

AN EXAMINATION OF MUSIC STUDENT TEACHING SEMINARS
AT MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITIES

A Dissertation presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
at the University of Missouri-Columbia

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctor of Philosophy

by

CHRISTOPHER M. BAUMGARTNER

Dr. Wendy Sims & Dr. Brian Silvey,
Dissertation Supervisors
MAY 2012

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School, have examined the dissertation entitled

AN EXAMINATION OF MUSIC STUDENT TEACHING SEMINARS
AT MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITIES

presented by Christopher M. Baumgartner, a candidate for the degree of doctor of philosophy, and hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Wendy Sims

Professor Brian Silvey

Professor Kathleen Unrath

Professor D. Bradley Snow

Professor Stefan Freund

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Dr. Wendy Sims for her continued support throughout my doctoral studies. Her guidance and wisdom has helped me to prepare for a future in academia and music education research. Thanks to Dr. Brian Silvey, who not only dedicated many hours to this project, but also has served as a great role model, advisor, and friend throughout my three years at Mizzou. He has been gracious enough to include me in his research and classroom teaching, for which I am very appreciative. I would also like to thank Ryan McLouth for his time and effort assisting me with the results of this study. A special thanks to Drs. Brad Snow and Stefan Freund, who have treated me more as a colleague than a student—I have learned more from these experiences than they will ever know.

A sincere thanks to the many professors who played an instrumental role in my pursuit of a doctoral degree: Kenneth Thompson, Joyce Eastlund Gromko, Vincent Kantorski, and Bruce Moss. Without their inspiration, I would not be the music educator I am today. To my family and friends for their years of encouragement—graduate school is a long road and I could not have achieved all my accomplishments without their financial, emotional, and loving support. And finally, to Melissa—thank you for everything.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	viii
ABSTRACT	x
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION	1
The Importance of the Student Teaching Experience	1
Student and Cooperating Teacher Concerns	3
Need for the Study	5
Statement of Purpose	5
Definitions	7
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
The Student Teaching Internship	10
The Importance of Student Teaching	10
The Student Teaching Internship and Teacher Socialization	12
Relationships with Cooperating and Supervising Teachers	13
Power Sharing Within the Triad	14
University Sponsored Seminars	16
Seminar Structure and Content	16
Seminars as Professional Learning Communities	17
Student Teacher Concerns and Perceptions of Professional Practice	19
Teaching Strategies in Music	19
Student Well-Being	21

Lesson Planning and Curriculum.....	22
Classroom Management.....	23
Extra-Musical Concerns.....	26
Summary.....	26
3. METHODOLOGY	28
Research Design.....	29
Participants.....	29
Survey Instrument.....	31
Student Teaching Internship	32
Student Teaching Seminar Structure	34
Student Teaching Seminar Instructor.....	36
Student Teaching Seminar Content	37
Pilot Testing.....	41
Validity	41
Procedures.....	42
Data Analysis	43
4. RESULTS	45
Structure of Music Student Teaching Seminars.....	45
Student Teaching Internship	45
Music Student Teaching Seminar Structure	48
Music Student Teaching Seminar Instructor.....	52
Internship and Seminar Structure Conclusion	55
Music Student Teaching Seminar Content	57

Topic Areas.....	58
Internship-Specific Topics.....	58
Classroom Management Topics.....	59
Curriculum Topics.....	60
Instructional Strategy Topics.....	61
University Coursework Topics.....	62
Student Needs Topics.....	63
Administrative Topics.....	64
Employment Topics.....	65
Additional Topic Areas.....	66
Seminar Activities.....	68
Seminar Content Conclusion.....	70
Summary.....	72
5. DISCUSSION.....	73
Characteristics of University-Sponsored Seminars.....	73
Seminar Structure.....	73
Distance Limitations.....	74
Music Specialists as Seminar Instructors.....	75
Seminars for Music Education Majors.....	76
Content of University-Sponsored Seminars.....	77
Addressing Professionalism and Employment.....	77
Classroom Management.....	78
Preparing for the Internship.....	79

Learning Administrative Tasks.....	80
Instructional Strategies and Curriculum	80
Implications for Music Teacher Preparation.....	82
Current Practices in Music Student Teaching Seminars.....	82
Music-Specific Content	83
Establishing Seminar Guidelines	84
Limitations and Suggestions for Research.....	85
Generalizability of Findings	85
Institution Location.....	86
Seminar Instructors and Formal Observers.....	87
Participant Responses	88
Student Teacher Perceptions.....	89
Concluding Statement.....	89
REFERENCES	91
APPENDICES	
A. Music Student Teacher Seminar Survey.....	99
B. Campus Institutional Review Board Approval Letter	110
C. Informed Consent.....	111
D. Recruitment Letter	112
E. First Reminder Message	113
F. Final Reminder Message.....	114
G. Responses to Survey Question 22.....	115
H. Responses to Survey Question 35.....	118

I. Responses to Survey Question 38.....	120
VITA.....	122

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Frequencies and Percentages of Survey Responses by State.....	31
2. Frequencies and Percentages of Length of Student Teaching Internship	46
3. Frequencies and Percentages of Distance of Student Teaching Placement from College/University Campus	47
4. Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty/Staff Who Make Formal Observations During the Internship	48
5. Frequencies and Percentages of the Number of Student Teaching Seminar Meetings Throughout the Internship	49
6. Frequencies and Percentages of Length of Student Teaching Seminar Meetings	50
7. Frequencies and Percentages of Alternative Attendance Methods to Student Teaching Seminar Meetings	51
8. Frequencies and Percentages of Academic Rank of the Student Teaching Seminar Instructor.....	53
9. Frequencies and Percentages of Area of the Highest Degree Earned by Student Teaching Seminar Instructors	54
10. Frequencies and Percentages of the Primary Teaching Area of Student Teaching Seminar Instructors	54
11. Frequencies and Percentages of Persons Required to Attend Student Teaching Orientation	58
12. Frequencies, Percentages, Number of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Internship-Specific Topics Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars.....	59

13. Frequencies, Percentages, Number of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Classroom Management Topics Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars.....	60
14. Frequencies, Percentages, Number of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Curriculum Topics Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars.....	61
15. Frequencies, Percentages, Number of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Instructional Strategies Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars.....	62
16. Frequencies, Percentages, Number of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Topics from University Coursework Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars.....	63
17. Frequencies, Percentages, Number of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Student Needs Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars.....	64
18. Frequencies, Percentages, Number of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Administrative Topics Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars.....	65
19. Frequencies, Percentages, Number of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Employment Topics Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars.....	66
20. Frequencies and Percentages of Activities/Assignments Included in the Music Student Teaching Seminar	69
21. Frequencies and Percentages of Culminating Projects Included in the Music Student Teaching Seminar	70

AN EXAMINATION OF MUSIC STUDENT TEACHING SEMINARS
AT MIDWESTERN UNIVERSITIES

Christopher M. Baumgartner

Dr. Wendy Sims & Dr. Brian Silvey, Dissertation Supervisors

ABSTRACT

This study was designed with two main purposes: (a) to provide researchers and educators with information about the structure and content of music student teaching seminars by gathering baseline data regarding current practices and (b) to examine whether the perceived needs of music student teachers, as identified in the research literature, were being met through the contents and structure of the student teaching seminars. Music education professors from accredited institutions in nine Midwestern states were invited to participate in a researcher-designed survey that included questions pertaining to the student teaching internship, the seminar course that coincides with the internship, and assignments and activities included in the seminar. Respondents also were asked to indicate how extensively they addressed specific content areas based on the list of concerns of student teachers and cooperating teachers that had been identified. Forty-five respondents (36.9% useable response rate) completed the survey.

Results indicated that most institutions ($n = 40$, 88.9%) hosted an accompanying seminar course during the student teaching internship; however, only 42.5% of respondents reported a seminar designed specifically for music education majors, separate from other education majors. Seminar instructors indicated that they addressed topics pertaining to the internship, classroom management, and employment more extensively than any other area. Professional portfolios, résumé writing, and mock interviews represented the most common seminar activities. Findings suggest that, with

the exception of classroom management, the topics that instructors addressed most extensively in the music student teaching seminar did not align with the perceived needs of music student teachers as reported in extant research. Seminar instructors may wish to dedicate more seminar time to discussion, reflection, and course activities that allow student teachers to address topics such as lesson planning, curriculum design, student needs, and instructional strategies with their peers and supervisors.

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

The student teaching internship represents the pinnacle of university coursework and field experience for students who are preparing to become educators. During this internship, novice teachers work side-by-side with an experienced educator who aids them in applying learned theories, skills, and techniques to the classroom. Student teachers become submersed in the daily life of a full-time educator—teaching students, collaborating with administrators and other teachers, and interacting with parents. This first-hand experience allows novice teachers to shape their teaching philosophies with the support and guidance of an experienced educator. Colleges and universities often offer further support through the use of a student teaching seminar. These seminars afford student teachers the opportunity to discuss their experiences in the classroom while addressing daily issues that arise in elementary and secondary school education. If the student teaching experience is to represent the final stage of teacher training, then institutions of higher education must bridge the transition from student to teaching professional skillfully through meaningful student teaching seminars.

The Importance of the Student Teaching Experience

Those involved in music teacher education “place great confidence on the impact of [the] student teaching experience in the training of music teachers” (Brand, 1982, p. 262). The experience of a full-time internship helps new teachers to understand their role as a facilitator of learning in the classroom. Working closely with an experienced educator can aid novice teachers in making the transition from student to instructor

(Conkling & Henry, 1999); one of the greatest challenges that beginning teachers face (Major, 1994). Because of the drastic identity shift that occurs during this transition, it is not surprising that teachers have cited their student teaching experience as one of the most valuable components of their teaching preparation (Conway, 2002).

The internship provides student teachers with the opportunity to apply what was learned through university coursework to daily instruction in the music classroom (Conway, 1999; Morin, 2000; Stegman, 2007). Often referred to as pedagogical content knowledge (PCK), these techniques can be obtained from a variety of sources—prior teaching experience, mentors, cooperating teachers, and undergraduate methods courses (Haston & Leon-Guerrero, 2008). Mentoring during student teaching should guide novice teachers to become thoughtfully adaptive of this knowledge (Duffy, 2005). In doing so, interns learn to adapt content knowledge for the classroom setting and adjust their methods of instruction for different types of student learners. The student teaching experience is essential because it affords novice teachers the opportunity to test these adaptations in a real-world setting.

Despite the importance of student teaching as an essential component of teacher preparation programs, the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) prescribes few guidelines for the student teaching internship. The NASM Handbook specifies that student teaching be included as professional education, a course area totaling 15–20 percent of the undergraduate music education curriculum. The handbook defines professional education as “those courses normally offered by the education unit that deal with philosophical and social foundations of education, educational psychology, special education, history of education, etc.” (NASM, 2010, p. 97). Aside from including student

teaching as a portion of this percentage, no other guidelines for the internship are outlined by NASM as a requirement for accreditation. This lack of specificity leaves the structure and content of student teaching internships entirely at the discretion of higher education institutions.

Many colleges and universities offer a seminar course that accompanies the student teaching internship. Zeichner and Liston (1987) stated that the purpose of the seminar is “to help students broaden their perspectives on teaching, consider the rationales underlying alternative possibilities for classrooms and pedagogy, and assess their own developing perspectives toward teaching” (p. 32). Although the structure of these seminars can vary among institutions, some are designed as a forum in which peers are encouraged to collaborate in creative problem-solving activities concerning their teaching practices (Weiss & Weiss, 2001). Reflective activities such as group discussions, written journals, portfolios, and video analyses have been cited as effective means in directing student teachers to think critically about their teaching (Baumgartner, 2011b; Berg & Lind, 2003; Chaffin & Manfredo, 2010; Stegman, 2007; Weiss & Weiss, 2001). Ideally, the student teaching seminar is designed to help stimulate deeper reflection of novices’ teaching practice and their application of content knowledge to the classroom (Stegman, 2007). This type of structure provides the student teacher with an opportunity for professional development during the internship, as well as a peer support system.

Student and Cooperating Teacher Concerns

Concerns about entering the teaching profession seem to grow as young teachers approach the student teaching internship (Campbell & Thompson, 2007). Researchers

have examined professional concerns by investigating college students in various field experience settings (Berg & Miksza, 2010; Campbell & Thompson, 2007). Many of the novice teachers' apprehensions are related to content knowledge learned in methods and techniques classes. Although some students have cited methods courses as helpful in preparing them to teach in a school setting (Green & Mitchell, 1998; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009; McDowell, 2007; Morin, 2000), other researchers reported that students often find it difficult to apply learned techniques to the music classroom (Baumgartner, 2011b; Berg & Miksza, 2010). Because student teachers work closely with cooperating teachers in an environment that supports trial and error, Bell and Robinson (2004) emphasize the importance of the student teaching experience as an ideal time for synthesizing content knowledge. In an attempt to bridge the gap between content knowledge and its application to the classroom, university supervisors may find the student teaching seminar important in fostering such transfers.

Of further concern to novice teachers is behavior and classroom management, which student teachers have mentioned as a contributing factor in their confidence during early classroom experiences (Baumgartner, 2011b; Brand, 1982; McDowell, 2007). Although Brand (1982) found that working with an experienced teacher throughout the internship did not affect novices' beliefs and skills concerning classroom management, some cooperating teachers feel it is their responsibility to help shape student teachers' behavior management methods (Snyder, 1998). Teacher educators must continue to search for techniques that improve novices' classroom management skills in an attempt to relieve some of the apprehension cited by beginning teachers. The student teaching

seminar presents an opportunity for university professors to address these issues through discussion, reflection, and class activities.

Need for the Study

Although research exists regarding both the importance of the student teaching experience and the concerns of student teachers and cooperating teachers, there is little indication of how the university supports the students and addresses these concerns during the internship. The student teaching seminar can serve as an important method by which university faculty can assist students throughout the internship, helping students to connect what was learned in university coursework to authentic classroom teaching experiences. However, there are few guidelines in place for structuring this part of the music student teaching experience; no details are prescribed for accreditation by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), for example. The student teaching seminar should be structured in a way that addresses the needs of music student teachers and it should serve as a positive contribution to the student teaching experience. Because of the lack of music education research concerning the structure and efficacy of student teaching seminars, it seems that an important place to start is with an investigation of the current practices being implemented by music teacher education programs.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to provide researchers and educators with information about the structure and content of music student teaching seminars by gathering baseline data regarding current practices, with the goal of providing seminar leaders with information for identifying and designing a seminar course that will best meet the needs of music student teachers. The findings have the potential to provide

music educators with information for determining the efficacy of their own seminars, and to serve as a basis for future comparisons of the efficacy of different types of seminar courses.

A secondary purpose of this study was to examine the perceived needs of music student teachers, as identified in the research literature, to determine if those needs are being met through the contents and structure of the student teaching seminars. Because many concerns and apprehensions arise throughout the internship, it is important that the seminar be structured in a way that best addresses the needs of the music teacher interns. The seminar course should represent a viable and effective means of support for music student teachers during the student teaching internship—such an important capstone event in the teacher preparation process.

