other university representatives are solely responsible for early field experience observations. Although percentages are not radically different (see Table 4.10), colleges (51.9%) that receive accreditation through the North Central Association report using both music education faculty and other appointees.

Table 4.10

Supervisory Responsibility Reported According to Accrediting Agency

Institution's Accrediting Agency		Full Time Faculty		0	ther	Both		
	Ν	n	%	n	%	n	%	
Middle States Commission on Higher Education	7	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	
New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education	7	4	57.1%	0	0.0%	3	42.9%	
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, The Higher Learning Commission	27	11	40.7%	2	7.4%	14	51.9%	
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities	10	8	80.0%	0	0.0%	2	20.0%	
Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges	22	14	63.6%	1	4.5%	7	31.8%	
Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Senior College and University Commission	5	3	60.0%	0	0.0%	2	40.0%	

*n is number within the category in this and subsequent tables

Question: How are EFE observations conducted?

Observations of EFE students are accomplished using one of two methods, or a combination of both. Thirty-six institutions (48.6%) assessed students only through live observations, while 31 (41.9%) used a combination of both live and student-recorded lessons. Only 7 (9.5%) evaluated EFE students solely on recorded lessons.

Question: How many field observations does the university supervisor make for each placement?

The number of observations ranges from 0 to as many as 20. The range is the same when considering the average number of observations reported: some institutions require as few as 0, while others report an average of 20. Tables 4.11 and 4.12 present a more explicit accounting of the data.

Table 4.11

Number of EFE Observations by Supervisors According to Institution Demographics

		Minimum Number of Observations						Average Number of Observations							
Description of Institution															
	Ν	High*	Low	Mean*	Median	Mode	High*	Low	Mean*	Median	Mode				
State University	54	8	0	2.39	2	0	12	0	2.59	2	0				
Private University	20	6	0	2.70	3	4	8	0	3.05	4	0				
Enrollment over 10,500	42	7	0	2.48	2	0	10	0	2.60	2	0				
Enrollment under 10,500	32	8	0	2.47	2	1	12	0	2.97	3	4				
Located in Urban Setting	54	8	0	2.57	2	0	12	0	2.74	2	0				
Located in Rural Setting	20	6	0	2.20	2	0	6	0	2.80	3	3				
Densely Populated Area	39	20	0	3.38	3	4	20	0	3.41	2	0				
Sparsely Populated	36	6	0	1.97	1.5	1	6	0	2.53	2.5	0				

*One isolated instance has been omitted from the calculations in this table, in the following categories: Private University, Enrollment under 10,500, Located in Urban Setting, and Densely Populated Area. One university reports 30 minimum and average observations.

Table 4.12

Number of EFE Observations by University Supervisors by Accrediting Agency

			Minimum Number of Observations Minimum Number of Observat						ations		
Description of Institution	Ν	High	Low	Mean	Median	Mode	High	Low	Mean	Median	Mode
Middle States Commission on Higher Education	6	4	0	2.50	3	3	4	0	1.83	1.5	0
New England Association of Schools and Colleges, Commission on Institutions of Higher Education	6	8	2	3.83	2.5	2	12	2	4.83	3.5	2
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools, The Higher Learning Commission	27	7	0	2.26	1	0	8	0	2.52	2	0
Northwest Commission on Colleges and Universities	10	5	0	2.60	3	3	10	0	3.20	2	0
Southern Association of Colleges* and Schools, Commission on Colleges	20	5	0	2.40	2.5	4	9	0	2.80	3.5	4
Western Association of Schools and Colleges, Senior College and University Commission	5	6	0	2.00	1	0	4	0	1.60	1	0

*One isolated instance has been omitted from the calculations in this table. One university who receives accreditation from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, Commission on Colleges indicates a total of observations for EFE.

Arranged Observations

The student is informed prior to every visitation in 62% of the responding institutions. Another 22% indicated that they usually inform the student prior to an observation visit, while 10% only sometimes arranges with a student. Seven percent of respondents usually inform students. Another 10% report they sometimes inform students prior to an observation, and 7% never inform their students prior to a visit. The distribution of responses is consistent as related to the categories of universities.

Observation Discussions

Question: Does the observation include a discussion with the supervisor alone?

Forty percent of the respondents indicated that they schedule time during an observation visit for a discussion with the student alone. Another 26% report that they usually include such a discussion, while 20% do so "sometimes." Only 11% said that discussions rarely happen. Four percent indicated they never happen between the university supervisor and student.

Discussions with the Site Supervisor

Discussions with the site supervisor alone are not as necessary as those with the EFE student, according to the responses to this question. According to 30% of the respondents, such discussions always or usually take place. The site supervisor and the university supervisor sometimes meet alone according to 46% of the responses; 24% report they rarely or never have discussions with site supervisors.

Final Grade Determination

The majority of the respondents (75%) indicate that the final grade for the student's EFE is based on the evaluation of the university supervisor. Only 22% of the

respondents base their evaluations on both the site supervisor and the university supervisor, while 3% allow the final mark to be determined solely by the site supervisor.

Research Questions Four and Five

To supplement the information provided by their objective responses to questions related to the status of EFE, the respondents were asked to share some of their personal observations of emerging trends in music teacher EFE to answer the following research questions: (4) "What areas of student growth are most desirable as a result of EFE?" and (5) "What areas have presented the most frequent problems for students in EFEs?" Finally, respondents were asked to list the top 3-4 emerging trends in music teacher EFEs.

Qualities Most Desirable in a Successful EFE Student

Question: What areas of student growth are most desirable as a result of a successful EFE?

The respondents were asked to rank a list of eight general attributes deemed desirable in a successful student in EFE. Five of the respondents did not answer at all; one stated that they were unable to place these qualities in any order of importance, indicating all attributes were desirable, and two ranked only three attributes. The remaining 80 respondents did assign each attribute a numerical ranking indicating order of importance, which produced some interesting results (see Table 4.13). If each rank is given a numerical value (with the first rank given the value 8, the second, the value 7, on down to the eighth, which would have the value 1), the order of all the respondents' ranks can be established by multiplying the rank value by the number indicating the ranking from Table 4.13. The results are as follows: First is pedagogical knowledge, with a value

of 473; second, classroom management skills, with a value of 431; third, professionalism, with a value of 393; fourth, general musicianship, with a value of 289; fifth, understanding of child psychology, with a value of 287; sixth, technical knowledge of instruments/voice, with a value of 270; seventh, aural perception, with a value of 217; and last, conducting skills, with a value of 170.

As can be seen in Table 4.13, there is considerable agreement among the respondents regarding the general order of these qualities. The higher numbers tend to cluster around three ranks, indicating near agreement on the importance of most qualities. Only "understanding of child psychology" received a wide spread of placements. There can be little question that pedagogical knowledge is viewed as the most important quality for successful EFE.

Table 4.13

$\Delta \mathcal{L}$	Ranking	Oualities	Most I	Desirable	in a	Successful	EFE Student	(Most to Le	east Important)	
----------------------	---------	------------------	--------	-----------	------	------------	-------------	-------------	-----------------	--

	Ranking Established by Respondents							
Criteria	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
	n	n	n	n	n	n	n	n
Aural Perception	1	2	3	4	13	17	18	9
Conducting skills	1	1	1	2	8	9	17	23
Classroom management skills	11	31	10	3	7	5	4	0
General musicianship	3	4	15	7	12	12	5	9
Technical knowledge of instruments/voice	4	1	8	17	10	8	12	5
Professionalism	16	12	13	11	7	2	3	4
Pedagogical knowledge	31	15	7	11	2	5	0	0
Understanding of child psychology	16	5	11	14	9	8	7	13

Only three of the respondents wrote additional comments related to the desirable qualities a student in EFE should possess. Two respondents ranked their additional comment as the #1 desirable outcome. One stated a desirable outcome was to have "active music making" and the other suggested "effective teaching." The third respondent, who added an attribute, suggested the student's "ability to differentiate" be ranked number 5.