NASM accredited institutions were chosen because of their similarities in music education curricula. I selected Missouri and its eight contiguous states (Arkansas, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Tennessee) in an attempt to gather information from institutions that are similar in location and culture. Four-year degree granting institutions that offered a bachelors degree in music education (e.g., BS, BSED, BME) were included in the examination. Based on the gap in the professional literature, I posed the following research questions concerning music student teaching seminars:

1. What are the characteristics of university-sponsored seminars offered to music student teachers?
 - a. What are the different structures of music student teaching seminars?
 - b. Who instructs the music student teaching seminar?
 - c. What topics are covered in music student teaching seminars?

- d. What types of activities are included as a portion of the seminar course?
2. How does the music student teaching seminar address the needs of music student teachers, as identified in the professional literature?
 - a. Are the topics covered in music student teacher seminars representative of the concerns expressed by student teachers and cooperating teachers?
 - b. Do the activities included in music student teaching seminars address the concerns expressed by student teachers and cooperating teachers?

Definitions

The following definitions were used in this study:

1. The terms *student teaching*, *internship*, and *student teaching experience* were used interchangeably to refer to the final full-time field experience portion of an undergraduate education curriculum.
2. The terms *student teacher* and *intern* were used interchangeably to refer to a preservice teacher who has completed all coursework in an undergraduate education program and was enrolled in the final internship experience.
3. A *cooperating teacher* is an active, working educator in the school setting with whom the student teacher was assigned for mentorship during the student teaching experience.
4. A *university supervisor* is a professor or other assigned faculty/staff member of the degree-granting institution that observes and was responsible for coordinating the student teaching internship.
5. The *student teaching seminar* is an organized meeting or course that student teachers attended during the internship.

6. The *seminar leader* or *seminar instructor* is the university supervisor or other assigned faculty/staff that were responsible for the organization and instruction of the student teaching seminar.

CHAPTER TWO

Review of Literature

This study was designed with two main purposes: (a) to provide researchers and educators with information about the structure and content of music student teaching seminars by gathering baseline data regarding current practices and (b) to determine how music student teaching seminars address the perceived needs of music student teachers, as specified by extant research. Music education professors were invited to participate in a researcher-designed survey that included questions pertaining to the student teaching internship, the seminar course that coincides with the internship, the seminar instructor, and assignments and activities included in the seminar. To determine the extent to which student teaching seminars addressed the concerns of student and cooperating teachers, respondents were asked to indicate the level of attention given to various content areas.

This review of literature is organized into three main sections: (a) the importance of the student teaching internship, (b) student teaching seminars, and (c) the perceptions and concerns of the student teaching triad—student teacher, cooperating teacher, and university supervisor. Extant literature has focused on the importance and need for the student teaching internship, its affect on teacher socialization, and the relationship between student and cooperating teacher. Research examining student teaching seminars has included the influence of professional learning communities, activities included in seminar instruction, and the use of technology for distance learning in such settings. Manuscripts that reported student teacher perceptions and concerns in the classroom, motivation and preparedness of student teachers, experimentation with behavior

management and instructional techniques, and suggestions for promoting a positive internship are reviewed in the final section of this chapter.

The Student Teaching Internship

For students studying to become educators, the experience of working with a practicing teacher often represents their final endeavor before entering the profession. Novices have the opportunity to apply teaching theories, learned skills and techniques, and behavior management skills in a authentic classroom setting. As the last stage in their undergraduate preparation, this internship is arguably one of the most helpful aspects of teacher preparation (Koerner, 1992). It is often recognized by music educators as an experience “that introduces the prospective teacher to the realities, both positive and negative, of teaching music in the school setting” (Bowels, 1998, p. 15).

The importance of student teaching. The student teaching experience is a “central component of virtually all preservice teacher education programs” (Borko & Mayfield, 1995, p. 502). Not surprisingly, students themselves feel that the student teaching experience is one of the most valuable parts of undergraduate teacher preparation programs (Conway, 2002). Although the peer-teaching episodes that occur in university methods courses can be helpful in developing effective skills in the classroom (Conway, 2002), peers are often more sympathetic and tolerant of unclear instructions than actual students might be. Peers’ reactions to their colleagues’ teaching may not provide novice teachers with realistic feedback concerning behavior management and instruction (Kerchner, 1998; Schmidt, 2010). Working with children in an authentic setting is more representative of what beginning teachers will encounter during their first year in the profession. The internship allows students to apply content knowledge

consistently to actual classroom teaching, rather than a few short teaching episodes that often accompany field experience components of methods courses.

Theories in the field of cognitive psychology parallel the structure of field experience learning. Recent views in cognition suggest that learned knowledge is inseparable from the context in which it is introduced (Bransford, Brown, & Cocking, 2000; Brown, Collins, & Duguid, 1989). In other words, “what is learned cannot be separated from how it is learned” (Borko & Mayfield, 1995). This point of view suggests that for preservice teachers to learn about teaching, they must do so while actively engaged in the teaching process. Although university instructors may discuss teaching techniques and attempt to model real-world situations in their classrooms, the student teaching experience affords novices the opportunity to explore various instructional strategies in an authentic setting. Considering other field experience components that may accompany the undergraduate curriculum, such as peer teaching and methods courses, the student teaching internship represents the most significant authentic teaching environment that provides novices with feedback from experienced educators.

Music educators have stated their support for this critical experience in teacher preparation (Bowles & Runnels, 1998; Conkling & Henry, 1999; Legette, 1997; Valencia, Martin, Place, & Grossman, 2009). Novices who practice their teaching in the public school classroom can develop pedagogical skills and apply learned theories from university coursework (Morin, 2000). Although content knowledge and pedagogical techniques are acquired from numerous sources—methods classes, prior teaching experience, cooperating teachers, and observation of other teachers’ strategies—working

closely with a cooperating teacher allows novices to practice them in an authentic setting (Haston & Leon-Guerrero, 2008).

The student teaching internship and teacher socialization. Not only does practice in the field allow for the transfer of knowledge from university coursework, it also serves as a major socializing agent as novices make the transition from students to professionals (Conkling & Henry, 1999; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990; Isbell, 2008; Morin, 2000; Scheib, 2006). Working in a collaborative partnership with a cooperating teacher, student teachers begin a socialization process through which they “shed their student identities and become music teachers” (Conkling & Henry, 1999, p. 20). Studies in teacher socialization support the findings above, reporting that both the student teaching experience and collaboration with mentor/cooperating teachers positively affected novices’ professional socialization (Capel, Hayes, Katene, & Velija, 2011; Isbell, 2008).

Although professional socialization occurs throughout many stages of one’s career, a significant phase of this process “begins when students enter the actual world of teaching as practice teachers” (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990, p. 284). Lawson (1986) defined three stages of socialization: (a) acculturation (influential experiences during childhood and adolescence), (b) professional socialization (met through the requirements of student teaching), and (c) occupational socialization (the learning of attitudes and behaviors “on the job”). Interns may experience professional and occupational socialization simultaneously; when cooperating teachers are willing to fully share their professional responsibilities, student teachers experience many of the daily tasks of a full-time educator. Because of the authentic setting it provides for novices to “forge links between the university context and the professional world of teaching” (Morin, 2000), the student

teaching internship can encourage positive changes in student teachers' professionalism, classroom instruction, and student assessment.

Despite most universities' efforts to create teaching experiences that closely resemble real-world practices (e.g., field site teaching, methods classes, rehearsal clinic courses), there seems to be discontinuity between teacher preparation and the reality of classroom instruction (Lacey, 1977). Because "the ideal images of college are [often] in conflict with the norms and values of most veteran teachers," novices often experience a reality shock when entering the student teaching internship (Hoy & Woolfolk, 1990, p. 284). It is the responsibility of the cooperating teacher to guide young teachers through this identity shift during the student teaching experience, which seems important for students who are transitioning toward fulltime teaching.

Relationships with cooperating and supervising teachers. Success in the student teaching internship relies heavily on the relationship formed among the members of the student teaching triad. Educators have examined these relationships to determine how the three members interact with one another (Beck & Kosnik, 2002; Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Bullough & Draper, 2004; Draves, 2008; Koerner, 1992; Slick, 1997; Slick, 1998a; Slick, 1998b; Valencia et al., 2009). Despite university efforts to create a collaborative relationship between higher education and public school institutions, the roles that each party should play during the student teaching experience continue to be debated (Bowles & Runnels, 1998; Draves, 2008; McDowell, 2007; Morin, 2000; Veal & Rikard, 1998). Power struggles between cooperating teacher and university supervisor frequently occur on issues of assessment, evaluation, placement, teaching philosophies, and classroom management (Bowles & Runnels, 1998; Morin, 2000). Because

responsibility for these issues is often unclear (Bullough & Draper, 2004; Koerner, 1992), researchers suggest that the roles of these mentors be defined more clearly (Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Slick, 1998a). When confusion or miscommunication occurs between the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor, the student teacher may have “feelings of being stuck in the ‘middle’ of the conflict” (Bullough & Draper, 2004, p. 414). This sort of apprehension only adds to the myriad concerns that student teachers have reported and might be avoided with more defined responsibilities and improved communication between the cooperating teacher and university supervisor.

Educators agree that the student teacher and cooperating teacher must establish a positive rapport to promote a successful internship (Draves, 2008; Koerner, 1992). Many cooperating teachers favor relationships “based on respect, sharing, and mutual learning” (Draves, 2008, p. 8). Student teachers also have cited professional and personal interactions as important in establishing this positive relationship with their cooperating teachers (Baumgartner, 2011b; Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Bowles & Runnels, 1998; Kamens, 2007). When asked to describe the comfort level with his mentor, a student teacher stated that the two “would talk about [their] lives and each other, and [they] got to know each other...[they] built a relationship between each other” (Baumgartner, 2011b, p. 23). The same student teacher collaborated closely with his cooperating teacher throughout the internship and found the experience to be extremely beneficial. It seems important that a comfortable relationship be established between cooperating teacher and intern to promote a collaborative and successful internship.

Power sharing within the triad. Power sharing between student teacher and cooperating teacher is derived from both personal philosophies of the student teaching

internship (Clarke & Jarvis-Selinger, 2005) and student teacher motivation and preparedness (Draves, 2008). Some cooperating teachers view interns as observers, expecting them to learn as much as possible from watching the cooperating teacher in the classroom (Draves, 2008). Snyder (1998) argued that interns already have spent enough hours observing others' teaching throughout their university coursework and need to spend more time putting methods and techniques into practice. When cooperating teachers share this perspective, an equal delineation of power occurs with the student teacher. Allowing the intern to plan, instruct, and assess student achievement gives more power to the student teacher and allows him or her to experiment with instructional strategies. Although this model gives added responsibility to the student teacher, it does not represent a true equality between the intern and the cooperating teacher.

In the collaborative partnership model, the cooperating teacher and the intern work together in all aspects of teaching, including planning, delivery of instruction, student assessment, and administrative duties (Draves, 2008; Kamens, 2007). Collaboration has been viewed as the most rewarding power sharing model for both the student teacher and the cooperating teacher, with each learning from one another (Draves, 2008; Veal & Rikard, 1998). Approaching the internship in this manner allows the two teachers to work together in all aspects of classroom instruction, submersing the student teacher in the daily life of a music educator. As referenced in the literature, the formation of a positive rapport between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher is essential in promoting a collaborative relationship.

University-Sponsored Seminars

Many colleges and universities offer a course that coincides with the student teaching internship. This class usually is taught by the student teaching supervisor, which can vary from university faculty, to graduate students, to experienced classroom teachers. Most often, the goal of the course is to “help broaden [student teachers’] perspectives for teaching, consider rationales underlying alternative possibilities for classrooms and pedagogy, and assess their own developing perspectives toward teaching” (Zeichner & Liston, 1987). With this approach toward instruction, teachers focus on aiding the change in socialization from university student to teaching professional rather than describing new teaching techniques or methods.

Seminar structure and content. Scant research exists pertaining to the content of student teaching seminar courses. Although many studies have reported concerns of student teachers (Baumgartner, 2011b; Berg & Miksza, 2010; Brand, 1982; Campbell & Thompson, 2007; McDowell, 2007), there is little research examining how these concerns are addressed throughout the student teaching experience. It is inevitable that courses accompanying the internship vary among institutions; however, many are labeled as practicum, forum, or seminar courses (Weiss & Weiss, 2001; Zeichner & Liston, 1987). The seminar structure can provide student teachers with an opportunity to reflect upon, analyze, and reformulate ideas shared by novices in the class (Weiss & Weiss, 2001). Through class activities and discussions, the university supervisor can help guide student teachers toward new realizations about their current teaching practices in the public school setting.

Activities in student teaching seminars often are linked to the interns' current classroom experiences (Zeichner & Liston, 1987). Such activities may include keeping journals, evaluating teaching videos, sharing lesson plans, or discussing classroom management techniques. Student teachers also might be asked to read research articles on selected topics, discussing "the implications of the studies for their own development as teachers" (Zeichner & Liston, 1987, p. 33). This type of guided discussion can stimulate "deeper levels of consideration and more thoughtful reflection on practice" (Stegman, 2007, p. 77), skills that researchers have reported as valuable in promoting growth and development for young educators (Chaffin & Manfredi, 2010; Collier, 1999; Husu & Patrikainen, 2008).

Seminars as professional learning communities. Designed as a seminar, courses accompanying the student teaching internship can promote group discussion and peer feedback about the thoughts, strategies, and actions of preservice teachers. Seminars that meet regularly for the purposes of learning, problem-solving, and peer sharing often represent what the education profession has come to recognize as a professional learning community, or PLC (Bausmith & Barry, 2011). Spurred by recent attempts to improve student achievement through teacher professional development, PLCs "have been touted as an effective way to build upon the knowledge and skills of experienced teachers" (Bausmith & Barry, p. 175, 2011). Although student teaching seminars are not typically labeled as PLCs, they often share structure and format for student learning similar to those of learning communities.

The term *learning community* has been given a variety of meanings in both business and education settings (Roberts & Pruitt, 2009). Researchers have cited the

“most important” or “common” attributes of professional learning communities—shared knowledge and learning, focus on student learning, shared purpose and values, shared personal practice, reflection, and collaboration (DuFour, 2003; Hord, Roussin, & Sommers, 2010; Lenning & Ebbers, 1999; Ontario Principals’ Council, 2009; Roberts & Pruitt, 2009). Many of these characteristics are similar to those that education researchers have found important in promoting professional growth in novice teachers (Draves, 2008; Stegman, 2007; Weiss & Weiss, 2001). Because PLCs must have a “clear sense of the mission they are to accomplish and a shared vision” (DuFour, 2003, p. 15), it seems reasonable to suggest that student teaching seminars are often modeled after professional learning communities.

Through peer interaction, student teachers create a culture by developing shared values, norms, and experiences. Interaction may come in various forms, utilizing both in-person and virtual forms of communication. Although verbal reflection has been cited as an important aspect of teacher growth (Baumgartner, 2011b; Draves, 2008; Stegman, 2007), Fitzpatrick (2011) recently found Internet blogging to be an effective means of interaction for student teachers throughout the internship. The student teachers felt that communication through the blog allowed them to keep in contact between seminar meetings, promoting a greater sharing of ideas. Electronic mail, announcement or discussion boards, videoconferencing, and Internet chat rooms all are possibilities for virtual interaction among learning community members (Lewis & Allan, 2005). Employing a wide variety of communication methods in the student teaching seminar gives novice teachers opportunities to engage in reflective dialogue, share leadership tasks, establish a support system, gain new perspectives, and share ideas for professional

development through multiple avenues (Lenning & Ebberts, 1999; Lewis & Allan, 2005; Roberts & Pruitt, 2009).