Most Frequently Encountered Problems of EFE Students

The problems respondents most frequently observe appear on a frequency table. Twelve of the participants did not respond to the query, while two only provided their own problem. The 75 respondents who identified areas of most frequent problems produced a ranking scale, though its implications are not as clear as those related to the qualities in the previous section (see Table 4.14). Nevertheless, it is interesting to note that poor pedagogical knowledge is the most frequently encountered problem for EFE students; it ranked first in the most desirable qualities in Table 4.13. General musicianship and classroom management skills are ranked second and third, respectively, when identified as problematic areas for students, and these two attributes were ranked in the top four as the outcome qualities that are most desirable.

Of the areas that have presented the most frequent problems for students during EFE, it was agreed that pedagogical knowledge proved to be most difficult, followed closely by the general musicianship; the third problem identified by the majority of respondents was classroom management skills. The remaining attributes were identified from the listed items: aural perception, professionalism, understanding of child psychology, conducting skills, technical knowledge of instruments/voice, were ranked

accordingly from 4 - 8 (See Table 4.14).

Table 4.14

Frequency of Responses Related to the Areas That Have Presented the Most Frequent

Problems for Students During EFEs

Description of Institution		Percent of all Respondents
	n	N = 75
Aural perception	29	38.7%
Conducting skills	7	9.3%
Classroom management skills	42	56.0%
General musicianship	51	68.0%
Technical knowledge of instruments/voice	3	4.0%
Professionalism	28	37.3%
Pedagogical knowledge	55	73.3%
Understanding of child psychology	12	16.0%

Emerging Trends in Music Teacher Education

Question: In your opinion, what are the top 3 - 5 emerging trends/ problems/ needs in early field experience programs for music teacher education?

The majority of those surveyed responded to this question, providing some general insight into to what emerging trends that are taking place in music teacher education early field experiences. The 57 discussions that were supplied resulted in some interesting patterns of concurrence. The most frequently mentioned emerging trend was finding time, in an already overloaded undergraduate course schedule, for a quality and diverse early field experience. It was interesting that the second most frequently emerging trend was university's planning of EFE for music education students. These comments led to a discussion about the need to reconceive their EFE programs to provide better embedded instruction in the field and to pair undergraduate instruction with what the student is experiencing in the field. It was also noted that some music faculty believed the EFE program should work parallel with the school or college of education to create defined "core practices" of effective instruction, to scaffold experiences, and to assess students with a consistent evaluation tool.

Two responses to the open-ended question about emerging trends have been selected for individual treatment because it seems particularly enlightening and because they come from a cross-section of types of college settings and sizes.

The first comes from a small (under 10,500 enrollment) state university located in a rural area of a very sparsely populated area. This respondent states that the biggest problem he faces is the need for a larger circle of schools to choose from for early field experiences. If this were accomplished, he believes that site supervisors with more interest in the quality of the experience might be located. He feels in too many cases students take over a class for the site supervisor rather than as learning experiences placed in the proper time sequence. Also in need of improvement is the role of the music faculty in the whole process of observation-supervision-evaluation of the students in EFE. Finally, the respondent believes that the EFE student should experience multiple situations prior to student teaching to gain a broader perspective.

The second of these selected responses comes from a large (over 10,500 enrollment) state university, in a sparsely populated area of the state but located in an

urban setting. This respondent favors scheduling the various methodology courses concurrently with the actual practicum; he further states that the scheduling of such a plan would be feasible because of the schedules of the cooperating teachers currently used. The immediate and direct application of methodology and the practical relating of the solution to the problem is his goal in such a plan. He does not specifically mention hours required in this plan, instead focusing on the quality and relevance of the experience. However, he states that such a program is being contemplated for adoption.

In summary of the emerging trends in EFE programs, it is believed that observations should begin in the freshman year, but one respondent states little is to be gained by such an early experience. This last view holds that freshmen, and usually even sophomores are rarely committed to music education to the degree that anything more than a superficial interest in the observation is evidenced. A respondent further states that most music education students are in college initially as musicians who later become interested in education, and that that interest must be developed before valuable on-site experiences are likely to occur.

A position generally agreed upon, relative to on-site experiences, is that some form of participation in the classroom routine should be a part of those experiences early in the sequence. However, respondents have found local school administrators to be much less accommodating regarding observations and practicum experiences than they are of student teaching. Two even indicated that they were experiencing some increased antagonism toward the placing of EFE students because of the greater number of EFE hours required.

Since most observations are to fit into a student's class schedule, respondents

have found that the variety of experiences must be reduced. It is necessary, in most cases, to observe whatever happens to be going on at the time of the visit to the school, regardless of its applicability to the interests of the students. Also, few administrators or teachers wish to have more than one or two observers in a classroom at one time, which negates the scheduling of large numbers into a situation.

Transportation was a frequently mentioned problem related to observations. In metropolitan universities, where public transportation is available, time becomes a major factor, but the means of access to the public schools is open to all students. However, in the majority of settings, a car is necessary to reach most of the schools. The carpool is often not a solution because of the restrictions placed upon numbers of observers.

One respondent brought up the subject of state certification; he is fearful that compliance with increased state standards for the minimum number of on-site experiences is going to be increasingly difficult unless the state is able to impose some sort of demands upon local school boards to assure their cooperation. The lack of available model teachers and schools, coupled with increased administrative antagonism, has brought about a reduction in the number of observations required at one institution. Because observations are a nightmare to schedule, one respondent advanced the idea that all observations might be tape recorded and played for an entire class to supplement the number of observations each student makes.

Conclusion

One recurrent theme that became a part of every questionnaire had to do with the current economic situation and the job market. Students are not able to choose the kind of job they prefer, as they were able to do years ago. The kinds of field experiences must be

broader and more diversified than in the past in order to better prepare the student for a wider range of job opportunities. This greater diversity of experiences, particularly as related to location, is becoming mandatory. The urban-centered university must begin to place its students in rural settings for portions of early field experiences, and the rural colleges should begin to place students in urban settings, even Title I areas whenever possible. All of this, as pointed out by one respondent, is going to require an enlightened music education faculty with a broad range of experiences.

It is clear that the universities surveyed believe in the effectiveness of early field experiences, including observations, and are in agreement that a more robust EFE should be developed for music education certification.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Within the statement of the problem in Chapter One, a number of questions were posed related to the current status of early field experiences in music-teacher education. The answers to these and other questions about the topic, together with a summarization of the reports, opinions, and criticisms of field experience university professors, provide the material for the first segment of this chapter. The second part of the chapter is devoted to practicable recommendations and suggested future research.

Conclusions and Implications

The initial postulate that motived this study was that there exists a wide diversity in the practical experience facet of music teacher preparation in American universities. The results of this study tend strongly to support that postulate. Universities exercise considerable autonomy in setting the minimum requirements for all factors within their early field experience programs. Over half of the institutional requirements exceed those imposed by the states in which they are located. There appear to be few states with rigid standards relative to the diversification of the early field experience, the quantity, or quality of experiences, and the qualifications required of those school personnel involved with the supervision of on-site early field experiences.

Current Practices

Among the most divergent aspects of the music early field experience programs, nationally, are the duration and depth of the early field experiences. The required amount

of early field experience hours, prior to student teaching, ranges from 5 to 225. The average amount of hours required before student teaching is 97. There are some extreme cases that extend these limits, but they are isolated instances.

The identification of schools sites and qualified cooperating teachers has been the subject of much of the literature and has been one of the recurrent subjects of the additional notes written by the respondents to the questionnaire. Many of those who responded expressed the desire for better cooperating teachers – dedicated, model teachers who demonstrate genuine interest in the student and the initiative to provide him with a valuable experience. Since universities have indicated they are evaluating cooperating teachers on a different scale, this indicates that the usual criteria used for teacher certification purposes are not appropriate for selecting cooperating teachers. Based on the criteria outlined by respondents, continued autonomy for universities in the selection of cooperating teacher on a subjective basis is more tenable than the schedule of the *average* undergraduate student.

One conclusion concerning cooperating teachers becomes obvious. The relative responsibility they have in the viability of the early field experience is far greater than that of any other member of the supervisory team. The traditional compensation for their role has been, and continues to be extremely small. The rewards for the cooperative efforts in the nurturing of the early field experience student must be increased in terms not only of monetary consideration, but recognition as adjunct members of the college community.