Student Teacher Concerns and Perceptions of Professional Practice

Through examination of novice teachers' written and verbal reflective practice, interviews, and classroom observations, researchers have discovered many concerns novices hold about entering the teaching profession. Apprehensions increase as beginning teachers approach the student teaching internship (Campbell & Thompson, 2007). Closer examination of novice teachers' apprehensions may provide university supervisors with helpful information for guiding student teachers' development.

Teaching strategies in music. Music methods and techniques courses routinely focus on teaching and learning strategies. Although sequencing and feedback lie at the core of instruction (Duke, 2007), and are likely recurring topics in such classes, novice teachers have expressed difficulties applying these concepts in the field (Baumgartner, 2011b; Berg & Miksza, 2010; Conway, 2002; McDowell, 2007). Prior to beginning the student teaching internship, music education students have stated concerns about "keeping the flow and direction of the lesson" (McDowell, 2007, p. 53). In a study of preservice teachers' perceptions concerning their preparation for entering the teaching profession, Berg and Miksza (2010) reported similar issues in students' self-analyses of practice teaching episodes. Novices cited both the rehearsal process and reinforcement of teacher feedback as areas of concern. Findings by Goolsby (1997) revealed preservice teachers' uncertainty about instruction and feedback; more than one-third of student teachers' teaching segments did not contain either of these two elements. Although most preservice teachers are given the opportunity to practice teaching skills in field

experience and peer teaching lessons as a portion of undergraduate coursework, student teaching provides novices with more time and opportunities to refine these skills.

Copeland (1977) found that the intervention of a cooperating teacher significantly affected the student teachers' instruction. Student teachers who received feedback and suggestions from cooperating teachers exhibited significantly higher levels of teaching skills than those who did not receive intervention. For additional reinforcement, university supervisors might address these concerns in the student teaching seminar through discussions, video analysis, and other activities, enabling teachers to further refine their instructional strategies.

Novice teachers have voiced other apprehensions that stem from university coursework. Instrument pedagogy was of particular concern to some student teachers (Berg & Miksza, 2010; Conway, 2002). While students felt that they learned how to play many instruments adequately, they expressed a desire “to know more about how to teach all the instruments” (Conway, 2002, p. 29). Conway’s findings support the importance of pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) as a part of teacher preparation. Described by Shulman (1986), PCK “goes beyond knowledge of subject matter per se to the dimension of subject matter knowledge *for teaching*” (p. 9, emphasis in original). Teachers must learn to formulate and deliver subject matter in a way that makes it comprehensible to others. Simply learning how to play musical instruments does not necessarily lead preservice teachers to an understanding of pedagogy. Specific teaching strategies must be taught, connecting subject matter knowledge with instructional techniques, which might include “the most useful forms of representation of [musical] ideas, the most powerful analogies, illustrations, examples, explanations, and demonstrations” (Shulman, 1986, p.

9). Regardless of the detail in which PCK is included in university coursework, it seems important that student teachers continue to build PCK through seminar activities and application to classroom teaching experiences.

Teaching students with special needs requires another form of pedagogical content knowledge. Students at various points of their teacher preparation program have voiced special needs instruction as a concern (McDowell, 2007; Stegman, 2007).

Although these preservice teachers reported difficulties of differentiating instruction for students with special needs, they also expressed a desire to develop improved teaching strategies (McDowell, 2007). Practice teaching may serve as the most effective method for refining special needs instruction. Hourigan (2009) found experience in the field and the length of time teaching students with special needs to be positive factors in building preservice music teachers' confidence for teaching students with special needs, consistent with findings of previous studies (Kaiser & Johnson, 2000; VanWeelden & Whipple, 2005; Wilson & McCrary, 1996). Because of the length of the internship as compared with earlier field experiences, student teaching may offer novice teachers the most extensive opportunities for teaching students with special needs. Hourigan (2009) also found team teaching to have a positive affect on novices' comfort with and knowledge of special needs instruction. Having the opportunity to share experiences and teaching strategies with peers and cooperating teachers may help to diminish student teachers' apprehensions throughout the internship.

Student well-being. Fuller and Bown (1975) proposed a model of development in which teachers progress through a sequence of three stages of concern: self-survival, task-instruction, and impact-students. Despite research in music education that supports

the Fuller and Bown model for teacher development (Broyles, 1997; Stevanson, 2005; Yourn, 2000), Campbell and Thompson (2007) reported that preservice music teachers “identified impact-related issues as being of more concern than task- or self-related issues” (p. 172). Out of 45 concerns, students rated “Helping students to value music learning” and “Being able to motivate students to learn” in the top five overall concerns. One student teacher who was interviewed as part of a research study displayed high levels of concern for student well-being, focusing on student achievement and expectations, stating that he “was successful at getting them to make the connections” between new information and previously learned material (Baumgartner, 2011b, p. 15). Although Berg and Miksza (2010) reported that preservice teachers’ reflection essays indicated a high number of task-related concerns, participants also referenced student motivation and rapport as areas of focus. These research findings may indicate that beginning music teachers deviate from Fuller and Bown’s proposed “stages of concern” by focusing on students’ well-being during earlier stages of development than previously suggested.

Lesson planning and curriculum. Most teachers would agree that finding ample time to plan and prepare for class or rehearsal is difficult and time consuming. In the survey previously mentioned by Campbell and Thompson (2007), “not having sufficient time to plan” ranked in the top five responses of student teachers’ task concerns (p. 170). Because lesson planning, curriculum, standards-based instruction, and assessment were reported among the top concerns of preservice teachers and student teachers in music (Baumgartner, 2011b; Berg & Miksza, 2010; Campbell & Thompson, 2007; McDowell, 2007), student teachers should be guided toward resources that can aid in the planning

process. Conversations with cooperating teachers helped one intern to refine his lesson planning skills by “sit[ing] down at the end of every day” with his cooperating teacher to “make a lesson plan for the next time” (Baumgartner, 2011b, p.12). The guidance of a district-wide music curriculum may further help novice teachers to formulate effective and focused lesson plans. Conway and Hodgman (2006) suggested that student teachers gather district curriculum documents from their cooperating teacher and various state music frameworks for comparison. Discussing curriculum and lesson planning issues with the cooperating teacher or with peers in the student teaching seminar may provide interns with a collaborative, problem-solving experience.

Creating classroom activities that integrate meaningful assessments is essential toward evaluating both student learning and teaching effectiveness (Duke, 2007). Through reflective writings, novice teachers have written about their desire to construct lessons that incorporate meaningful assessments, drawing connections between instructional procedures and class activities (Baumgartner, 2011b; Stegman, 2007). Further evidence of preservice teachers’ concern for student learning were found by Campbell & Thompson (2007), who reported higher levels of concern for issues relating directly to student impact. “Whether each student is reaching his or her potential” and “guiding students toward intellectual, emotional, and musical growth” were among the top five overall concerns by survey respondents. These types of responses by preservice teachers may indicate that novices are thinking about how their instruction affects student achievement.

Classroom management. Many teaching skills can be identified as influential in establishing good classroom management. Developing skills in student motivation,

teacher organization, physical arrangements of materials and the classroom, managing student behavior (i.e., discipline), and pacing are some of the most frequently mentioned classroom management skills (Berg & Miksza, 2010; Copeland, 1987; McDowell, 2007; Snyder, 1998). “Careful monitoring of the total environment, including instruction and student learning” is essential in creating an atmosphere where students can learn (Snyder, 1998, p. 37). Novices have recognized the importance of classroom management, identifying it as a concern at various points throughout their teacher preparation programs (Baumgartner, 2011b; Berg & Miksza, 2010; Brand, 1982; McDowell, 2007; Poulou, 2007; Tillema, 2009). Student teaching in an environment where they can employ various methods of behavior management techniques may prove beneficial for novice teachers when determining appropriate strategies for different age levels. While some studies reported no significant effect of cooperating teachers on student teachers’ classroom management beliefs (Brand 1982; Snyder, 1996), other studies have suggested that collaboration with an experienced teacher can be influential on novices’ management techniques (Baumgartner, 2011b; Draves, 2008).

The skills needed to effectively manage a music class appear to be directly related to teachers’ abilities in other areas. Preservice teachers referenced experience, poor pacing, student motivation, and teacher enthusiasm as factors that they believed influenced their own ability to control the classroom (Baumgartner, 2011b; Berg & Miksza, 2010; Bergee, 2002; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009). The cooperating teacher is expected to provide primary leadership in the development of such behavior management techniques by student teachers (Brand, 1982). This may influence the student teacher positively by providing opportunities to practice and discuss making the transition from

student to classroom teacher. Practice teaching was reported to significantly affect novice teachers' self-efficacy measures related to classroom management techniques (Bergee, 2002), supporting the need for cooperating teacher intervention throughout the internship. Guiding student teachers to develop strategies for improved instructional skills seems important in improving classroom management abilities in novice teachers.

Establishing a good rapport with students is a recurring focus of attention among novice teachers. Building a professional relationship based on respect was viewed as an important step in establishing a well-managed classroom (Baumgartner, 2011b; Berg & Lind, 2003; Berg & Miksza, 2010; Hart, 2003; Marks, 2002). Although a lack of rapport may be more evident at the beginning of the student teaching internship when the intern is new to the environment (Baumgartner, 2011b), relationships can be developed over time. Simply being in the classroom allowed preservice teachers to build rapport with students, regardless of their time spent instructing the class (Berg & Lind, 2003). College professors appear to recognize the importance of teachers establishing rapport with students, citing interpersonal relationships as necessary toward teaching competence (Forsythe, Kinney, & Braun, 2007). Based on the professional literature, developing a positive rapport with students begins for the novice teacher in early field experiences and should continue through the student teaching internship.

Copeland (1987) discussed the necessary management skills for establishing an organized, well-behaved classroom. Although teacher intuition—"the proverbial 'eyes in the back of the head'" (Copeland, 1987, p. 220)—has been cited as an important trait among teachers (Kounin, 1970), there appear to be other helpful skills that novice teachers can develop over time. In what Kounin refers to as "overlap," teachers are

expected to multitask. Correcting one student's behavior and simultaneously observing another, both while teaching a group lesson, requires the teacher to divide attention among multiple activities in the classroom. Doing so allows the teacher to address small issues as they appear, preventing minor instances of unacceptable behavior from becoming large classroom management problems (Copeland, 1987). Cooperating teachers and university professors can help student teachers to improve their classroom management abilities through the development of instructional and organizational skills.

Extra-musical concerns. Extra-musical responsibilities, while not directly related to instruction, are an inevitable part of every music teacher's job (Conway, 2002). Novices and mentors alike believe that beginning teachers are unprepared to deal with many of the extra-musical duties assigned to teachers (Baumgartner, 2011b; Conway, 2002). Music methods course curricula often cover responsibilities such as parent booster programs, budgeting, travel, advocacy, and other extra-musical duties related to music teaching (Hewitt & Koner, 2011). Despite course instruction, these concepts do not always transfer to the K–12 classroom. Student teachers have cited difficulties with multiple supervision duties, extra responsibilities, completing paperwork, traveling, and working with administrators (Baumgartner, 2011b; Bullough & Draper, 2004; Conkling & Henry, 1999; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009). Teacher mentors and administrators have called for better preparation in these areas by universities (Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Conway, 2002), although most teachers agree that many of these tasks are best learned “on the job” (Baumgartner, 2011b; Haston & Leon-Guerrero, 2008).

Summary. The student teaching internship represents the most realistic setting in which music education students can refine their teaching skills prior to entering the

profession. With the number of concerns cited by preservice and student teachers, it seems imperative that teacher preparation programs address these concerns throughout the internship process. A university-sponsored seminar may provide the best setting for instructors, mentors, and peers to share ideas and collaborate in an attempt to diminish the anxiety often found in beginning teachers. While it is understood that most colleges and universities offer a course that coincides with the student teaching internship, there is scant research detailing the structure and content of these seminars. Before attempting to determine efficacy of various structures and curricula, music educators must first acquire a basic understanding of current practices in student teaching seminar instruction.

CHAPTER THREE

Methodology

This study was designed to investigate the structure and content of music student teaching seminars. Previous research involving music student teaching exists primarily in the areas of student teacher reflection, assessment, and the concerns of student teachers and cooperating teachers. The present study was intended to advance music teacher preparation by investigating the structure of music student teaching seminars, and to inform educators, administrators, and researchers about the current practices in seminar instruction. I also examined how student teacher and cooperating teacher concerns were being addressed through various activities in university-sponsored student teaching seminars.

The purpose of this study was to provide researchers and educators with information about the structure and content of music student teaching seminars by gathering baseline data regarding current practices. Because there were no specifications concerning student teaching seminars outlined by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), an investigation of current practices seemed warranted. The findings of this study may provide educators with ideas that may be applied to the structure, content, and activities of their own seminar courses. The investigation targeted seminars from colleges and universities that (a) were accredited by NASM, (b) were four-year degree granting institutions, (c) offered a bachelors degree in music education, and (d) were located in Missouri or one of its eight contiguous states. A secondary purpose was to determine how music student teaching seminars addressed the perceived needs of student

teachers, as identified in the research literature, to determine if those needs are being met through the contents and structure of the student teaching seminars.

Research Design

This research study was descriptive, consisting of an author-designed survey instrument. An online electronic survey was chosen due to the feasibility of gathering information from a population spread across a large regional area (Fink, 2009). Although mixed findings have been reported regarding the effects of electronic versus paper surveys (Miksza, Roeder, & Biggs, 2010), “it seems that e-survey methods potentially may yield more complete and detailed information than paper survey methods” (p. 368). The online survey allowed me to send reminders easily to the respondents and provided the ability to download data directly to an electronic database for analysis. The online survey tool also allowed participants to upload electronic files for subsequent examination.

When asked to share supporting documents (e.g., syllabi, assignments, classroom activities, etc.) from the music student teaching seminar, only five instructors uploaded materials using the survey system’s “File Upload” tool. All five documents were course syllabi that included a calendar of events, project descriptions, and important internship information. Due to the small response rate of supporting documents (11.1%), no generalizations concerning seminar structure or content could be made from examining these materials and thus, they were not analyzed.

Participants

The primary goal of this study was to determine the structure and content of music student teaching seminars that take place during the student teaching internship. In

an attempt to generalize the findings, colleges and universities accredited by NASM were selected for examination because of their similarities in teaching standards, learning goals, and curriculum. Furthermore, selection was limited to Missouri and its contiguous states (Arkansas, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Nebraska, Oklahoma, and Tennessee) in order to compare schools of similar location and culture.

Using the NASM online database (NASM, 2011), I searched for accredited institutions that (a) were listed as public or private, (b) were listed as degree-granting institutions, and (c) were located in each of the nine states representing the aforementioned Midwest region (NASM, 2011). Only institutions offering undergraduate degrees in music education were included. Search results returned the name of the institution, contact information of the department chair, and the Internet address for each accredited school of music. Using the listed web address, I searched each music school's website to determine the faculty member responsible for music student teacher internships. When no specific information was listed, I contacted a faculty member listed in the music education area of the school website, or the department chair designated by the NASM database. I recorded the faculty member's name, institution, teaching position, and email address in an electronic database for ease of sending electronic mail invitations. From the total number of music education professors surveyed ($N = 122$), 47 participants responded to the online survey. Two respondents did not complete the survey, resulting in 45 usable responses and a response rate of 36.9%. Although the usable response rate was relatively low, I determined that it was acceptable because the distribution of response rates among the nine states was relatively even, and thus the within-state response rate was representative of the total usable response rate. There was

one exception, however—a considerably higher number of responses were submitted from institutions in Iowa (80.0%) as compared to the other eight states, and thus Iowa is over-represented in this sample. Table 1 lists the response frequencies and percentages for each of the nine states surveyed.

Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages of Survey Responses by State (N = 122)

State	Number of Surveys Sent	Useable Surveys Returned		Overall % of Total
		<i>N</i>	% of state	
Illinois	21	8	38.1	17.8
Iowa	10	8	80.0	17.8
Missouri	17	6	35.3	13.3
Tennessee	18	6	33.3	13.3
Arkansas	11	5	45.5	11.1
Kansas	14	4	28.6	8.9
Kentucky	10	3	30.0	6.7
Oklahoma	14	3	21.4	6.7
Nebraska	7	2	28.6	4.4
Total	122	45	N/A	100.0

Survey Instrument

Because this study examined the current practices in music student teaching seminars across a large number of institutions, a cross-sectional survey design was utilized to gather data (Fink, 2009). A researcher-designed survey was developed based

upon (a) student teacher and cooperating teacher concerns found in the professional literature, (b) suggestions from professionals in the field of music teacher education who served as pilot survey participants, (c) a similar study by Hewitt and Koner (2011) that investigated the content of instrumental music methods courses, and (d) my own experiences leading a music student teaching seminar. Data were collected using an electronic web-based survey instrument accessible through the University of Missouri (Qualtrics Lab, Inc., 2011). This version was chosen because of convenience and its availability to faculty and graduate student researchers in the College of Education.

Student teaching internship. The survey was organized in four sections that included both quantitative (e.g., closed/guided response) and qualitative (e.g., open-ended response) questions (see Appendix A for the complete survey). In the first section, I sought to gather data pertaining to the institution of the respondent and the student teaching internship. In survey item 1, I asked participants to select the state in which the institution was located. Responses to this item allowed me to determine that the usable response rate was acceptable and representative of the population (Midwestern universities).

Because NASM accredited institutions varied in size, I asked respondents to indicate the average number of students enrolled in student teaching during both the fall and spring semesters (survey items 2 and 3) and the length of the student teaching internship (survey item 4). Respondents were prompted with a text entry box to indicate the average number of students enrolled. Participants selected the internship length from a list of weeks ranging from 1–32. Data from these questions allowed me to determine the similarity of internship structures among Midwestern institutions.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not the institution prescribed a limit for the distance of student teaching placements from the college/university campus (survey item 5). If “Yes” was selected, respondents were directed to survey item 6 to provide the number of miles from campus student teachers could be placed. Placement information was compared to the methods of attendance accepted by instructors for seminar meetings (e.g., in-person or video conferencing), highlighting differences in seminar structures (Research Question 1a).

Survey item 7 was designed in an attempt to determine who makes formal observations of the student teacher. Researchers have reported power struggles between university faculty and cooperating teachers (Bowles & Runnels, 1998; Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Bullough & Draper, 2004; Slick, 1997; Slick, 1998a; Slick 1998b), especially when determining evaluation responsibilities of the student teacher (Borko & Mayfield, 1995). Respondents were given a list of possible observers from which to choose, selecting all that applied:

- Student teaching seminar instructor
- Other music education faculty
- Music education graduate students
- Adjunct staff (non-terminal degree)
- Other (please specify)
- Unsure

In survey item 7—and each subsequent survey item that listed “other”—a text box was provided in which respondents could provide additional information when an appropriate choice was not listed.

Student teaching seminar structure. Section two of the survey focused on the structure of the music student teaching seminar. Researchers have suggested that student teachers benefit from joint problem-solving activities (Zeichner & Liston, 1987) and guided reflective practice throughout the internship (Stegman, 2007). Therefore, it seemed important to determine the existence and frequency of seminar meetings. In survey item 8, respondents indicated whether or not the institution offered a seminar course that coincided with the student teaching internship. If “No” was selected, they were directed to the end of the questionnaire. If “Yes” was selected, respondents continued by indicating how often the seminar met throughout the internship (survey item 9), selecting all that applied from the following responses:

- Once a month
- Twice per month
- Once a week
- Daily (prior to the internship)
- Other (please specify)

Because no respondents selected “Daily (prior to the internship),” survey item 10—which was designed to collect the number of days seminars met prior to the internship—received no responses.

In survey item 11, I asked, “What is the average length of your seminar meetings?” A range of 1 through 9 hours, including half-hour increments, was provided for respondents to indicate the length of seminar meetings.

Respondents continued to provide information pertaining to the structure of seminar meetings in survey items 12 through 16, which I based on my own experiences

leading the seminar. I included survey item 12 in an attempt to determine the types of seminar meeting locations among the participating institutions. Respondents were asked to select a meeting location from the following choices:

- On-Campus classroom/meeting room
- Off-Campus private location (e.g., school, meeting room, etc.)
- Off-Campus public location (e.g., restaurant, coffee shop, etc.)
- Virtual meeting (i.e., Internet conferencing)
- Hybrid (mix of face-to-face and virtual meetings)

In survey item 13, I asked, “If the student teachers are unable to attend in person, what methods of attendance are used for the seminar (check all that apply)?” Respondents chose from (a) teleconferencing, (b) Internet video conferencing, (c) other (please specify), and (d) none.

Because researchers have cited concerns specific to student teachers in music (Baumgartner, 2011b; Berg & Miksza, 2010; Campbell & Thompson, 2007; McDowell, 2005), I attempted to determine the percentage of seminars designed solely for music education majors versus those designed for various specializations. In survey item 14, respondents indicated the demographic of seminar participants: (a) all music education majors, (b) education majors of various specialization, or (c) other (please specify).

Respondents indicated whether or not music student teachers were required to attend seminar meetings (survey item 15) and if interns received a grade for the seminar that was separate from the student teaching internship (survey item 16), choosing either “Yes” or “No” for each of the two prompts.

Student teaching seminar instructor. The third section of the survey focused on data pertaining to the seminar instructor. Music education researchers have reported that rank, experience, and education vary among university personnel involved in student teaching supervision (Borko & Mayfield, 1995; McIntyre, Byrd, & Foxx, 1996; Slick, 1998a; Slick, 1998b). In survey item 17, I asked, “What is the current rank of the seminar instructor?” Respondents chose from the following selections:

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Instructor/Lecturer
- Graduate student
- Other (please specify)
- Unsure

Respondents indicated the highest degree earned by seminar instructors (survey item 18)

by choosing from the following:

- Doctorate
- Certificate
- Masters
- Bachelors
- Associates
- Unsure

Survey item 19 was designed to determine the area in which the highest degree of the seminar instructor was earned. Respondents chose from (a) music education, (b)

applied music, (c) conducting, (d) other (please specify), or (e) unsure. I then asked respondents to select the seminar instructor's level of public school teaching experience from a list ranging from 1 to 40+ years (survey item 20). In survey item 21, respondents were asked to select the primary teaching area of the seminar instructor from the following choices:

- Education
- Music education
- Music performance
- Large ensembles/conducting
- Music theory/composition
- Music history
- Graduate student
- Other (please specify)
- Unsure

To conclude the section of questions pertaining to the structure of the seminar, respondents were given an open-response prompt to provide “any other information that...is important in understanding the structure of the student teaching internship or seminar” (survey item 22).

Student teaching seminar content. In the fourth section, I asked respondents to provide information regarding the content of their institution's music student teaching seminar. Based on the limited number of music student teaching textbooks/handbooks that are currently published, I asked respondents if there was a required text for the music

student teaching seminar (survey item 23). If “Yes” was selected, instructors were directed to survey item 24 to provide the title, author, and edition of the required text.

Survey item 25 was designed to determine the inclusion of an introductory orientation prior to the internship. If “Yes” was selected, respondents indicated who was required to attend the orientation (survey item 26) by selecting all that applied from the provided list:

- Student teacher
- Cooperating teacher
- University supervisor
- Seminar instructor
- School administration
- Other (please specify)

The concerns of music student teachers and cooperating teachers were of primary concern in this study (Research Question 2). In an attempt to determine how these concerns are addressed in the music student teaching seminar, I organized individual topics and concerns—those found in existing music education research and from my own experiences supervising music student teachers—into eight topic areas:

- Internship-specific topics
- Classroom management topics
- Curriculum topics
- Instructional strategies
- Topics from university coursework
- Student needs

- Administrative topics
- Employment topics

Each of the eight topic areas included three to nine individual items (see Appendix A for the complete survey). I asked seminar instructors to indicate to what extent they addressed each topic area item by responding to a four-point, Likert-type scale: 4 (a lot), 3 (somewhat), 2 (very little), and 1 (not at all). I chose a four-point scale to obviate a neutral response and create a forced choice between extensively addressed and not at all. After rating items from each of the eight topic areas, an open-ended prompt was provided for respondents to “list and describe topics not included in the previous topic areas” that were covered in the seminar course (survey item 35).

I also attempted to determine if the activities included in music student teaching seminars address the concerns of student teachers and cooperating teachers (Research Question 2a). In survey item 36, I asked instructors, “Which activities or assignments do you include in the music student teaching seminar (check all that apply)?” and provided the following list:

- Reading/Discussing music teaching articles
- Article reviews
- Compose a philosophy of teaching
- Creating lesson plans
- Viewing/Discussing intern teaching videos
- Analyzing intern teaching videos
- Constructing a résumé and cover letter
- Conducting mock interviews

- Daily/Weekly written reflection journals
- Written teaching reflections
- On-line discussion boards/web-logs
- Peer group discussions
- Portfolios/e-Portfolios
- Sharing student teacher artifacts (lessons, unit plans, materials, etc.)
- Guest speakers
- Other (please specify)
- None

Based on extant research concerning student teacher assessment (Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Raths & Lyman, 2003; Tillema, 2009), and specifically, the use of professional portfolios (Berg, 1997; Borko, Michalec, Timmons, & Siddle, 1997; Draves, 2009; Dutt, Tallerico, & Kayler, 1997; Rogers, 1995), I asked respondents to indicate which type of culminating project was included in the seminar course (survey item 37).

Instructors selected all that applied from the following choices:

- Hard-copy portfolio
- Electronic portfolio
- Teacher work sample
- Synthesis project/paper
- Other (please specify)
- None

In the final open-ended response prompt, I asked instructors if there was anything else they felt was important in understanding the content of the music student teaching seminar (survey item 38).

In survey item 39, respondents were encouraged to upload any supporting documents (e.g., syllabi, assignments, classroom activities) that they felt comfortable sharing. The last survey item served as a “thank you” to instructors for participating in the project and provided them with an email address to which they could send a message to receive a summary of the results.

Pilot Testing

The survey instrument was pilot tested by five music education professors outside the population area designated for this study. Pilot participants all had prior experience advising student teachers and/or leading the music student teaching seminar at their institutions. Each was provided with the web address of the online survey. Pilot study participants were asked to report the amount of time required to complete the survey and make suggestions to improve both the content and clarity of the questionnaire. Revisions to the final survey instrument were made based on feedback received from the pilot study participants.

Validity

Content validity of the survey instrument was established in two ways: (a) information reported in the research literature pertaining to the structure and content of seminar courses and professional learning communities, and extant literature documenting the concerns expressed by student teachers and cooperating teachers, provided a basis for questions related to seminar structure and content; and (b) pilot study

participants all had experience supervising music student teachers or leading the student teaching seminar. Because of their expertise in the music student teaching internship, the feedback they provided about the structure and content of the survey helped to establish validity of the survey instrument.

Procedures

Prior to distributing the survey, I submitted the participant invitation letter, an informed consent letter, and the survey instrument to the university's Internal Review Board (IRB) for approval (see Appendix B). In both the invitation letter and the informed consent letter, participants were assured that all reported data would remain confidential when any findings were presented. The informed consent letter (see Appendix C) 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. All three documents were approved by the campus IRB and prepared for electronic distribution.

An electronic mail message was sent to each potential participant inviting him or her to participate in the study. The message explained the purpose of the research, the minimal risks involved, the protection of their personal and institutional information, and included a 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. This process minimized the chance that invitations would be routed to participants' junk mail as a mass-message list. A copy of the email invitation can be found in Appendix D.

The online survey remained available to participants for four weeks. Two weeks after the initial invitation to participate, a follow-up message was sent as a reminder to

participate within the next two weeks (see Appendix E). A final reminder was delivered seven days prior to the closing of the survey (see Appendix F). Reminder messages were sent to all potential participants because the online survey system did not track individual survey responses; there way no was to determine who had responded to the survey. Course documents that were returned by the participants were printed and kept in a secure location for confidentiality purposes.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the collected data of closed-response questions with respect to frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. The online survey program provided these calculations for some of the survey item responses, but this information was not sufficient for interpreting the results of the study. I exported the survey responses 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, I calculated percentages for responses to each Likert-type scale item in questions 27 through 34. Because respondents were given the opportunity to provide additional information when selecting “other” in many of the closed-response items, text responses were categorized in order to present meaningful data. For example, if a respondent checked “other” in survey item 7 and typed “cooperating teacher” in the text box, a new category was created and the frequency of that response was calculated. Additionally, 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” (American Psychological Association, 2010).

Open-ended responses were analyzed using a three-part procedure for examining qualitative analysis methods—assigning codes, combining codes into themes, and displaying the data (Creswell, 2007). I used keyword coding to determine categories that emerged from the written responses rather than assigning predetermined codes to the data. I looked for aspects of participant responses that related to the research questions when generating codes for each survey item; the number of codes varied for each of the three open-ended response items. Once keyword codes were determined, I combined the codes into larger categories for data presentation. I included interpretations of and quotations from participant responses in the presentation of the findings so as to provide a rich description of each emergent category. In order to establish reliability, another doctoral student in music education, who had experience analyzing qualitative research data, reviewed responses to the three open-ended survey items. I provided this person with all participant responses, including a list of codes that emerged from each survey item; the doctoral student then assigned codes to the data using the provided list. Our percentage of agreements was 79.5% after comparing our assigned codes. We then discussed coded differences until we achieved 100% agreement.

CHAPTER FOUR

Results

The primary purpose of this study was to provide researchers and educators with information about the structure and content of music student teaching seminars by gathering baseline data regarding current practices. I investigated seminars from colleges and universities that (a) were accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), (b) were four-year degree granting institutions, (c) offered a bachelors degree in music education, and (d) were located in Missouri or one of its eight contiguous states. A secondary purpose was to determine how music student teaching seminars addressed the needs of student teachers, as identified in the research literature. Music education professors from 122 institutions were contacted to participate in the study. The response rate of usable surveys was 36.89% ($N = 45$).

Structure of Music Student Teaching Seminars

The first section of the survey was designed to collect demographic information about the student teaching internship and the music student teaching seminar. This section addressed Research Question 1, “What are the characteristics of university-sponsored seminars offered to music student teachers?” In survey item 1, respondents indicated the state in which their institution is located. Response frequencies and percentages were previously reported in Chapter 3.