Also related to the role of the cooperating teacher are the objectives of early field experiences. One conclusion in this regard cannot be overlooked. The cooperating

teacher has the primary responsibility for establishing the objectives and the evaluative criteria for the early field experience student. The role of the supervisor is advisory, at best. Over 93% of the supervisors provide written instructions for the cooperating teacher, but it is the cooperating teacher who must decide when the student is ready to assume a role as a teachers, what latitude he will be given in the choices of performance literature and subject matter, when and if he will be given total responsibility over some facet of the program, and even what lesson plans may be implemented.

It becomes clear that the stating of specific behavioral objectives, as has been suggested by several writers on the subject of early field experiences, would have to be accomplished through a cooperative effort between the college supervisor and the cooperating teachers. This would have to take into account any curriculum guides or other course outlines mandated by the school system.

There is little reason to believe there has been widespread adoption of the plan recommended by Music Teacher Education: Partnership and Process, the Task Force on Music Teacher Education for the Nineties (1987) and others whereby early field experience cooperating teachers carry out a joint assignment as part-time college faculty and part-time public school teachers. No universities reported such an arrangement in their answers related to the faculty assigned to the supervision of early-field experiences. It is clear, though, that music educators are responsible for the entirety of early field experience supervision in all universities, and that the general education staff does not carry any of this responsibility as was reported in earlier surveys.

The early field experiences to be encountered by the music education students constitute another area of concern in which there is a significant lack of concurrence.

There can be little question as to the advisability of early encounters with school children for future teachers; however, there is little similarity in the practices of teacher training institutions regarding the number, types, and chronological placement of on-site experiences prior to the student-teaching experience.

The number of experiences is even more diversified, with some students completing as many as 580 or more hours and others only 2 during the entire four-year period leading up to the student teaching experience. On-site experiences involve observations of teaching methods in nearly 85% of the institutions, and include some form of participation in the planning and operation of the class activities in approximately 80%. About 73% of the students preparing to teach music are required to participate in a microteaching demonstration before they begin the student teaching experience. Certainly, it is clear that far more time is scheduled for student teaching than is allocated to all early field experience hours combined.

As was noted above, the early field experience portion of the music teacher preparation programs has undergone change in recent years, with increased and intensified work in the schools by students in the earlier years of college. This has caused some difficulties in certain areas of the country. It is notable that increased numbers of early on-site experiences have caused more mounting tensions with local school boards and administrations. Many colleges are being met with some animosity where none existed before when they attempt to arrange for on-site experiences of all types, including, in some cases, early field experiences, and student teaching.

Observation and Evaluation

It is clear that the majority of university's have relegated the full responsibility for the observation and evaluation of early field experience for music education students to music specialists. Among those universities reporting the employment of graduate students in the observation of early field experiences, a recurrent expressed desire is that the practice should be terminated or at least limited. In order to bring this about the course load of the music education professor must be adjusted to provide him with the necessary time to fulfill the supervisory role.

The teaching loads of most college supervisors are adjusted to allow for the observation of student teachers. However, these adjustments are rarely adequate, and the practice within the colleges is not consistent. The most common means of adjusting the teaching load is simply imposing a ration of the number of students in early field experiences to the number of course-load hours, with no consideration given to varying travel times.

The number of supervisory observations made of each EFE student varies greatly among universities. The average number of observations reported by the participants in this survey ranges from a high of 20 per experience to a low of none. All of the observations of each EFE student are done by one music education supervisor in nearly 50% of the universities, and in about 35% a combination of one music education professor and one general education supervisor is employed. Fewer than 15% have more than one music education faculty (including graduate assistants) involved in observations of each EFE student. A full period is considered a minimum length of time to observe the student in their EFE. Most supervisors provide their students with advance notice of their

impending visits at least part of the time. A written critique is made of the student's performance by nearly half of the supervisors and nearly 80% utilize an observation form.

The evaluation of the student's EFE is a joint effort of the cooperating teacher and the supervisor in most cases. The self-analysis of the student is rarely considered, but such is the case in some instances.

Summary

Early field experience programs are dissimilar in four major aspects: 1. the length of the amount of hours/ experiences; 2. the number, regularity, depth, and chronological placement of early field experiences; 3. the number of observations for criticism and evaluation made by the college supervisor; 4. the type of experience the student receives – whether it is diversified or specialized. In addition, there are several other practices of some of the music EFE programs that have been universally adapted. Among these are the following: 1. formal written instructions for the cooperating teacher; 2. objectives and evaluative criteria for the EFE; 3. policies which will assure the supervisor enough time effectively to observe and evaluate the EFE student; 4. a cooperative attitude between the members of the music department which will assure compliance with scheduled off-campus, practical experience activities; 5. appointment of music methods teachers to joint assignments in local schools and the university.

It is clear that the size and location of the university have a decided impact upon the administration and implementation of many aspects of the EFE program.

There are several aspects of the programs that display marked national consensus: 1. the EFE experience is a required experience tied to methods courses; 2. cooperating

teachers are provided with some form of instruction, but it is usually informal and frequently verbal; 3. in most cases, excellent cooperation is shown by all those involved with placement of EFE students, in spite of the fact that tensions are beginning to mount in some areas where increased numbers of on-site experiences are being scheduled; 4. the attempt to diversify EFE experiences is difficult for schools in remote, sparsely populated universities; 5. observations and other on-site experiences prior to student teaching are scheduled in a variety of settings, levels, and with several teachers; 6. observations and evaluations of EFE are completed, at least in part, by music professors from the university; 7. observations are at least one period in length, include a discussion with the EFE student, and are described either by written critique or with an observation form which is placed in the student's file; 8. EFE evaluation is a joint effort of the cooperating teacher and the college supervisor; 9. general musicianship, aural perceptivity, and skill at classroom management are the most desirable attributes to be developed in a successful EFE.

Finally, the participants in this study have designated that the areas of field experiences programs most in need of improvement are the number and chronological placement of early field experiences and identifying specific attributes of a "quality" program.

Recommendations

Although many individual recommendations for the improvement of the early field experience programs in universities seem worth of consideration, only those which could be implemented without major curricular overhauls by most music education schools have been included in the outline below. Following the outline are

recommendations of a more global nature effecting on-site early field experience programs and suggested areas for future research.

Recommendations to be Implemented Within Current University Music Teacher

Education Early Field Experience Programs

- I. Evaluation and structuring of the duration and depth of the early field experience program to facilitate the development of
 - A diverse experience encompassing several age levels and the three areas of concentration – instrumental music teaching, vocal music teaching, and general music teaching – as well as experience in both the urban and rural setting where feasible.
 - b. An understanding on the part of the student of the importance of continuity and of the ability to sustain a sequence of lessons.
 - c. An awareness of the role of the teacher in all aspects of the job curricular, extra-curricular, teaching, and non-teaching.
- II. Implementation of a broad-based, multi-occurrence on-site experience program which would:
 - a. Commence no later than the beginning of the sophomore year.
 - Be incorporated within and in conjunction with each of the methods classes (voice, brass, percussion, strings, and woodwinds), the pedagogy classes, conducting courses, and various performing ensembles.
 - c. Involved the entire music education faculty in scheduling, administration, and supervision of the program.

- III. Implementation of a subjective screening procedure to be administered in two phases:
 - An early screening (no later than the end of the sophomore year) to identify students clearly not well-suited for the teaching profession, who should then be advised to seek another educational goal.
 - A final screening that transcends the objective determinates of grade points, musicality, and skill development to the extent that only those students who demonstrate the qualities of outstanding prospective music teachers shall be admitted into the culminating field experience, student teaching.

IV. Strengthen the supervision of early field experience students by:

- a. Establishing a minimum number of observations for each early field experience student by a university music education faculty member through their sophomore years, and then bi-weekly observations beginning their junior year.
- b. Spreading the responsibility for the supervision of each early field experience student among a team of music education specialists including doctoral music education graduate assistants.
- c. Adopting an equitable system of teaching-load adjustments of university faculty to allow time for visitations.
- V. Involvement of cooperating teachers in the university program as adjunct professors, compensated as such to bring about:
 - a. More selectivity in the choices of available cooperating teachers.

- b. A higher level of dedication to the needs of the early field experience students.
- c. More control over the objectives and evaluative criteria upon which the student's experience is based.

Recommendations to be Considered for Future Implementation

Studies have shown that there are more students graduating from colleges and universities with training as specialists in instrumental music than there were instrumental positions available, while at the same time there were more positions open for general music teachers than there were graduates trained as generalists by those same colleges. The development of teachers who are specifically trained for the special demands of general music is clearly called for. Within that development must come concentration upon, rather than neglect of, the general music aspect of the on-site experience program.

A cooperative program between two or more colleges located in dissimilar sections of states could be used to facilitate diversified setting experiences for early field experiences through the use of an exchange program or by providing recorded lessons for viewing. The multiple-setting experiences are particularly crucial because the current job market has diminished the likelihood that a student will locate a position within the immediate area of the college from which he graduates.

As has been accomplished by school districts and universities, the joint appointment of music faculty to positions as methods teachers who are also active in the day-to-day teaching of public school music would bring about realistic, practical, pedagogically sound methods courses. But just as important, model teachers would then

be available for observation by students and for service as cooperating teachers in the field experience programs.

Recommendations for Further Research

Because several of the recommendations which have ensued from this study seem to imply the need for a degree of standardization, research should be undertaken to determine the optimal number of hours of early field experiences before student teaching, what is the optimum ratio of observation to practical experiences, the diversity of the experience, and how to best provide time for students to engage in meaningful early field experiences amongst an already cluttered course schedule, due to specific school of music ensemble requirements.

A study designed to discover innovative early field experience programs currently in existence or in planning stages, should be conducted to aid in the development of functional models.

A national survey of music education student-teachers who recently completed an early field experience program should be conducted to determine the areas they consider to be most in need of improvement and to elicit from them their recommendations for future planning.

Since the national trend seems to be in the direction of increased early field experiences, studies must be made to determine how best to foster lasting cooperative arrangements with local school boards of education to avoid jeopardizing the excellent cooperation which now characterized most early field experience programs.

Once the research has been completed and the data gathered, it is further recommended that the National Association for Music Education and its associated

organizations, together with those accrediting agencies concerned with music teacher training, undertake the development and national dissemination of guidelines designed to effect quality field experience programs in undergraduate music education. It is further recommended that the National Association for Music Education initiate a campaign to develop an awareness among all those concerned—university music faculties, boards of education, school administrators, and public school music teachers—of the paramount importance of the on-site field experience program in the development of excellent music teachers

REFERENCES

- Aiken, I. P., & Day, B. D. (1999). Early field experiences in preservice teacher education: Research and student perspectives. *Action in Teacher Education*, 21(3), 7–12. doi:10.1080/01626620.1999.10462965
- Anderson, G., Frager, A., & Boling, C. (1982). Developing instructional competence in field-based programs: Videotape protocols versus role-play simulations. *The Teacher Educator*, 18(3), 16–25. doi:10.1080/08878738209554811
- Anderson, N. A., & Graebell, L. C. (1990). Usefulness of an early field experience. *The Teacher Educator*, 26(2), 13–20. doi:10.1080/08878739009554976
- Andrews, L. O. (1964). *Student teaching*. New York, NY: Center for Applied Research in Education.
- Applegate, J. H. (1985). Early field experiences: Potpourri recurring dilemmas. Journal of Teacher Education, 36(2), 60–64. doi:10.1177/002248718503600213
- Applegate, J. H., & Lasley, T. J. (1982). Cooperating teachers' problems with preservice field experience students. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(2), 15–18. doi:10.1177/002248718203300203
- Association of Teacher Educators. (1973). *Guidelines to clinical experiences in teacher education*. Washington, DC: Association of Teacher Educators.

 Baker, P. J. (1982). The development of music teacher checklists for use by administrators, music supervisors, and teachers in evaluating music teaching effectiveness (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI No. 8201803)

Becher, R. M., & Ade, W. E. (1982). The relationship of field placement characteristics and students potential field performance abilities to clinical experience performance ratings. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(2), 24–30. doi:10.1177/002248718203300205

- Bennie, W. A. (1972). Supervising clinical experiences in the classroom. New York, NY:Harper & Row.
- Bennie, W. A. (1982). Field-based teacher education—a reconsideration? *The Teacher Educator*, *17*(4), 19–24. doi:10.1080/08878738209554794

Bergee, M. J. (2006). Description and evaluation of experiences at a new early field site. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 15(2), 21–28. doi:10.1177/10570837060150020104

- Bowers, J. (2001). A field experience partnership for teacher education with university, public school and community participants. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 148, 3–11. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40319072
- Boyd, D., Grossman, P., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2008). Teacher preparation and student achievement. (Report No. 14314). Cambridge, MA. National Bureau of Economic Research. doi:10.3386/w14314

- Brand, M. (1985). Research in music teacher effectiveness. *Update*, *3*(2), 13–16. doi:10.1177/875512338500300204
- Butler, A. (2001). Preservice music teachers' conceptions of teaching effectiveness, microteaching experiences, and teaching performance. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 49(2), 258–272. doi:10.2307/3345711
- Campbell, M., R. (1999). Learning to teach music: A collaborative ethnography. *Bulletin* of the Council for Research in Music Education 139. 12-36. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40318946

Chesley, G. M., & Jordan, J. (2012). What's missing from teacher prep. *Education and Leadership*, 69(8), 41–45. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.org/publications/educationalleadership/may12/vol69/num08/abst ract.aspx

- Clark, A. T. (1974). The effect of a public school field experience upon student achievement, educational philosophy, and attitudes in an introductory educational psychology course. Grand Forks, ND. University of North Dakota. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED098171)
- Colwell, C. M. (1995). Effect of teaching setting and self–evaluation on teacher intensity behaviors. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 43(1), 6–21.
 doi:10.2307/3345788
- Conant, J. B. (2001). *The education of American teachers*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

- Conkling, S. W. (2001). Field–based experiences in music teacher preparation: A critical examination. *Desert Skies Symposium on Research in Music Education*, *3*, 39–50.
 Retrieved from http://cfa.arizona.edu/desertskies/2001–symposium/proceedings–2001
- Cottrell, D. P. (1956). *Teacher education for a free people*. New York, NY: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2012). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Culpepper, L. R. (1956). The "extra" qualities. *Music Educators Journal*, 42(5), 91–92. doi:10.2307/3388175
- DeLorenzo, L. C. (1990). Early field experiences in the community. *Music Educators Journal*, 77(3), 51–53. doi:10.2307/3397840
- Denemark, G. (1985). Educating a profession. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *36*(5), 46–52. doi:10.1177/002248718503600508
- Denton, J. J. (1982). Early field experience influence on performance in subsequent coursework. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 33(2), 19–23. doi:10.1177/002248718203300204
- Dewey, J. (1938). Experience and education. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Dewey, J. (1962). *The relation of theory to practice in education*. Cedar Falls, IA: Association for Student Teaching.
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed–mode surveys: The tailored design method.* Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

- Dillon, N. K. (2004). An examination of teacher education programs and school induction programs in their preparation of teachers for the first year of teaching (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI No. 3140176)
- Donofrio, A. M. (1980). Age and experience as factors affecting student attitudes toward experience-based teacher training programs. Abstract retrieved from ERIC database. (ED182309)
- Doyle, M. (1997). Beyond life history as a student: Preservice teachers' beliefs about teaching and learning. *College Student Journal*, 31(4), 519–532. Retrieved from EBSCOhost database. (Accession No. 245237)
- Elmore, R. F., & Cromartie, S. W. (1975). Teacher Perceptions of and Reactions to Field Based Programs in Early Childhood, Elementary, and Middle School Education at the University of Georgia, 1973–74. Abstract retrieved from ERIC database. (ED141305)
- Ferguson, R. F. (1991). Paying for public education: New evidence on how and why money matters. *Harvard Journal on Legislation*, 28, 465–498. Retrieved from http://www.heinonline.org/HOL/Page?handle=hein.journals/hjl28&collection=jou rnals&id=471
- Fink, A. (2009). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Flowers, J. G. (1927). *The observation of teaching: A manual for the guidance of teachers in training*. Dallas, TX: Southern Publishing Company.