Student teaching internship. The next seven survey items were created to determine the structure of the student teaching internship and were answered by all 45 respondents, unless otherwise noted. In survey items 2 and 3, respondents indicated the

number of music students enrolled in student teaching during the fall and spring semesters at their respective institutions. Average enrollment in the spring semester was 7.20 students ($SD = 5.21$), slightly higher than the mean number of students reported for fall semester ($M = 5.31$, $SD = 3.98$). One institution accounted for the highest individual enrollments for both fall and spring semesters, 15 and 30 respectively. Four respondents reported zero music student teachers during the fall semester and two reported none for the spring term. In an open-response item found later in the survey, one respondent reported that the institution utilized a tri-term schedule in which student teaching only occurred during fall and winter terms, not spring.

Length of the student teaching internship varied from 10 to 18 weeks among the 45 institutions. Although 16 weeks was the most common response (42.2%), 12-, 14-, and 15-week internships accounted for another 48.9%, representing 91.1% of all responses. Internships of 10, 11, 17, and 18 weeks also were reported (see Table 2).

Table 2

Frequencies and Percentages of Length of Student Teaching Internship

Weeks	Response Frequency	%
10	1	2.2
11	1	2.2
12	7	15.6
13	0	0.0
14	6	13.3
15	9	20.0
16	19	42.2
17	1	2.2
18	1	2.2
Total	45	100.0

Survey item five addressed distance limitations for student teaching placements. Forty-three instructors responded, 23 (53.5%) of which indicated no distance limit from the college/university campus for placing student teachers. The 20 respondents who did report a distance limit (46.5%) were directed to survey item six to report the number of miles student teachers were allowed to be placed from campus. Nineteen respondents provided information, with 60 miles being the most common distance ($n = 5$). A majority ($n = 13$, 68.4%) reported a distance limitation of 60 miles or less. Distance limitations, frequencies, and percentages are reported in Table 3.

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages of Distance of Student Teaching Placement from College/University Campus

Miles	Response Frequency	%
15	1	5.3
30	1	5.3
40	2	10.5
45	1	5.3
50	3	15.8
60	5	26.3
71	1	5.3
80	1	5.3
90	1	5.3
100	1	5.3
150	1	5.3
200	1	5.3
Total	19	100.3

Note: Total exceeds 100.0% due to rounding.

Respondents were asked to indicate all university personnel who make formal observations of music student teachers during the internship. Student teaching seminar instructors (75.6%) and other music education faculty (73.3%) were the most frequently

cited. In addition to observations by the student teaching seminar instructor, one respondent listed videotaped observations as a method of formal observation used, but did not indicate who viewed the recordings. Table 4 lists the frequencies and percentages of all responses to survey item 7.

Table 4

Frequencies and Percentages of Faculty/Staff Who Make Formal Observations During the Internship

Observer	Response Frequency	%
Student teaching seminar instructor	34	75.6
Other music education faculty	33	73.3
Adjunct staff (non-terminal degree)	10	22.2
Music education graduate student	4	8.9
Retired teacher	3	6.7
Cooperating teacher	2	4.4
Teacher education faculty	2	4.4
Videotaped observations	1	2.2

Student teaching seminar structure. Survey items 8 through 22 were designed to answer the first sub-question of Research Question 1, “What are the different structures of music student teaching seminars?” In survey item 8, respondents reported whether or not a seminar course is offered during the student teaching internship. Five respondents (11.1%) indicated their institution did not offer a seminar and they were subsequently directed to the final open-response item (survey item 38). The remainder of the survey data is based on the 40 respondents (88.9%) who indicated there was a student teaching seminar at their institution. One of these 40 respondents indicated that, while aware that the institution offered a seminar course, he/she was not the seminar instructor

and could not provide enough information to accurately answer all of the remaining questions. Any responses based on fewer than 40 responses were noted.

The frequency of seminar meetings throughout the internship was determined by responses to survey item 9. Weekly meetings represented the most frequently reported seminar structure (30.8%). One respondent indicated that student teachers also “have three weeks of seminars during the semester [in addition to weekly meetings], two before and one between their two sites.” Another respondent reported three group seminar meetings, as well as 15 extra hours at the discretion of the supervisor. This respondent did not indicate whether the supplemental hours were group or individual meetings. A respondent who reported two meetings throughout the internship added that the music student teachers also were required to submit weekly journal entries electronically. No respondents reported seminar meetings that occurred solely before the internship. See Table 5 for response frequencies and percentages of the number of seminar meetings throughout the student teaching term.

Table 5

Frequencies and Percentages of the Number of Student Teaching Seminar Meetings Throughout the Internship

Frequency	Response Frequency	%
Once a week	12	30.8
Once a month	11	28.2
Twice per month	9	23.1
Three times	5	12.8
Two times	2	5.1
Total	39	100.0

A majority of respondents ($n = 25$, 62.5%) indicated in survey item 11 that their student teaching seminar meetings ranged from one to two hours in length; 19 of these seminars met weekly ($n = 11$) or biweekly ($n = 8$). The remaining respondents ($n = 15$, 37.5%) reported that their seminars met less frequently (e.g., monthly or 2 to 3 times throughout the internship) and for longer periods of time. These less frequent meetings ranged from five to eight hours hour in length. The four institutions that hosted six-hour meetings reported the greatest variance in meeting frequency: once per month ($n = 1$), two times during the internship ($n = 1$), and three times during the internship ($n = 2$). Table 6 displays the frequencies and percentages of seminar meeting length.

Table 6

Frequencies and Percentages of Length of Student Teaching Seminar Meetings

Hours	Response Frequency	%
1	10	25.0
1.5	7	17.5
2	8	20.0
2.5	1	2.5
3	1	2.5
4	3	7.5
4.5	1	2.5
5	2	5.0
6	4	10.0
6.5	1	2.5
7	1	2.5
8	1	2.5
Total	40	100.0

Survey item 12 was used to determine the location of student teaching seminar meetings. Ninety-percent ($n = 36$) of seminar courses were reported as face-to-face meetings, held in campus classrooms or meeting rooms. Two respondents (5.0%)

indicated face-to-face meetings were held at off-campus sites—one in a private location, and the other in a public location. Although no instructors reported using only virtual meetings (i.e., Internet video conferencing), two respondents (5.0%) indicated they utilized a mix of face-to-face and virtual meetings.

All but one respondent reported that attendance at seminar meetings was mandatory for student teachers, representing 97.5% of the 40 responses to survey item 15. When asked what attendance methods are used when interns could not appear in person (survey item 13), 50.0% of responding instructors cited no alternative. Three of the 18 respondents that selected “other” as an alternative attendance method used the text response to reiterate that seminar attendance was mandatory. Of those that did allow an alternative to in-person attendance, Internet video conferencing, teleconferencing, and individual appointments were listed as the most common attendance methods. Table 7 displays the frequencies and percentages of response for each of the alternative attendance methods to student teaching seminar meetings.

Table 7

Frequencies and Percentages of Alternative Attendance Methods to Student Teaching Seminar Meetings (N = 36)

Method	Response Frequency	%
None	18	50.0
Internet video conference	6	16.7
Teleconference	3	8.3
Individual appointment	3	8.3
Substitute/Make-up assignment	2	5.6
Weekly reflection	1	2.8
Independent study	1	2.8
Take prior to internship	1	2.8
Don't know	1	2.8
Total	36	100.0

Thirty-nine respondents completed survey item 16, providing information on the grading structure of student teaching seminars. The majority of respondents ($n = 23$, 59.0%) indicated that interns did not receive a grade for the seminar that was separate from the student teaching internship. The remaining 41.0% ($n = 16$) reported that their institution did record a separate grade for the seminar course.

Survey item 14 was intended to gather information regarding the demographics of student teachers enrolled in the seminar. Most respondents ($n = 19$, 47.5%) reported that seminars comprised students seeking education degrees of various specializations, while 17 institutions (42.5%) offered a seminar specifically for music education majors. Four respondents (10.0%) specified that their teacher preparation programs provided a seminar for all education students, but that they included separate meetings for music education majors (in addition to the general education seminar).

Student teaching seminar instructor. Survey items 17 through 21 were designed to answer the second sub-question of Research Question 1, “Who instructs the music student teaching seminar?” Most seminar instructors ($n = 32$, 82.1%) held a rank of full, associate, or assistant professor, as reported in survey item 17. Table 8 displays the frequencies and percentages of seminar instructor ranks.

Table 8

Frequencies and Percentages of Academic Rank of the Student Teaching Seminar Instructor

Rank	Response Frequency	%
Professor	9	23.1
Associate Professor	12	30.8
Assistant Professor	11	28.2
Instructor/Lecturer	3	7.7
Unsure	2	5.1
Various faculty	1	2.6
Graduate student	1	2.6
Total	39	100.0

Seventy percent of seminar instructors ($n = 28$) reported holding a doctorate as the highest degree. The only other degree listed in survey item 18 as the highest earned by seminar instructors was a master's ($n = 10$, 25.0%). Two respondents were unsure of the highest degree earned by their institutions' instructors. Respondents were then asked to list the area in which the seminar instructor earned their highest degree (survey item 19). The most frequent response was music education ($n = 25$, 62.5%) followed by general education ($n = 9$, 22.5%). See Table 9 for frequencies and percentages of the area of highest degrees earned by seminar instructors.

Table 9

Frequencies and Percentages of Area of the Highest Degree Earned by Student Teaching Seminar Instructors

Specialization	Response Frequency	%
Music education	25	62.5
Education	9	22.5
Unsure	3	7.5
Conducting	1	2.5
Music composition	1	2.5
Other	1	2.5
Total	40	100.0

Although music education was reported as the area in which most seminar instructors earned their highest degree ($n = 25$, 62.5%), only 53.6% ($n = 21$) taught primarily in that area. Fourteen respondents (35.9%) listed education as their primary teaching area, although only nine (22.5%) cited education as the specialization of their highest degree. Frequencies and percentages of primary teaching areas of student teaching seminar instructors (survey item 21) are reported in Table 10.

Table 10

Frequencies and Percentages of the Primary Teaching Area of Student Teaching Seminar Instructors

Area	Response Frequency	%
Music education	21	53.6
Education	14	35.9
Multiple areas in music	2	5.1
Large ensembles/conducting	1	2.7
Graduate student	1	2.7
Total	39	100.0

I determined student teaching seminar instructors' years of public school teaching experience through responses to survey item 20. Thirty-six respondents provided information on instructor experience, ranging from 2 to 40 years ($M = 13.11$, $SD = 9.41$). The most frequent response was 20 years ($n = 5$).

Internship and seminar structure conclusion. To conclude the section of the survey designed to collect demographic information about the student teaching internship and the music student teaching seminar, I asked respondents to provide any other information they believed was important in understanding the structure of the student teaching seminar at their institution (survey item 22). Responses to the open-ended question seemed to elaborate on many of the previous survey items. After coding the 22 responses (see Appendix G), I categorized the data into one of three topics: (a) seminar structure, (b) seminar content/activities, or (c) structure of the student teaching internship.

The majority of responses in the category of seminar structure ($n = 10$) focused on the department that administrated the seminar. Although nine instructors indicated that the college/department of education oversaw student teaching seminars, five indicated that music student teachers met with music education specialists in addition to the general education seminar. One respondent described separate seminars for vocal/keyboard and instrumental majors, each seminar led by the respective music education specialist. Information regarding the seminar instructor ($n = 3$) and meeting time/frequency ($n = 4$) also was mentioned in instructor responses. Another respondent clarified how the seminars are structured, indicating five on-campus meetings and online weblog discussions that occurred twice per week throughout the internship. Although this level of detail exemplified the majority of free responses, one music educator stated that he/she

was “guessing as to the frequency and duration” of seminar meetings because the course is taught through the college of education. The same respondent was also unsure of the background of the seminar instructors.

Two respondents provided information about the content of and activities included in music student teaching seminars. Guest speakers were mentioned by both respondents, one of whom stated, “Typically, it is an administrator (principal or superintendent).” The other respondent indicated that the general education seminar, which represented half of the student teachers’ seminar time, often included “special topics and guest speakers.” Only two respondents provided information regarding seminar content, perhaps because the survey item asked respondents to focus on the structure of the seminar.

Structure of the student teaching internship was a frequent topic of instructor responses ($n = 10$). Four instructors addressed the length of teaching placements, each providing varying timelines for the internship (e.g., trimester configuration, the student’s choice of a semester or year-long internship, and programs that were undergoing drastic curriculum changes). Two respondents, both of whom indicated that there was no real limit, clarified distance of placements from the college/university campus. One of the two respondents reported that, while the distance limit was of the department’s choosing, students “normally won’t go farther than...about 200 miles.” Respondents wrote that music faculty members made formal observations of student teachers most frequently ($n = 7$). Three of these seven indicated that observation was the extent of their personal role in the student teaching internship. Two respondents stated that the student teaching

placement was divided evenly between two different levels (e.g., elementary and secondary).

Music Student Teaching Seminar Content

The second section of the survey was designed to collect information regarding the content of music student teaching seminars (Research Question 1): “What are the characteristics of university-sponsored seminars offered to music student teachers?” Sub-questions pertaining to seminar content included (a) “What topics are covered in music student teaching seminars?” and (b) “What types of activities are included as a portion of the seminar course?”

Survey items 23 and 24 collected data about the use of required textbooks for the music student teaching seminar. Five respondents indicated a required text, three of which provided reference information for those texts: *Introduction to Music Education*, 3rd ed. (C. Hoffer); *A Field Guide to Student Teaching in Music* (A. Clements & R. Klinger); and *Student Teacher Handbook* (Anonymous).

Survey item 25 was designed to determine the number of institutions that hosted an introductory meeting prior to the student teaching internship. Thirty-three of 40 respondents (82.5%) confirmed an internship orientation. Student teachers were expected to attend in each case; however, only 21.2% ($n = 7$) of the institutions that hosted an orientation required the cooperating teacher to attend the session. Table 11 displays the response frequencies and percentages of those required to attend a student teaching orientation meeting; respondents indicated all that applied.

Table 11

Frequencies and Percentages of Persons Required to Attend Student Teaching Orientation (N = 33)

Internship Participants	Response Frequency	%
Student teacher	33	100.0
Seminar instructor	14	42.4
University supervisor	13	39.4
Cooperating teacher	7	21.2

Topic areas. Survey items 27 through 34 were designed to determine the extent to which specific content areas were addressed in the music student teaching seminar. Each of the eight survey items included individual topics related to the content area. Instructors indicated the extent to which each topic was covered in the student teaching seminar by responding to a 4-point Likert-type scale: a lot (4), somewhat (3), very little (2), or not at all (1). Frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations were calculated for each topic in the eight content areas.

Internship-specific topics. “Student teacher responsibilities” was the highest rated of all internship-specific topics ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 0.31$) and reported to be addressed “a lot” by 89.7% of respondents. Although “cooperating teacher relationships” received the second-highest mean response ($M = 3.74$, $SD = 0.44$), “student teacher preparedness” was addressed “a lot” by a higher percentage of instructors (76.3%). Responses indicated that each of the six individual topics was addressed “somewhat” or “a lot” by most seminar instructors; only three topics received ratings less than “somewhat.” See Table 12 for the complete set of descriptive statistics.