- Flowers, J. G. (1948). School and community laboratory experiences in teacher education. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 26(2), 67–69. doi:10.1080/01619564809536150
- Gantt, W. N., & Davey, B. (1972). Pre–student teachers react to field–supplemented methods courses. *Education and Leadership*, 33(3), 259–262. Retrieved from http://www.ascd.com/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_197312_gantt.pdf
- Garland, C. (1982). *Guiding clinical experiences in teacher education*. New York, NY: Longman.
- Gehrke, N. (1981). Rationales for field experiences in the professions. In C.D. Webb &
 Association of Teacher Educators (Eds.), *Exploratory field experiences in teacher education* (pp. 1–6). Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.
- Gregory, M. K. (1995). Collaboration for music teacher education between higher education institutions and k–12 schools. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 43(1), 47–59. doi:10.2307/3345791
- Grossman, G. (1980). A comparison of the effectiveness of student teachers who have had extensive early field experience with those who have not. Abstract retrieved from ERIC (ED207943)
- Gumm, A. J. (1993). The development of a model and assessment instrument of choral music teaching styles. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 41(3), 181–199. doi:10.2307/3345324
- Haberman, M. (1978). Toward more realistic teacher education. *Action in Teacher Education*, 1(1), 8–17. doi:10.1080/01626620.1978.10518936

- Hamann, D. L., Baker, D. S., Mcallister, P. A., & Bauer, W. I. (2000). Factors affecting university music students' perceptions of lesson quality and teaching effectiveness. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 48(2), 102–113. doi:10.2307/3345569
- Haring, M. J., & Nelsen, E. (1980). A five-year follow-up comparison of recent and experienced graduates from campus and field-based teacher education programs.
 Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED186429)
- Harste, J. C. (1973). *The effect of a field–based teacher education program upon pupil learning*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA. Retrieved from ERIC database.
 (ED076572)
- Harty, H., & Smith, B. (1977). Prospective Teachers' Acceptance of Others During Placements in Multi–Ethnic Community Centers. Abstract retrieved from ERIC database. (ED181003)
- Heath, M. P. (1984). An examination of the curriculum of early field experiences in selected teacher education programs in Ohio (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI No. 8418949)

Hedberg, J. D. (1979). The effects of field experience on achievement in educational psychology. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 30(1), 75–76.
doi:10.1177/002248717903000135

Henry, W. (2001). Music teacher education and the professional development school. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 10(2), 23–28.
doi:10.1177/10570837010100020105

- Hoffman, R. A., & Gellen, M. I. (1981). A comparison of self-evaluations and classroom teacher evaluations for aides in a pre-student teaching field experience program.
 The Teacher Educator, *17*(2), 16–21. doi:10.1080/08878738109554785
- Hourigan, R. M., & Scheib, J. W. (2009). Inside and outside the undergraduate music education curriculum: Student teacher perceptions of the value of skills, abilities, and understanding. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, *18*(2), 48–61. doi:10.1177/1057083708327871
- Howey, K. R. (1976). A bicentennial commission plots the path to professionalism.*Journal of Teacher Education*, 27(1), 81–84. doi:10.1177/002248717602700122
- Howey, K. R., Yarger, S. J., & Joyce, B. R. (1978). *Improving teacher education*.Washington, DC: Association of Teacher Educators.
- Ingle, R. B., & Robinson, E. W. (1965). An examination of the value of classroom observation for prospective teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 16(4), 456– 460. doi:10.1177/002248716501600416
- Jackson, C. R. (2008). Effectiveness of preservice experiences and course work in music education toward teacher self–efficacy in classroom management (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI No. 3370983)
- Johnson, J. A. (1968). *A brief history of student teaching*. DeKalb, IL: Creative Educational Materials.
- Kapel, D. E. (1978). Career Education Training and the Role Perceptions of Cooperating Teachers Toward the Field Experience. Abstract retrieved from ERIC database. (ED151519)
- Kay, R. S., & Ishler, M. F. (1980). Exploratory field experiences survey: Investigating field sites and field trainers. *Action in Teacher Education*, 2(3), 61–66. doi:10.1080/01626620.1980.10519017
- Kelly, D. E. (1971). An assessment of the effects of two experimental arrangements on the classroom behavior of student-teachers as measured by iota (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI No. 7109702)
- King, V. D., & Martin, B. H. (1981). A Study of the Relationship Between the Amount of Student Teacher's Prior Contact with Children and Anxiety Level During Student Teaching. Abstract retrieved from ERIC database. (ED199241)
- Kulm, G. (1975). The Effects of Practicum Experience on the Opinions of Secondary Mathematics Teachers. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, DC. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED111691)
- Lindsey, M., Hunter, E., & Friends of Margaret Lindsey. (1979). *Margaret Lindsey: A teacher educator speaks*. North Bergen, NJ: Friends of Margaret Lindsey.
- Liston, D. P., & Zeichner K. M. (1991). *Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lofgren, N. (1974). A task analysis approach to determine musical and extra-musical competencies of school music teachers (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI No. 7510780)

- Lux, J. E. (1973). *The impact of field experiences on the competencies and attitudes of prospective social studies teachers*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED088894)
- Maheady, L., Jabot, M., Rey, J., & Michielli–Pendl, J. (2007). An early field based experience and its impact on pre–service candidates' teaching practice and their pupils' outcomes. *The Journal of the Teacher Education*, 30(1), 24–33. doi:10.1177/088840640703000103
- Marso, R. N., & Reed, R. L. (1971). Observable changes in student teacher behavior following field oriented elementary education programs. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED085395)
- Martin, R. E. Jr., & Wood, G. H. (1983). Two perspectives of early field experiences: Inservice and preservice teachers, Paper presented at Annual Meeting of Teacher Educators. Orlando, FL. Retrieved from ERIC database (ED227059)
- McIntyre, D. J., Byrd, D. M. (Eds.). (1996). Preparing tomorrow's teachers: The field experience. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Meaux, R. J. (2004). A descriptive analysis of twenty-six undergraduate music education programs at Texas four-year colleges and universities accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI No. 3123919)
- Melgrano, V. J. (1976). Changes in selected characteristics of pre–service teachers following variable, semi–variable, and non–variable field experiences. Cleveland, OH: Cleveland State University. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED126010)

Miksza, P., Roeder, M., & Biggs, D. (2010). Surveying Colorado band directors' opinions of skills and characteristics important to successful music teaching. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *57*(4), 364–381. doi:

10.1177/0022429409351655

- Mills, J., & Smith, J. (2003). Teacher's beliefs about effective instrumental teaching in schools and higher education. *British Journal of Music Education*, 20(1), 5–28.
- Minor, L. C., Onwuegbuzie, A. J., Witcher, A. E., & James, T., L. (2002). Preservice teachers' educational beliefs and their perceptions of characteristics of effective teachers. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 96(2), 116–127.
- Music Educators National Conference Commission on Teacher Education. (1970). Teacher education in music. *Music Educators Journal*, *57*(2), 33–48. doi: 10.1017/s0265051702005260
- Music Teacher Education: Partnership and Process, the Task Force on Music Teacher Education for the Nineties. (1987). *Music teacher education: Partnerships and process: A report.* Reston, VA: Music Education National Conference
- National Association of Schools of Music. (2015). *Handbook 2015–16*. Reston, VA: National Association of Schools of Music. Retrieved from https://nasm.artsaccredit.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2015/11/NASM_HANDBOOK_2015– 16.pdf
- National Association of Schools of Music (2015). *State accredited institutions*. Reston, VA: NASM. Retrieved from https://nasm.arts-accredit.org/directorylists/accredited-institutions/

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. (2015). *Standards for state approval of teacher education*. United States: National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification. Retrieved from http://www.nasdtec.net/?page=interstate

National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification, &
 American Association for the Advancement of Science guidelines. (1961).
 Guidelines for preparation programs of teachers of secondary school science and mathematics. United States: National Association of State Directors of Teacher
 Education and Certification. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED011854)

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2001). Standards for professional development schools. Retrieved from

http://www.ncate.org/ProfessionalDevelopmentSchools/tabid/497/Default.aspx

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2015). Research supporting the effectiveness of teacher preparation. [Online research]. Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/Public/ResearchReports/TeacherPreparationResearch/ EffectivenessofTeacherPreparation/tabid/362/Default.aspx

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (2015). Unit standard in effect 2008. [Standards]. Retrieved from http://www.ncate.org/Standards/NCATEUnitStandards/UnitStandardsinEffect200 8/tabid/476/Default.aspx#stnd3

National Education Association of the United States. (1982). *Excellence in our schools: Teacher education: an action plan.* Washington, DC: The Association.

- Nolan, J. F. (1982). Professional laboratory experiences: The missing link in teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *33*(4), 49–53.
 doi:10.1177/002248718203300412
- Paese, P. C. (1996). Contexts: Overview and framework. In D. J. McIntyre & D. M. Byrd (Eds.), *Preparing tomorrow's teachers: The field experience* (pp. 1–7). Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Paul, S. J. (1998). The effects of peer teaching experiences on the professional teacher role development of undergraduate instrumental music education majors. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, *137*, 73–92. doi:10.1177/1057083710365052
- Puckett, E. (1983). A national survey of field experiences in elementary teacher preparation programs. Unpublished manuscript, Brigham Young University.
- Reynolds, A. M., & Conway, C. M. (2003). Service–learning in music education methods: Perceptions of participants. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 155, 1–9. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40319419
- Rohwer, D., & Henry, W. (2004). University teacher's perceptions of requisite skills and characteristics of effective music teachers. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, *13*(2), 18–26. doi:10.1177/10570837040130020104
- Ross, S. M., Raines, F. B., Cervetti, M. J., & Dellow, D. A. (1980). Field experiences for teacher candidates: A comparison between tutorial and apprenticeship programs on student activities and attitudes. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *31*(6), 57–61. doi:10.1177/002248718003100621

- Rozmajzl, M. (1992). Preparatory field experiences for elementary music education majors. *Update*, *11*(1), 19–24. doi:10.1177/875512339201100105
- Scannel, D., Denemark, G., & Dieterly, L. (1983). Educating a profession: Profile of a beginning teacher. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED227079)
- Schmidt, C. P. (1989). Applied music teaching behavior as a function of selected personality variables. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 37(4), 258–271. doi:doi:10.2307/3344660
- Schmidt, M. (2008). First–year teachers and methods classes. In L. K. Thompson & M.
 R. Campbell (Eds.), *Diverse methodologies in the study of music teaching and learning* (pp. 67–90). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Seiforth, B., & Samuel, M. (1979). The emergence of early field experiences. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 57(1), 10–16. doi:10.1080/01619567909538261
- Shannon, D. M., & Bradshaw, C. C. (2002). A comparison of response rate, response time, and costs of mail and electronic surveys. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 70(2), 179–192. doi:10.1080/00220970209599505
- Shulman, L. S., & Hutchings, P. (2004). Teaching as community property: Essays on higher education. San Francisco, CA: Jossey–Bass.
- Silvernail, D. L. (1980). Assessing the effectiveness of preservice field experiences in reducing teacher anxiety and concern levels. Abstract retrieved from ERIC database. (ED191828)
- Smith, B. O., Cohen, S. B., & Pearl, A. (1970). *Teachers for the real world*. Washington,DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

- Souter, F., & Bartos, R. (1981). *Practicum experience: Its impact on schools*. Abstract retrieved from ERIC database. (ED200555)
- Southall, C. T., & Dumas, W. (1981). Early classroom field experiences in state universities of seven Midwestern states. *Contemporary Education*, 52(4), 203 208.
- Teachout, D. (1997). Preservice and experienced teachers' opinions of skills and behaviors important to successful music teaching. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45(1), 41–50. doi: 10.2307/3345464
- The Holmes Group, Inc. (1986). *Tomorrow's Teachers: A Report of The Holmes Group*. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED270454)
- Veenan, S. (1984). Perceived problems of beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 54(2), 143–178. doi:10.2307/1170301
- Verrastro, R. E., & Leglar, M. (1992). Music teacher education. In R. Colwell (Ed.),
 Handbook of research on music teaching and learning: A project of the Music
 Educators National Conference (pp. 676–696). New York, NY: Schirmer Books.
- Wasicsko, M. M., Butler, E. D., Bush, A. J., Carlile, N., Calaway, F., & Murrell, S.
 (1981). *The influence of field experiences and introductory professional courses* on student attitudes toward American education, Paper presented at the Regional Mini–Clinic of the Association for Teacher Education, Carbondale, IL. Retrieved from ERIC database. (ED209185)
- Weaver, H. M., Hounshell, P. B., & Coble, C. B. (1979). Effects of science methods courses with and without field experience on attitudes of preservice elementary teachers. *Science Education*, 63(5), 655–664. doi:10.1002/sce.3730630510

- Webb, C. D. (1981). Exploratory field experiences in teacher education. Washington,DC: Association of Teacher Educators in cooperation with the College of Education.
- Wolfgang, R. E. (1990). Early field experience in music education: A study of teacher role socialization (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Digital Dissertations. (UMI No. 9117573)
- Yarbrough, C. (1975). Effect of magnitude of conducting behavior on students in selected mixed choruses. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 23(2), 134–146. doi:10.2307/3345286
- Zeichner, K. M. (1980). Myths and realities: field–based experiences in preservice teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education*, *31*(6), 45–55.
 doi:10.1177/002248718003100620

APPENDIX A: National Center for Education Statistics Locale Codes

Locale Codes

Locale codes are a measure of geographic status on an urban continuum that ranges from "large city" to "rural." New locale codes incorporate changes in the way rural areas are defined, in agreement with geographic standards used in the 2000 decennial Census.

New Urban-Centric Locale Codes 11 - City, Territory inside an urbanized area and inside a principal city with population of 250,000 or more. Large 12 - City, Territory inside an urbanized area and inside a principal city with Midsize population less than 250,000 and greater than or equal to 100,000. Territory inside an urbanized area and inside a principal city with 13 - City, population less than 100,000. Small 21 -Territory outside a principal city and inside an urbanized area with Suburb, population of 250,000 or more. Large 22 -Territory outside a principal city and inside an urbanized area with Suburb. population less than 250,000 and greater than or equal to 100,000. Midsize 23 -Territory outside a principal city and inside an urbanized area with Suburb. population less than 100,000. Small 31 - Town, Territory inside an urban cluster that is less than or equal to 10 miles from Fringe an urbanized area. 32 - Town. Territory inside an urban cluster that is more than 10 miles and less than or Distant equal to 35 miles from an urbanized area. 33 - Town. Territory inside an urban cluster that is more than 35 miles from an urbanized area. Remote Census-defined rural territory that is less than or equal to 5 miles from an 41 - Rural, urbanized area, as well as rural territory that is less than or equal to 2.5 Fringe miles from an urban cluster. Census-defined rural territory that is more than 5 miles but less than or 42 - Rural. equal to 25 miles from an urbanized area, as well as rural territory that is Distant more than 2.5 miles but less than or equal to 10 miles from an urban cluster. 43 - Rural, Census-defined rural territory that is more than 25 miles from an urbanized area and is also more than 10 miles from an urban cluster. Remote

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire

FINAL Undergraduate Music Education Early Field Experience Inventory

Q1 Undergraduate Music Education Early Field Experience Inventory.

Please supply the following information about early field experiences in music education.

Definition of terms: Early field experiences: all field experiences prior to student teaching

Site supervisor: a K-12 music teacher supervising undergraduate music education

students in a classroom setting University supervisor: college/university-affiliated faculty

or graduate assistants responsible for on-site supervision of EFEs

Q2 Does your institution consistently use designated lab or partner schools/ districts for EFE?

O Yes (1)**O** No (2)

Answer If Does your institution have designated lab or partner schools/ districts for EFE? Yes Is Selected

Q3 Are you limited to these lab or partner schools/ districts when placing students?

O Yes (1)**O** No (2)

Q4 What is the approximate number of school sites used during a typical semester?

- O 1 4 school sites (1)
- \bigcirc 5 9 school sites (2)
- **O** 10 14 school sites (3)
- O 15+ school sites (4)
- Comment: (5) _____

Q5 How many students are normally placed with a single site supervisor at one time?