Table 12

Frequencies, Percentages, Numbers of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Internship-Specific Topics Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars

Internship-Specific Topic	1 (Not at All)	2 (Very Little)	3 (Somewhat)	4 (A Lot)	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Student teacher responsibilities	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (10.3%)	35 (89.7%)	39	3.90	0.31
Cooperating teacher relationships	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	10 (25.6%)	29 (74.4%)	39	3.74	0.44
Student teacher preparedness	0 (0.0%)	2 (5.3%)	7 (18.4%)	29 (76.3%)	38	3.71	0.57
Assessment of the student teacher	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	12 (30.8%)	27 (69.2%)	39	3.69	0.47
Transition to student teaching	0 (0.0%)	4 (10.3%)	15 (38.5%)	20 (51.3%)	39	3.41	0.68
Student teacher motivation	0 (0.0%)	6 (15.4%)	15 (38.5%)	18 (46.2%)	39	3.31	0.73

Classroom management topics. “Behavior management” was reported as the classroom management topic most extensively addressed by seminar instructors ($M = 3.66$, $SD = 0.58$). Responses for “gaining student respect” and “motivating students” were exactly the same, and the categories tied for fourth place among the six topics. Each of the classroom management topics presented was covered to some degree in the seminar course—no topic received a rating of “not at all.” Table 13 displays the frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations for each classroom management topic listed in survey item 28.

Table 13

Frequencies, Percentages, Numbers of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Classroom Management Topics Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars

Classroom Management Topic	1 (Not at All)	2 (Very Little)	3 (Somewhat)	4 (A Lot)	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Behavior management	0 (0.0%)	2 (5.3%)	9 (23.7%)	27 (71.1%)	38	3.66	0.58
Organization	0 (0.0%)	2 (5.1%)	12 (30.8%)	25 (64.1%)	39	3.59	0.59
Teacher confidence/ apprehension	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.6%)	18 (47.4%)	19 (50.0%)	38	3.47	0.56
Gaining student respect	0 (0.0%)	4 (10.5%)	14 (36.8%)	20 (52.6%)	38	3.42	0.68
Motivating students	0 (0.0%)	4 (10.5%)	14 (36.8%)	20 (52.6%)	38	3.42	0.68
Pacing	0 (0.0%)	4 (10.5%)	15 (39.5%)	19 (50.0%)	38	3.39	0.68

Curriculum topics. “Assessment and evaluation of student learning” and “lesson/rehearsal planning” were the two curriculum topics addressed “a lot” by a majority of the respondents, 52.6% and 51.3% respectively. Assessment and evaluation was reportedly not addressed at all in one respondent’s seminar. Thirteen of 39 instructors (33.3%) reported that they did not discuss literature selection—the least addressed of all curriculum topics presented in the survey. Overall, the most frequent response was “somewhat” for topics listed in the curriculum area. See Table 14 for descriptive statistics of the nine curriculum topics listed in survey item 29.

Table 14

Frequencies, Percentages, Numbers of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Curriculum Topics Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars

Curriculum Topic	1 (Not at All)	2 (Very Little)	3 (Somewhat)	4 (A Lot)	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Assessment & evaluation of student learning	1 (2.6%)	3 (7.9%)	14 (36.8%)	20 (52.6%)	38	3.39	0.75
Lesson/Rehearsal planning	2 (5.1%)	7 (17.9%)	10 (25.6%)	20 (51.3%)	39	3.23	0.93
Standards-based education	2 (5.1%)	7 (17.9%)	12 (30.8%)	18 (46.2%)	39	3.18	0.91
Curriculum development	2 (5.4%)	7 (18.9%)	17 (46.0%)	11 (29.7%)	37	3.00	0.85
Designing classroom activities	4 (10.3%)	5 (12.8%)	17 (43.6%)	13 (33.3%)	39	3.00	0.95
Teaching philosophies	3 (7.9%)	11 (28.9%)	12 (31.6%)	12 (31.6%)	38	2.87	0.96
Cross-discipline integration	5 (13.5%)	9 (24.3%)	19 (51.2%)	4 (10.8%)	37	2.59	0.86
Music learning theories	8 (20.5%)	9 (23.1%)	14 (35.9%)	8 (20.5%)	39	2.56	1.05
Choosing performance literature	13 (33.3%)	10 (25.6%)	11 (28.2%)	5 (12.8%)	39	2.21	1.06

Instructional strategy topics. Providing “effective feedback” ($M = 3.26$, $SD = 0.83$) and “adjusting instructional techniques” ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.86$) were the instructional strategies most extensively addressed in music student teaching seminars. “Experimenting with instructional strategies” and “developing transfer” were rated the lowest of all six items, each with a mean rating less than 3.00. “Adjusting instructional techniques” received the highest percentage of “a lot” ratings (45.9%) among the six

topics; no instructional strategy topic was addressed “a lot” by a majority of respondents.

The complete list of descriptive statistics for survey item 30 is displayed in Table 15.

Table 15

Frequencies, Percentages, Numbers of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Instructional Strategies Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars

Instructional Strategy	1 (Not at All)	2 (Very Little)	3 (Somewhat)	4 (A Lot)	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Effective feedback	2 (5.3%)	3 (7.9%)	16 (42.1%)	17 (44.7%)	38	3.26	0.83
Adjusting instructional techniques	2 (5.4%)	4 (10.8%)	14 (37.8%)	17 (45.9%)	37	3.24	0.86
Sequencing instruction	3 (7.9%)	2 (5.3%)	17 (44.7%)	16 (42.1%)	38	3.21	0.87
Differentiated instruction	1 (2.6%)	8 (21.1%)	14 (36.8%)	15 (39.5%)	38	3.13	0.84
Experimenting with instructional strategies	3 (8.1%)	7 (18.9%)	15 (40.5%)	12 (32.4%)	37	2.97	0.93
Developing transfer	4 (11.1%)	10 (27.8%)	12 (33.3%)	10 (27.8%)	36	2.78	0.99

University coursework topics. “Music education methods” ($M = 2.89$, $SD = 1.09$) received the highest average rating of all university coursework topics and was addressed “a lot” by 39.5% of seminar instructors. “Music theory and history concepts” were covered the least ($M = 2.05$, $SD = 0.93$) and received the most ratings of “not at all” ($n = 12$). See Table 16 for responses to survey item 31.

Table 16

Frequencies, Percentages, Numbers of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Topics from University Coursework Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars

Coursework Topic	1 (Not at All)	2 (Very Little)	3 (Somewhat)	4 (A Lot)	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Music education methods	5 (13.2%)	9 (23.7%)	9 (23.7%)	15 (39.5%)	38	2.89	1.09
Instrumental techniques	7 (18.9%)	10 (27.0%)	11 (29.7%)	9 (24.3%)	37	2.59	1.07
Vocal techniques	8 (21.6%)	11 (29.7%)	10 (27.0%)	8 (21.6%)	37	2.49	1.07
Conducting techniques	10 (26.3%)	12 (31.6%)	10 (26.3%)	6 (15.8%)	38	2.32	1.04
Music theory/ history concepts	12 (31.6%)	15 (39.5%)	8 (21.1%)	3 (7.9%)	38	2.05	0.93

Student needs topics. “Student well-being” received the highest overall rating ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 0.70$) of student needs topics and was addressed to some extent in the seminar by all respondents ($n = 38$). “Students’ personal issues” ($M = 3.03$, $SD = 0.88$) were addressed the least of the student needs topics listed in survey item 32, with a combined 31.5% of respondents addressing the topic “very little” or “not at all.” Descriptive statistics of student need topics addressed in music student teaching seminars are displayed in Table 17.

Table 17

Frequencies, Percentages, Numbers of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Student Needs Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars

Student Need	1 (Not at All)	2 (Very Little)	3 (Somewhat)	4 (A Lot)	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Student well-being	0 (0.00%)	6 (15.8%)	18 (47.4%)	14 (36.8%)	38	3.21	0.70
Students with special needs in music	1 (2.6%)	4 (10.5%)	20 (52.6%)	13 (34.2%)	38	3.18	0.73
Students' personal issues	1 (2.6%)	11 (28.9%)	12 (31.6%)	14 (36.8%)	38	3.03	0.88

Administrative topics. “Working with school administration” was the most extensively addressed administrative topic ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 0.67$) by instructors in student teaching seminar meetings and received a rating of either “somewhat” or “a lot” by a combined 89.4% of the respondents. “Parent–teacher relationships” rated second-highest among the six topics, with a combined 84.2% of responses reported as either “somewhat” or “a lot.” “Working with school administration” and “educational policy” were the only two administrative topics addressed by all instructors; neither topic received a rating of “not at all.” “Somewhat” was the most frequent response for each topic (tied with “a lot” for “working with school administration”). Table 18 displays frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations for administrative topics listed in survey item 33.

Table 18

Frequencies, Percentages, Numbers of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Administrative Topics Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars

Administrative Topic	1 (Not at All)	2 (Very Little)	3 (Somewhat)	4 (A Lot)	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Working with school administration	0 (0.0%)	4 (10.5%)	17 (44.7%)	17 (44.7%)	38	3.34	0.67
Parent–Teacher relationships	1 (2.6%)	5 (13.2%)	20 (52.6%)	12 (31.6%)	38	3.13	0.74
Educational policy	0 (0.0%)	10 (27.0%)	18 (48.6%)	9 (24.3%)	37	2.97	0.73
Advocacy	2 (5.4%)	8 (21.6%)	18 (48.6%)	9 (24.3%)	37	2.92	0.83
Program handbooks	5 (13.5%)	12 (32.4%)	13 (35.1%)	7 (18.9%)	37	2.59	0.96
Parent/Booster programs	5 (13.5%)	11 (29.7%)	19 (51.4%)	2 (5.4%)	37	2.49	0.80

Employment topics. Instructors rated “professionalism” as an extensively addressed employment topic in seminar courses; each respondent ($n = 38$) addressed the topic “somewhat” (21.1%) or “a lot” (78.9%). “Interviewing for teaching positions” (64.9%) and “applying for teaching positions” (54.1%) also received the highest ratings by over half of the respondents. Although “teacher burnout” received the lowest mean rating ($M = 2.46$, $SD = 0.80$), the topic was still addressed “somewhat” or “a lot” by more than half of the respondents. Descriptive statistics for employment topics are listed in Table 19.

Table 19

Frequencies, Percentages, Numbers of Responses, Means, and Standard Deviations of Employment Topics Addressed in Music Student Teaching Seminars

Employment Topic	1 (Not at All)	2 (Very Little)	3 (Somewhat)	4 (A Lot)	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Professionalism	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	8 (21.1%)	30 (78.9%)	38	3.79	0.41
Interviewing for teaching positions	1 (2.7%)	1 (2.7%)	11 (29.7%)	24 (64.9%)	37	3.57	0.69
Applying for teaching positions	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.7%)	16 (43.2%)	20 (54.1%)	37	3.51	0.56
Licensure	1 (2.6%)	1 (2.6%)	20 (52.6%)	16 (42.1%)	38	3.34	0.67
Professional development	0 (0.0%)	4 (10.8%)	18 (48.6%)	15 (40.5%)	37	3.30	0.66
Mentoring in the first year	1 (2.7%)	7 (18.9%)	21 (56.8%)	8 (21.6%)	37	2.97	0.73
Teacher burnout	5 (13.5%)	12 (32.4%)	18 (48.6%)	2 (5.4%)	37	2.46	0.80

Additional topic areas. In survey item 35, I asked respondents to list and describe topics covered in their student teaching seminar that were not included in the eight topic areas listed in the survey. I assigned codes to the 22 responses (see Appendix H) based on the topic areas that were mentioned in the text, then grouped the coded data into one of three categories: (a) seminar topic areas, (b) seminar structure, and (c) seminar assignments and activities.

Five different respondents listed a type of employment topic as a focus of the seminar course: networking, interviewing, licensure, application materials, and student assessment. However, the extent to which instructors addressed these employment topics was reported in responses to previous survey items. Four respondents indicated that many

of the content areas presented in the survey were previously covered in students' music methods classes, and were not revisited in the student teaching seminar. Three instructors listed legal issues, such as school safety, state mandates, and national education law (e.g., No Child Left Behind Act), as topics for seminar discussion that were not mentioned earlier in the survey. One respondent stated that time in seminar meetings was often spent reviewing the requirements of the state-mandated internship year that follows student teaching: "...most of the time we see our student teachers during the seminar we need to help them learn to navigate through these materials."

Four respondents discussed the structure of the student teaching seminar. Three of these four respondents indicated that the student teaching seminar is instructed by the college/department of education. Because these faculty members reported no responsibility for instructing the seminar, they could not provide specific information pertaining to content and organization of the course. One respondent wrote, "My best guess is that the college of education seminar covers general pedagogy topics in addition to interview/professional dispositions. I do not believe they cover anything specifically related to teaching music." Another respondent indicated that separate meetings were held between the music student teachers and the music supervisor in an attempt to cover areas specific to music that are not addressed in the general seminar (e.g., "the differences of teaching elementary music, choral music, and instrumental music"). One respondent indicated that the seminar was not structured as "an instructional class," but rather as a discussion-based forum.

Eight respondents described assignments and activities that were included in the music student teaching seminar, seven of which discussed creating portfolios and work

sample projects. Written and verbal reflections also were reported by seminar instructors ($n = 2$), and included journal entries, discussion groups, and reflections on individual lessons taught by the interns. Two respondents mentioned résumé writing and video case studies as additional seminar activities.

Seminar activities. I designed survey item 36 to determine the types of activities and assignments that instructors included in the music student teaching seminar. Respondents were provided with a list of 17 items and asked to indicate which of the activities were included as a portion of the seminar course, checking all that applied. The most recurrent activities reported by the 40 respondents were professional in nature. Constructing a résumé/cover letter (80.0%) and creating portfolios (80.0%) were the most frequently reported; mock interviews were reported second most frequently (70.0%). Various forms of reflection, class discussions, hosting guest speakers, and creating lesson plans were incorporated into seminars by more than half of the instructors who responded. Response frequencies and percentages of all reported activities/assignments can be found in Table 20.

Table 20

Frequencies and Percentages of Activities/Assignments Included in the Music Student Teaching Seminar (N = 40)

Activity/Assignment	Response Frequency	%
Constructing a Résumé & Cover Letter	32	80.0
Portfolios/e-Portfolios	32	80.0
Conducting Mock Interviews	28	70.0
Creating Lesson Plans	27	67.5
Daily/Weekly Written Reflection Journals	26	65.0
Peer Discussion Groups	26	65.0
Guest Speakers	23	57.5
Written Teaching Reflections	23	57.5
Sharing Student Teacher Artifacts	21	52.5
Compose a Philosophy of Teaching	20	50.0
Viewing/Discussing Intern Teaching Videos	17	42.5
Reading/Discussing Music Teaching Articles	16	40.0
Analyzing Intern Teaching Videos	14	35.0
Article Reviews	9	22.5
On-Line Discussion Boards/Web-logs	9	22.5
Other	3	7.5
None	1	2.5

In survey item 37, instructors indicated the type of culminating projects included in the student teaching seminar. Given a list of six different projects, respondents were asked to check each project that was used in the seminar course. Creating professional portfolios, either in electronic or hard copy format, accounted for a total of 82.5% ($n = 33$) of final projects; four of these 33 respondents required both formats of the portfolio. Three instructors reported no use of final projects in the seminar course. Table 21 lists the response frequencies and percentages of culminating projects included in music student teaching seminars.

Table 21

Frequencies and Percentages of Culminating Projects Included in the Music Student Teaching Seminar (N = 40)

Project	Response Frequency	%
Electronic portfolio	21	52.5
Teacher work sample	14	35.0
Hard-copy portfolio	12	30.0
None	3	7.5
Synthesis project/paper	2	5.0
Assessment <i>PowerPoint</i>	1	2.5
Videos	1	2.5
Unsure	1	2.5

Seminar content conclusion. To conclude the section of the survey designed to collect information about the content of music student teaching seminars, I asked respondents to provide any other information they felt was important in understanding the content of the seminar at their institution (survey item 38). Nineteen respondents provided a response to the open-ended prompt (see Appendix I). Four main categories emerged from the coded responses: (a) seminar content, (b) student teacher assessment, (c) seminar activities and projects, and (d) instructor perceptions.

Seminar content was addressed by eight of the 19 respondents. Four respondents indicated that another department (e.g., education, arts and humanities) was responsible for instructing the student teaching seminar, which made it difficult for one of these faculty members to provide information about seminar content: “I, music faculty, attend [the seminar] as a guest only.” Two instructors reiterated that most of the content provided in survey items 27 through 33 was covered in music methods courses prior to student teaching. Reflective practice was cited as “the conceptual basis” for one

institution's seminar; "problem posing and problem solving" were listed as "key features" of another instructor's seminar course.

Two respondents mentioned student teacher assessment. One instructor stated that, although local retired teachers were often contracted to supervise interns, "Someone from the university still has to be responsible for grading and paperwork." The second instructor explained that the positive relationship with the college of education allowed the head of the music education area to take responsibility for observing, supervising, and grading music student teachers.

Three respondents elaborated on the use of seminar activities and projects. One of the two instructors who listed professional portfolios as a culminating project clarified its role in the student teaching internship, stating, "We do use electronic portfolios, but they are part of the student teaching experience grade, not the seminar course." Another respondent listed weekly journal assignments and Internet video conferencing as seminar activities. All three activities mentioned in this open-response prompt were addressed in previous survey items.

Instructor perceptions represented the last category of responses. Two respondents cited the student teaching experience as the most crucial portion of teacher preparation: "It is a very important culminating experience for their undergraduate degree. Student teaching pulls at their course work, ensemble, private studio lessons, theory, history together." One respondent stated that hiring local retired teachers to observe student teachers who are placed far from campus was beneficial for the music department. Other respondents ($n = 2$) mentioned their relationships with various departments on campus, both positively and negatively. While one of these instructors cited "an excellent working

relationship between the School of Education and the Department of Music,” another stated that music faculty members were only permitted to “speak to the music students...in breaks.” Managing instructional time in the student teaching seminar was listed as a concern for one particular respondent, who stated, “It is tough to balance what I feel I need to present with what they often need to vent about/talk about.”

Summary

Results of this study indicated that most institutions ($n = 40$, 88.9%) hosted an accompanying seminar course during the student teaching internship; however, only 42.5% of these respondents reported a seminar designed specifically for music education majors, separate from other education majors. Seminar instructors indicated that they addressed topics pertaining to the internship, classroom management, and employment more extensively than any other topic area included in the survey. Respondents wrote that many of the less extensively addressed topics were previously covered in music methods courses. Professional portfolios, résumé writing, and mock interviews represented the most common seminar activities, and some form of portfolio was used as a culminating project in 82.5% of music student teaching seminars.

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

In this study, I sought to provide researchers and educators with information about the structure and content of music student teaching seminars. Music education professors at Midwestern institutions accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) were invited to participate in a survey, which was used to collect demographic information pertaining to the music student teaching internship and accompanying seminar course. I also intended to determine how the perceived needs of music student teachers—as reported in extant research—were being met through the content and structure of the student teaching seminars.

Characteristics of University-Sponsored Seminars

Seminar structure. Frequent meetings throughout the internship may be beneficial for providing student teachers with multiple opportunities to reflect and share ideas on a routine basis (Bausmith & Barry, 2011; Stegman, 2007; Weiss & Weiss, 2001). It is not surprising that most participants in this study reported some type of university-based student teaching seminar course that accompanied the internship. However, there was a disparity between the frequency and length of these meetings among various institutions. Most respondents indicated that the seminar met weekly or bi-weekly for one to two hours in length. It seems important that student teachers be afforded the opportunity to meet regularly to share ideas, solve problems, and reflect on their experiences in the classroom (Stegman, 2007; Weiss & Weiss, 2001). Fewer, less frequent meetings reported by some respondents (e.g., meetings at the beginning, middle,

and/or end of the internship) may not provide interns with sufficient opportunities for engaging in reflective practice. Do student teachers value frequent and regular meetings that promote idea sharing and reflection among their peers? Future researchers might investigate student teacher perceptions of various seminar structures in an attempt to determine the most effective way of promoting communication among interns throughout the student teaching experience.

Distance limitations. How far student teachers are placed from the college/university campus may impact the level of institutional support they receive during the internship. Three-fourths of survey respondents reported that the seminar instructor and/or other music education faculty made formal observations of student teachers; however, adjunct or retired K–12 teachers made some observations when interns were placed at great distances. Is it important that the seminar leader make formal observations for all student teachers? Doing so would allow the seminar instructor to design seminar discussions and activities based on the observed needs of student teachers in the classroom. If seminar leaders have no personal contact with the interns in the field, instructors may have difficulty creating effective seminar activities that meet the needs of their student teachers.

In the event that student teachers are placed at great distances from campus, current technology can be used to facilitate seminar attendance—which was reported as mandatory by all but one survey respondent. Considering the lack of distance limitations reported by nearly half of seminar instructors, it is surprising that only two respondents utilized virtual communication methods for regular seminar meetings. Lewis and Allan (2005) suggested the use of video conferencing as a viable means of interaction among

professional learning community (PLC) members. Although some instructors listed Internet video conferencing as an alternative attendance method when students could not attend the seminar in person, half of the survey respondents listed no substitute. This percentage seems low, considering the current availability of free software programs designed to facilitate distance video conferencing (Ward et al., 2012). Other forms of virtual communication (e.g., weblogs, discussion boards, electronic mailing lists) have been reported as beneficial in promoting interns' peer interaction and professional development during the internship (Fitzpatrick, 2011; Lenning & Ebbers, 1999; Lewis & Allan, 2005; Roberts & Pruitt, 2009). The effectiveness of seminar experiences in which students and instructors use virtual communication methods for interaction throughout the student teaching experience would be a valuable area of future investigation.

Music specialists as seminar instructors. Because many instructional strategies, classroom management techniques, and administrative duties in music are specific to the discipline, they often are approached in a manner unique to music education. A student teaching seminar instructed by an experienced music education specialist might address these topics most effectively in the seminar; roughly half of survey respondents indicated that a music education specialist instructed the student teaching seminar. A seminar instructor with public school teaching experience in music would be familiar with the types of issues that arise in the music classroom and may be able to offer more effective guidance—when addressing needs specific to music—than an instructor with other types of teaching experiences. One survey respondent focused on the importance of student teaching in the curriculum, writing that it “pulls all [the student teachers’] coursework, ensembles, private studio lessons, theory, [and] history together.” Is it important, then,

that a music education faculty member—one with knowledge of the undergraduate music education curriculum—lead the seminar in an attempt to draw connections from course material to classroom instruction? Research to investigate the impact of music education specialists as the seminar instructors, to determine whether seminars instructed by a music education specialist result in a better experiences for student teachers than seminars lead by a non-music educator, seems warranted.

Seminars for music education majors. A seminar course designed specifically for music student teachers could promote interaction among members of the same discipline—an important characteristic of curricular area learning communities (Lenning & Ebbers, 1999). Less than half of survey respondents reported a seminar course designed exclusively for music education students. I do not know why some institutions offered a specialized seminar and some do not. The size of the institution or the music department, and availability of resources (e.g., music education specialists' time, funding for separate seminars), may be factors that influence the offering of a music-exclusive seminar course. The survey used in this study was not designed to collect such information, but understanding the reasons that have resulted in the varying seminar structures would be informative, especially if an institution wishes to advocate for a seminar exclusively for music student teachers. It seems important to determine whether music-specific issues are addressed in seminars that encompass education majors of various specializations, and whether a music-exclusive seminar addresses the needs of music student teachers more effectively than other seminar structures. Future researchers may wish to investigate the differences between music-exclusive and general education

seminar courses to determine not only their efficacy in addressing music education topics, but also the interns' perceptions of the seminar content.

Content of University-Sponsored Seminars

Addressing professionalism and employment. Music educators agree that the student teaching experience is important in preparing novice teachers to enter the professional world. It is not surprising that, during this critical semester, seminar instructors focus extensively on activities that prepare new teachers for employment. Creating portfolios—both electronic and paper forms—was an overwhelmingly common seminar activity included by instructors in this study. Aside from selecting portfolios from a list of activities, respondents also mentioned the project in response to open-ended prompts. One instructor described the portfolio as an ongoing process throughout the undergraduate program, in which students must integrate “designing, teaching and assessing a unit or concert during their student teaching semester.” Not only do portfolio projects help to display a student teacher’s work across the span of the internship, they also have been found to be “a reliable and valid assessment tool for student teaching” (Draves, 2009). How well do portfolios exhibit the progress a student teacher makes over the course of the internship? Do school administrators find these collections of student work useful when interviewing or hiring new school faculty members? Because of the high percentage of seminar instructors who include portfolios as a culminating project, it seems important that music education researchers continue to investigate the use of portfolios as an assessment tool, as well as their efficacy in the job search process.

Perhaps many instructors choose to address employment procedures in the seminar because, typically, the student teaching internship immediately precedes

graduation. Seminar instructors reported addressing employment extensively during the internship, indicating that “professionalism,” “interviewing for teaching positions,” and “applying for teaching positions” were the primary focus of various employment topics. Similarly, résumé writing and mock interviews were two of the three most frequently cited activities included by seminar instructors; respondents wrote that the seminar was used “to prepare [student teachers] for final licensure and job searches.” Certification and state mandates also were activities listed in responses to open-ended prompts. Despite the extensive focus on professional activities by most respondents, one seminar instructor indicated that these topics are addressed in coursework taken prior to the student teaching semester. Is the student teaching seminar the most effective course in which to include employment topics, or do novice teachers need to begin résumé writing and refining interview strategies prior to the internship? Music education researchers might explore the ways in which institutions prepare their undergraduates for employment in an effort to determine the most effective activities to spend time on in student teaching seminars.

Classroom management. Classroom management is one of the most frequently cited concerns of both student teachers and cooperating teachers (Baumgartner, 2011b; Brand, 1982; Poulou, 2007; Snyder, 1998; Tillema, 2009) and is one of the primary areas that “student teachers in music regularly struggle with” in the classroom (Coway & Hodgman, 2006, p. 143). Instructors responding to this survey addressed classroom management topics extensively in the student teaching seminar, addressing behavior management the most of any individual topic. Despite instructors’ apparent commitment to addressing classroom management, it is unclear what type of activities they use to reinforce these skills. None of the items listed in the survey or presented through

responses to open-ended prompts elaborated on how instructors addressed classroom management. Written reflections, discussion groups, and reading music teaching articles were all cited as popular activities in the seminar; however, the survey was not constructed to solicit specific information about these activities. Seminar activities with the potential to impact student teachers' ability to manage their own classroom might include regular discussions and reflections about classroom management skills and the analysis of intern teaching videos. Further investigation of seminar activities seems warranted to determine whether there is any evidence that these activities are useful to student teachers in addressing their perceived classroom management needs and fostering improved classroom management skills.

Preparing for the internship. Preparing student teachers for the internship process has been cited as an important task for promoting a successful student teaching experience (Draves, 2008). "Intern preparedness," "student teacher responsibilities," and "professionalism" were three of the most extensively addressed topics (among all eight categories) by survey respondents. A majority of seminar instructors also indicated that they hosted a mandatory orientation meeting to prepare student teachers for the internship. Although music educators have written extensively about the importance of establishing a good rapport among student teaching triad members (Baumgartner, 2011a; Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Bowles & Runnels, 1998; Clarke & Jarvis-Selinger, 2005; Kamens, 2007; Slick, 1998a; Valencia, Martin, Place, & Grossman, 2009), less than one-fourth of the instructors who reported hosting an orientation meeting required cooperating teachers to attend. Examining the types of activities that are included in internship orientations seems important in determining their efficacy in establishing a

good rapport between student teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors. Determining successful ways in which various institutions navigate the beginning of the internship and prepare music student teachers for a successful experience, including how interns are introduced to the relationship with their cooperating teachers, would be a valuable area for future research.

Learning administrative tasks. Beginning teachers and mentors have cited administrative tasks as responsibilities with which new teachers often are unprepared to cope during their first year of teaching (Baumgartner, 2011b; Conway, 2002). Topics such as advocacy, booster programs, extra duties, and parent–teacher relationships often are covered in university methods courses that are taken prior to the internship, which may be the reason respondents in this study did not address them extensively in the student teaching seminar. Although the survey did not provide respondents with activities specific to administrative topics, instructors did write about discussing administrator expectations and hosting administrators as guest speakers. Future researchers might examine the types of activities that seminar instructors use to address administrative topics in seminar courses. Because so many of these administrative skills are more aptly learned “on the job” (Haston & Leon-Guerrero, 2008), it seems important that university seminars be structured in a way that allows student teachers to share with each other what they have learned from internship experiences.

Instructional strategies and curriculum. Aside from classroom management, student teachers have frequently cited concerns for designing music curriculum, lesson/rehearsal planning, and student assessment (Berg & Miksza, 2010; Campbell & Thompson, 2007; McDowell, 2005). Music education specialists have suggested that

these topics are valuable aspects of the seminar course (Conway & Hodgman, 2006; Draves, 2008) and that novice teachers need pedagogical reinforcement in these content areas (Berg & Miksza, 2010; Conway, 2002; Snyder, 1998). Respondents in this study indicated that curriculum and planning topics were not covered in the seminar because they are part of the “professional sequence that leads up to the student teaching experience” or were previously covered in “methods class and other music education classes.” Final projects of the seminar course, such as the Teacher Work Sample or synthesis project, may help to promote transfer of learned theories to the music classroom. Student teachers also may acquire ideas for improving their own instruction and assessment by sharing teaching artifacts or engaging in reflective discussions—an effective means of promoting in-depth, problem-solving conversation (Zeichner & Liston, 1987). Although these seminar activities were included by over half of survey respondents, their efficacy in improving interns’ instructional strategies remains unclear. Future researchers might investigate how seminar activities are structured—as well as their perceived implications by student teachers—to determine the most efficient methods of reinforcing learned teaching theories throughout the internship.

Although student teachers have had prior experience writing lesson plans as a portion of the undergraduate curriculum, “young teachers still need to write specific plans for classes” (Conway & Hodgman, 2006, p. 145) to reinforce good planning procedures. Nearly one-fourth of survey respondents in this study reported addressing lesson/rehearsal planning “very little” or “not at all,” despite the fact that creating lesson plans was the fourth most frequently cited activity included in the seminar. Reviewing the lesson planning process throughout the internship may create opportunities for student

teachers to refine planning procedures while teaching in a more authentic setting than was provided in earlier field experience or peer teaching episodes—which may not always provide young educators with accurate feedback about their instruction (Kerchner, 1998; Schmidt, 2010). Aside from creating lesson plans in the seminar, what other activities impact novices' lesson planning skills throughout the internship? Perhaps some seminar instructors choose to exclude lesson planning from the seminar because interns often review this process with cooperating teachers (Baumgartner, 2011b.). Examining the ways in which music student teachers engage in refining the lesson/rehearsal planning process might provide instructors with the most effective means for addressing the topic in the seminar course.