- **O** 1 2 students (1)
- **O** 3 4 students (2)
- O 5+ students (3)
- O Comment: (4) _____

Q6 Rank the criteria used when selecting EFE sites, from most to least important:

- _____ Availability of site supervisors (3)
- _____ Proximity to campus (1)
- Instructional level (preschool, elementary, high school, etc.) (2)
- _____ Instructional area (general music, band, choral, etc.) (7)
- _____ Socioeconomic profile of school (4)
- _____ Academic performance of school (6)
- _____ Quality of music program (10)
- _____ Other (11)
- Q7 Undergraduate Music Education Early Field Experience Inventory

Q128 With which of the following do you require EFE students to have experience?

	Required (1)	Not Required (2)
Title I schools (1)	Ο	Ο
Special needs students (2)	Ο	Ο
Urban schools (3)	Ο	Ο
Rural schools (4)	Ο	Ο
Suburban schools (5)	Ο	Ο
Public schools (6)	Ο	Ο
Private schools (7)	Ο	Ο
Comment (8)	Ο	Ο

Q18 Undergraduate Music Education Early Field Experience Inventory

Q19 Are minimum clock hour requirements for EFEs specified in the undergraduate

music education curriculum?

O Yes (1)**O** No (2)

Answer If Do you have clock hour minimum requirements for early field experiences [not including student-te... Yes Is Selected

Q20 What are the total clock hour minimums required for EFEs in the undergraduate

music education curriculum?

Freshman (1)
Sophomore (2)
Junior (3)
Senior (4)
Overall required total (if not required by year) (5)

Comment (6)

Answer If Do you have clock hour minimum requirements for early field experiences [not including student-teaching] in the undergraduate music education curriculum ? Yes Is Selected Q21 Are these minimums specified by:

- State certification requirements (1)
- **O** University requirements (2)
- **O** Both (3)

Answer If Do you have clock hour minimum requirements for early field experiences [not including student-te... Yes Is Selected

Q22 Do your institutional requirements exceed state requirements?

O Yes (1)

O No (2)

Q23 Undergraduate Music Education Early Field Experience Inventory

Q24 Do you use some form of syllabus (written goals, etc.) for EFE courses or program?

- **O** Yes (1)
- **O** No (2)
- Comment (3) _____

Answer If Do you use some form of syllabus (written goals, etc.) for EFE courses or program? Yes Is Selected Or Do you use some form of syllabus (written goals, etc.) for EFE courses or program? Comment Is Selected Or Do you use some form of syllabus (written goals, etc.) for EFE courses or program? Comment Is Not Empty

Q26 If you are willing to share your material (goals/objectives or syllabus) for purposes

of this research only, please upload here.

Q27 Undergraduate Music Education Early Field Experience Inventory

Q28 In the chart below, please indicate which of the descriptors are specifically required..

Q29 Program Elements: Non-Teaching Experiences

	Required (1)	Not Required (2)
Individual observations at an elementary, middle, or a high school. (16)	0	0
Group/ class observations at an elementary, middle, or a high school. (15)	0	0
Observation of physical classroom environment (e.g. arrangement, student seating) (1)	0	O
Examination of student learning styles. (3)	0	0
Observation of teaching	Ο	Ο

methods (4)		
Observation of student behavior (5)	0	0
Interviews with teachers or administrators (8)	0	0
Observation of classroom social environment (e.g., peer or teacher-student relationships, etc.) (9)	0	O
Observation of specific teaching and classroom management techniques (e.g. discipline techniques, questioning, teacher talk, etc.) (11)	O	O
Preparation of teaching aids, materials (e.g., bulletin boards, transparencies, study aids) (12)	O	O
Other (please specify) (13)	Ο	Ο

Q30 Are EFE students required to submit written reflections/ reports of non-teaching

experiences?

O Yes (1)**O** No (2)

Answer If Are EFE students required to submit written reflections/ reports of nonteaching experiences? Yes Is Selected

Q31 To whom are these reports submitted for assessment/ suggestions/ comments?

- **O** University supervisor (1)
- O Site supervisor (2)
- **O** Both (3)

Q32 Undergraduate Music Education Early Field Experience Inventory

Q33 In the chart below, please indicate which of the descriptors are specifically required.

	Required (1)	Not Required (2)
Micro-teaching (1)	Ο	Ο
Reflective participation in seminars or individual conferences with supervisors (2)	0	0
Video recordings of lessons (3)	0	0
One-on-one instruction (4)	О	О
Small-group instruction (5)	Ο	Ο
Full-class instruction (6)	О	О
Special-needs instruction (7)	О	О
Lesson plan construction (10)	0	0
Construction and/ or administration of assessment tools (11)	0	Ο
Other (please specify) (12)	Ο	Ο

Q34 Early Field Experience Elements: Teaching Experience

Q35 Are written reflections/ reports of teaching experiences required?

O Yes (1)**O** No (2)

Answer If Are written reflections/ reports of teaching experiences required? Yes Is Selected Q36 To whom are these reports submitted for assessment/ suggestions/ comments?

- **O** University supervisor (1)
- Site supervisor (2)
- **O** Both (3)

Q37 Undergraduate Music Education Early Field Experience Inventory

Q38 Who assumes the duties of the university supervisor

- **O** Full-time faculty (1)
- Personnel other than full-time faculty (teaching assistants, part-time personnel, etc.) (2)
- **O** Both (3)

Q39 How are EFE field observations conducted by the university supervisor?

O Live observation (1)
O Video recording (2)
O Both (3)

Q40 How many field observations does the university supervisor make for each

placement?

_____ Minimum (1)

_____ Average (2)

Q41 Undergraduate Music Education Early Field Experience Inventory

Q42 Is there an evaluation tool/rubric for use by university supervisors conducting an

EFE field observation?

O Yes (1)**O** No (2)

Answer If Is an evaluation tool or form in use by supervisors when completing an EFE field observation of a... Yes Is Selected Q43 If YES,

- □ It is used throughout the education department or university (1)
- \Box It is used only in music education, designed by the music education department (2)
- □ It is an adaptation of a form used by all disciplines (3)

Answer If Is there an evaluation tool/rubric for use by university supervisors conducting an EFE field observation? Yes Is Selected

Q45 If you are willing to share your evaluation tool/rubric for purposes of this research

only, please upload here.

Q46 Who determines the summative evaluation (grade) for the EFE?

- **O** University supervisor (1)
- Site supervisor (2)
- **O** Both (3)

Q47 Undergraduate Music Education Early Field Experience Inventory

Q48 Does an observation include a discussion with the student alone?

- **O** Always (1)
- **O** Usually (2)
- O Sometimes (3)
- O Rarely (4)
- **O** Never (5)

Q49 Does an observation include a discussion with the site supervisor alone?

- **O** Always (1)
- **O** Usually (2)
- O Sometimes (3)
- O Rarely (4)
- O Never (5)

Q50 Does an observation include a discussion with the student and site supervisor

together?

- O Always (1)
- **O** Usually (2)
- O Sometimes (3)
- O Rarely (4)
- **O** Never (5)

Q51 Is the student informed prior to an observation?

- O Always (1)
- **O** Usually (2)
- O Sometimes (3)
- O Rarely (4)
- O Never (5)

Q52 Are written critiques of the student's performance made during each observation?

- **O** Always (1)
- **O** Usually (2)
- O Sometimes (3)
- O Rarely (4)
- O Never (5)

Q53 Undergraduate Music Education Early Field Experience Inventory

Q54 What areas of student growth are most desirable as a result of a successful

EFE?(Please rank from most to least important.)

_____ Aural perception (2)

_____ Conducting skills (3)

_____ Classroom management skills (4)

_____ General musicianship (5)

_____ Technical knowledge of instruments/voice (6)

_____ Professionalism (7)

_____ Pedagogical knowledge (8)

_____ Understanding of child psychology (9)

_____ Other (10)

Q55 What areas have presented the most frequent problems for students during EFEs?

(Select all that apply)

- □ Planning for instruction (2)
- Technology (3)
- □ Implementation and management of instruction (4)
- □ Evaluation/ assessment of student outcomes (5)
- □ Knowledge of subject (6)
- □ Communication skills (7)
- Classroom management (8)
- □ Professional responsibilities (9)
- □ Other (10) _____

Q56 In your opinion, what are the top 3 - 5 emerging trends/ problems/ needs in early

field experience programs for music teacher education?

Q57 Would you be willing to participate in a 15-minute phone interview with the

researcher about your university's field experience program?

O Yes (1)**O** No (2)

Answer If Would you be willing to participate in a 30 minute phone interview by the researcher about your u... Yes Is Selected

Q58 Please enter your contact information:

First Name (1)

Last Name (2)

Email Address (3)

Contact Phone Number (4)

APPENDIX C: IRB Approval



Phone 706-542-3199

Office of the Vice President for Research Institutional Review Board Fax 706-542-3660

APPROVAL OF PROTOCOL

April 7, 2015

Dear Mary Leglar:

On 4/7/2015, the IRB reviewed the following submission:

Type of Review:	Initial Study
Title of Study:	An Examination of Early Field Experience Programs in
	Undergraduate Music Education Teacher Preparation
	Institutions at NASM Accredited Schools of Music in
	the United States of America.
Investigator:	Mary Leglar
IRB ID:	STUDY00001993
Funding:	None
Grant ID:	None

The IRB approved the protocol from 4/7/2015.

In conducting this study, you are required to follow the requirements listed in the Investigator Manual (HRP-103).

Sincerely,

Larry Nackerud, Ph.D. University of Georgia Institutional Review Board Chairperson

629 Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center

 Athens, Georgia 30602-7411
 An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Institution

APPENDIX D: Informed Letter of Consent

Dear Colleague:

You are invited to participate in a research study entitled, "An Examination of Early Field Experience Programs in Undergraduate Music Education Teacher Preparation Institutions at NASM Accredited Schools of Music in the United States of America," conducted by Brandon Robertson, under the direction of Dr. Mary Leglar, Hugh Hodgson School of Music, University of Georgia. The purpose of this study is to establish a database regarding requirements, planning, placements, supervision, activities, and goals currently used by faculty in music teacher education early field experiences.

Your participation will involve completing a survey and should only take about 20 minutes of your time. The completion of the survey is voluntary, and you may choose not to participate or to stop at any time without penalty or loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you decide to stop or withdraw from the study, the information/data collected from or about you up to the point of your withdrawal will be kept as part of the study and may continue to be analyzed.

Please note that you will receive an individualized link to complete the survey, however upon completion and when submitted, the IP address will be removed along with disconnecting the response from the individual who provides the information. The results of the research study may be published, but your name or any identifying information will not be used. All data will be stored on a Qualtrics server under password protection. Only I will have access to submitted data. All data will be deleted and destroyed by August 2015. We do not anticipate any risks or discomforts associated with this study, however, you may withdraw at any time without penalty, or skip any questions you feel uncomfortable answering. Closing the survey window will erase your answers without submitting them. If you are not comfortable with the level of confidentiality provided by the Internet, I will be happy to send you a hard copy of the survey along with a stamped and addressed envelope to complete and mail to me.

The findings from this project may provide information on similarities, trends within states and regions about music teacher education early field experiences. Moreover, this study will provide a better understanding of the current state of early field experiences in music teacher education in the United States of America's music education institutions. The published results will be presented in summary form only.

If you have any questions about this research project, please feel free to call me, Brandon Robertson or Dr. Mary Leglar at XXXXX or send an e-mail to XXXX. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 609 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602; telephone (706) 542-3199; email address irb@uga.edu.

By completing and submitting this questionnaire via Qualtrics, you are agreeing to participate in the above described research project.

Thank you for your consideration! Please keep this letter for your records.

Sincerely,

Brandon H. Robertson

APPENDIX E: Electronic Invitation to Participate

Subject: Dissertation Research, Survey of Early Field Experiences in Music Education

[Date]

Dear {name}:

I am writing to request your help to collect information about early field experiences in music teacher education in the National Association of Schools of Music institutions for a dissertation. I am conducting a survey for research to ask music education department chairs or music school directors to provide details of their field experience program.

You have been identified, as the point of contact (via the National Association of Schools of Music and institution website) that may best be able to answer the questions provided in the survey. I know that this is a busy time of year; I hope that you will take just a little time to participate (15 minutes) in this brief web survey created via the University of Georgia's Qualtrics secure web survey interface.

To complete the survey online, please go to the URL below and follow the online survey instructions. If you do not have access to the Internet, or prefer to answer the questionnaire on paper, you may request a paper survey by e-mail at xxxxx@uga.edu or calling (XXX) XXX-XXXXX.

Your answers will be completely confidential. Your URL will be used for tracking purposes only. Moreover, the results of the survey will be reported in a summary format, so again no one will link you to your responses. Text comments will be reported verbatim, so please do not provide identifying information in your text comments.

Thank you in advance for your participation. If you have any questions about the administration of the survey, please contact Dr. Mary Leglar, the principal investigator at (XXX).XXX-XXXX or xxxx@uga.edu.

Sincerely,

Brandon Robertson University of Georgia School of Music

Follow this link to the Survey: \${1://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your Internet browser: \${1://SurveyURL}

Follow the link to opt out of future contact: \${1://OptOutLink?d=Please%20click%20here%20to%20opt%20out%20of%20this%20su rvey.}

APPENDIX F: Follow-up Survey Message

Dear Dr. \${m://LastName},

Last week, you should have received an email inviting you to participate in a comprehensive study entitled, "An Examination of Early Field Experience Programs in Undergraduate Music Teacher Education at Selected NASM-Accredited Schools of Music." The purpose of the study is to prepare and share a comprehensive database of strategies and practices currently being employed in early field experiences. It is hoped that a summary of the findings will provide an informative profile of these experiences.

You are being contacted because you have been identified as either the teacher education coordinator or program contact person for your institution. If this request has reached you in error, I would be grateful if you could provide the name and contact information of the appropriate person.

Your willingness to share your knowledge and expertise by completing the following 15minute survey will be greatly appreciated. Please be assured that upon submission of the survey, the IP address will be removed, and neither your name nor any identifying information associated with your response will be used.

Follow this link to the Survey:

\${l://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser: \${1://SurveyURL}

Closing the survey window at any time before submission will erase your answers. If you are not comfortable with the level of confidentiality provided by the Internet, I will be happy to send you a hard copy of the survey along with a stamped addressed envelope.

Please contact me if you have any questions about this project, which will be submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Ed.D. in Music Education. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 609 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602; telephone (XXX) XXX-XXXX; email address irb@uga.edu. Thank you again for your cooperation. Please keep this letter for your records.

Sincerely, Brandon Robertson (xxxxxxx@uga.edu) Doctoral Candidate, Ed.D. Music Education Hugh Hodgson School of Music University of Georgia 250 River Road Athens, GA 30602 Follow the link to opt out of future emails: \${1://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}

APPENDIX G: Final Announcement – Survey Window Closing

Dear Dr. \${m://LastName},

I am writing to follow up on messages sent previously asking you to participate in a comprehensive study entitled, "An Examination of Early Field Experience Programs in Undergraduate Music Teacher Education at Selected NASM-Accredited Schools of Music." This collection of data is to prepare and share a comprehensive database of strategies and practices currently being employed in early field experiences is drawing to a close, and this is the last reminder I am sending about this study.

The URL is below to provide an easy link to the survey website.

Follow this link to the Survey:

\${1://SurveyLink?d=Take the Survey}

Or copy and paste the URL below into your internet browser: \${1://SurveyURL}

Closing the survey window at any time before submission will erase your answers. If you are not comfortable with the level of confidentiality provided by the Internet, I will be happy to send you a hard copy of the survey along with a stamped addressed envelope.

Please contact me if you have any questions about this project, which will be submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Ed.D. in Music Education. Questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant should be directed to The Chairperson, University of Georgia Institutional Review Board, 609 Boyd GSRC, Athens, Georgia 30602; telephone (XXX) XXX-XXXX; email address irb@uga.edu.

Thank you again for your cooperation. Please keep this letter for your records.

Sincerely, Brandon Robertson (xxxxxx@uga.edu) Doctoral Candidate, Ed.D. Music Education Hugh Hodgson School of Music University of Georgia 250 River Road Athens, GA 30602

Follow the link to opt out of future emails: \${1://OptOutLink?d=Click here to unsubscribe}