Implications for Music Teacher Preparation

Current practices in music student teaching seminars. Both students and educators consider the student teaching internship to be one of the most important elements of any teacher preparation program (Brand, 1982; Bowles & Runnels, 1998; Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Conkling & Henry, 1999; Conway, 2002; Koerner, 1992; Legette, 1997; Valencia et al., 2009). Although experts agree that the experience and relationship forged by the student working closely with a practicing teacher is the most influential aspect of the internship (Draves, 2008; Kamens, 2007; Koerner, 1992), the university supervisor also plays an important role in guiding novice teachers through the student teaching experience (Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Slick, 1997; Slick, 1998a; Slick, 1998b). Although there have been investigations of teaching triad relationships, there is scant research pertaining to the seminar course that often accompanies the student teaching internship. The findings of this study provide music teacher educators with

demographic information that may provide a basis for examining their own situations in an effort to improve the structure and content of their current university-sponsored seminar courses.

Music-specific content. The findings of this study indicate that professors from areas outside of music taught more than half of all student teaching seminar courses; most often they were faculty members in the college/department of education. While these instructors may have expertise related to various educational theories and practices, they most likely do not possess pedagogical content knowledge specific to music education. Lesson planning, sequencing instruction, classroom management, and extra-musical duties have been cited as topics of concern by beginning music teachers. Although student teachers in other areas of education may share the same concerns, these topics are often approached in a unique manner in the music classroom. Planning for an ensemble rehearsal or music class requires different techniques and materials than preparing a unit for a high school math class. Similarly, behavior management in an ensemble with 100 middle school students must be approached differently than an English class of 25 students. Because instructors of undergraduate music education courses often have had experience teaching public school music classes, it seems important that music education specialists be responsible for guiding the music student teaching seminar to most accurately address concepts specific to music education. It seems advisable that colleges and universities should strive to make the music student teaching seminar a responsibility of the music education area.

After examining the extent to which instructors address specific topics in the music student teaching seminar, it appears that professionalism and internship-specific

topics are of primary focus to seminar leaders. Although these topics are important to the success of beginning teachers, many of the concerns identified in music education research literature—with the exception of classroom management—were not as extensively addressed in these student teaching seminar courses. Several respondents indicated that topics listed in the survey were eliminated from seminar content because they were “studied intensely in methods classes.” Seminar instructors should consider revisiting topics such as lesson planning, designing curriculum, and addressing student needs in an attempt to reinforce content knowledge learned in prior coursework. Students appear to need reinforcement of these pedagogical concepts once they begin applying them in the classroom (Baumgartner, 2011b; Berg & Miksza, 2010; Campbell & Thompson, 2007; Conway, 2002; Hourigan, 2009; McDowell, 2007); researchers have called for methods course instructors to take an active role in the student teaching process to help facilitate this transfer (Casey & Howson, 1993). Although this may not be feasible at some institutions, a music education specialist leading the seminar course—with knowledge of the theories and techniques taught in music methods courses—might be able to foster connections from coursework to practice throughout the internship.

Establishing seminar guidelines. Few guidelines exist pertaining to the structure of the music student teaching internship. Based on the lack of standardization in both the student teaching internship and the accompanying seminar course found in this study, is there a need for basic guidelines to be established for structuring the student teaching internship and seminar course? NASM accreditation standards do not prescribe (a) distance limitations for student teaching placements, (b) education/experience requirements for the seminar instructor, (c) education/experience requirements for

observers of music student teachers, (d) a requirement for hosting an accompanying seminar course seminar, (e) limitations for seminar meeting frequency and length, or (f) the content of the seminar course. If music education needs a prescribed outline for the professional semester, an accreditation council might provide the greatest impact toward unifying the structure and content of the internship among similar institutions. However, considering current practices, changes may be drastic for some institutions—especially those which do not currently offer an accompanying seminar course. Based on the perceived importance of student teaching in the undergraduate curriculum, music teacher educators should consider establishing guidelines for the student teaching internship in an attempt to achieve a uniform definition of best practices, including structure and curriculum of the seminar course.

Limitations and Suggestions for Research

Generalizability of findings. Colleges and universities selected for participation in this study were accredited by NASM at the time the survey was administered. National accreditation and location (Midwestern U.S.) were used to generalize the findings across these various institutions, assuming that music teacher preparation programs were similar in teaching standards, learning goals, and curricula. After examining the data, it appears that it may have been advantageous to compare seminar demographics and content by the size of both the institution and the department/college of music. Nearly half of the respondents reported that music student teachers were included in the general education seminar, which may be a result of the administrative structure of the institution. The size of institution may affect which college/department grants the music education degree, and thus be a determining factor in the selection of the faculty member who instructs the

student teaching seminar for music education majors. Seminar courses housed in the college/department of education may not be as effective in addressing music students' needs as those instructed by music faculty members. Future researchers should consider examining school size, administrative structure, and degree type as variables that might influence the type of seminar courses offered for music student teachers.

It should be noted that the usable response rate (36.9%) was a limitation of this study; the findings presented are based on less than half of the population invited to participate in the project. However, each state's individual response rate was representative of the overall percentage, which I determined was acceptable for generalizing the findings across the geographic location of the population for the scope of this study. Geographic location could impact the structure of the student teaching internship, resulting in restrictions on the distance of teaching placements, the faculty member responsible for making formal observations, and the requirement for seminar attendance. Music education researchers might find differences in the internship structure at schools from other regions of the United States. In an attempt to gather data that is generalizable to other accredited music schools, future researchers should examine student teaching seminars at institutions from other geographic regions to determine if the seminars are constructed similarly to those at institutions in the Midwest.

Institution location. The area in which the institution is located may have an impact on the distance of student teaching placements. Although most institutions reported a distance limit of 60 miles or less, those which allowed students teachers to be placed further from campus may have done so because of an insufficient number of school districts near the college/university. Conversely, institutions without a distance

requirement may not impose a limitation because of the large number of adjacent public school districts. Further examination of population area and student teaching placement limitations may reveal differences concerning intern observations (e.g., methods of observation, supervisor assignments), student teaching seminar attendance (i.e., the use of Internet video conferencing and teleconferencing), and the types of university support offered to music student teachers during the internship.

Seminar instructors and formal observers. Respondents indicated that student teacher seminar instructors and other music education faculty were the most common personnel to make formal observations during the internship. Two respondents selected “other” from the provided list and specified that the cooperating teacher was responsible for formal observations. Researchers have reported power struggles between university supervisors and cooperating teachers (Borko & Mayfield, 1995; Bullough & Draper, 2004; Slick, 1997; Slick, 1998a; Slick, 1998b), particularly in the area of student teacher assessment. However, I did not ask respondents to specify who determined the overall internship grade. Future researchers might investigate the assessment process further to determine if formal observations by university faculty serve as the primary evaluation for student teacher interns or if the cooperating teachers shares the assessment responsibilities. Based on extant research, it seems that situations requiring both instructors to work together toward assessment would promote a quality triadic relationship.

Undoubtedly, instructing a seminar course and observing student teachers are time consuming responsibilities. Although the survey was designed to collect baseline information pertaining to the seminar instructor and formal observers of student teachers,

I did not inquire how these responsibilities impacted the faculty members' teaching loads. Traveling to an off-campus site, completing an observation, and meeting with the intern to discuss what was observed are all activities that could be included in a formal observation. The institution should take these tasks into consideration when determining the amount of time required to complete an intern observation. Similarly, if the seminar is not graded separately from the student teaching internship (i.e., a stand-alone course), how many credit hours are figured into the instructor's teaching load? It would seem that the amount of time required for planning and teaching the seminar would be comparable to other courses the instructor might teach. It may be valuable to investigate how institutions include the student teaching seminar and formal observations into a faculty member's course load, and how time impacts instructors' abilities to design and teach a seminar course that best meets the needs of music student teachers.

Participant responses. Providing specific information about the music student teaching seminar proved difficult for respondents who indicated that someone from the college/department of education instructed the seminar. Although my recruitment message asked recipients to forward the survey information to the professor responsible for leading the seminar, some respondents indicated that they were unsure of exactly who the instructor was, thus they were unable to forward the survey information to the appropriate individual. This may have led to inaccuracies in the data reported. Future researchers might consider a detailed comparison of different seminar structures at contrasting institutions (e.g., a music student teaching seminar and a general education seminar) to better determine the differences in content, structure, and student perceptions of their experience in the seminar.

Student teacher perceptions. For the purpose of this study, I focused primarily on the perceived needs of music student teachers as determined by other researchers. Although I also reviewed research pertaining to preservice teachers at other points in their teacher preparation (e.g., students enrolled in methods courses and field experience), future researchers might examine first-year music teachers' perceptions of the student teaching experience and the accompanying seminar course. Because the first year of teaching provides many experiences for professional growth, beginning teachers may be able to provide information to seminar instructors concerning topics and activities that they feel would have been helpful in better preparing them for their first year. There is scant research specifically related to the effectiveness of the music student teaching experience, including the seminar, and its ability to serve as a bridge from the university experience as a student to the public school music classroom as a teacher.

Concluding Statement

Educators and researchers view the student teaching internship as one of the most impactful experiences of the undergraduate music education curriculum. The university can provide ongoing support to student teachers by offering a seminar course that meets regularly during the internship and encourages peer interaction, deep reflection, and problem-solving discussions. With an experienced music educator leading the seminar, activities can be designed to meet the perceived needs specific to music student teachers. While continuing to address professionalism and employment during the internship, seminar instructors also should consider revisiting many of the topics covered in prior coursework in an attempt to foster transfers from learned theories to their application in the music classroom. Assessing the efficacy of these music student teaching seminars in

preparing novice teachers for the profession may encourage music educators and accreditation associations to establish basic guidelines for the structure and content of this course.

References

- American Psychological Association, (2010). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Baumgartner, C. M. (2011a). Creating a positive internship for student and cooperating teachers: Five steps for success. *Missouri School Music Magazine*, 66, 24–26.
- Baumgartner, C. M. (2011b). An examination of a pre-service music teacher's reflection across consecutive teaching placements. *Visions of Research in Music Education*, 18. Retrieved from <http://www-usr.rider.edu/~vrme/v18n1/index.html>
- Bausmith, J. M., & Barry, C. (2011). Revisiting professional learning communities to increase college readiness: The importance of pedagogical content knowledge. *Educational Researcher*, 40(4), 175–178. doi: 10.3102/0013189X11409927
- Beck, C., & Kosnik, C. (2002). Professors and the practicum: Involvement of university faculty in preservice practicum supervision. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 53, 6–19.
- Bell, C. L., & Robinson, N. G. (2004). The successful student-teaching experience: Thoughts from the ivory tower. *Music Educators Journal*, 91(1), 39–42. doi: 10.2307/3400104
- Berg, M. H., & Lind, V. R. (2003). Preservice music teacher electronic portfolios integrating reflection and technology. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 12(2), 18–28. doi: 10.1177/10570837030120020104
- Berg, M. H., & Miksza, P. (2010). An investigation of preservice music teacher development and concerns. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 20, 39–55. doi: 10.1177/1057083710363237
- Bergee, M. J. (2002). Direct and mediated experiences: Effects on classroom management self-efficacy. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 12, 33–37. doi: 10.1177/10570837020120010301
- Borko, H., & Mayfield, V. (1995). The roles of the cooperating teacher and university supervisor in learning to teach. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 11(5), 501–18.
- Borko, H., Michalec, P., Timmons, M., & Siddle, J. (1997). Student teaching portfolios: A tool for promoting reflective practice. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 45, 345–357. doi: 10.1177/0022487197048005004

- Bowles, C., & Runnels, B. D. (1998). The need for collaboration in the student teaching experience. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 8(1), 15–24. doi: 10.1177/105708379800800104
- Brand, M. (1982). Effects of student teaching on the classroom management beliefs and skills of music student teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 30, 255–265. doi: 10.2307/3345299
- Bransford, J. D., Brown, A. L., & Cocking, R. R. (Eds.) (2000). *How people learn: Brain, mind, experience, and school*. Washington, D.C.: National Academies Press.
- Brown, J. S., Collins, A., & Duguid, P. (1989). Situated cognition and the culture of learning. *Educational Researcher*, 18(1), 32–42. doi: 10.3102/0013189X018001032
- Broyles, J. W. (1997). Effects of videotape analysis on role development of student teachers in music (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Oklahoma, 1997). *Dissertations Abstracts International*, 58(03A), 0823.
- Bullough, R. V. J., & Draper, R. J. (2004). Making sense of a failed triad: Mentors, university supervisors, and positioning theory. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 55, 407–420. doi: 10.1177/0022487104269804
- Campbell, M. R., & Thompson, L. K. (2007). Perceived concerns of preservice music education teachers: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 55, 162–176. doi: 10.1177/002242940705500206
- Capel, S., Hayes, S., Katene, W., & Velija, P. (2011). The interaction of factors which influence secondary student physical education teachers' knowledge and development as teachers. *European Physical Education Review*, 17, 183–201. doi: 10.1177/1356336X11413184
- Casey, B. M., & Howson, P. (1993). Educating preservice students based on a problem-centered approach to teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 44, 361–369.
- Chaffin, C., & Manfredo, J. (2010). Perceptions of preservice teachers regarding feedback and guided reflection in an instrumental early field experience. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 19(2), 57–72. doi: 10.1177/1057083709354161
- Clarke, A., & Jarvis-Selinger, S. (2005). What the teaching perspectives of cooperating teachers tell us about their advisory practices. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 21, 65–78.

- Collier, S. T. (1999). Characteristics of reflective thought during the student teaching experience. *Journal of Teacher Education, 50*, 173–181. doi: 10.1177/002248719905000303
- Conkling, S. W., & Henry, W. (1999). Professional development partnerships: A new model for music teacher preparation. *Arts Education Policy Review, 100*(4), 19–23. doi: 10.1080/10632919909599465
- Conway, C. (1999). The development of teaching cases for instrumental music methods courses. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47*, 343–356. doi: 10.2307/3345489
- Conway, C., & Hodgman, T. (2006). *Handbook for the beginning music teacher*. Chicago, IL: GIA.
- Conway, C. (2002). Perceptions of beginning teachers, their mentors, and administrators regarding preservice music teacher preparation. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 50*, 20–36. doi: 10.2307/3345690
- Copeland, W. D. (1977). Some factors related to student teacher classroom performance following microteaching training. *American Educational Research Journal, 14*(2), 147–157.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry & research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Draves, T. J. (2008). “Firecrackers” and “duds”: Cooperating teachers’ perspectives on their relationships with student teachers. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 18*(1), 6–15. doi: 10.1177/1057083708323140
- Draves, T. J. (2009). Portfolio assessment in student teaching: A reliability study. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 19*(1), 25–38. doi: 10.1177/1057083709343906
- Duffy, G. (2005). Developing metacognitive teachers: Visioning and the expert’s changing role in teacher education and professional development. In S. Israel, C. Block, K. Bauserman, & K. Kinnucan-Welsch (Eds.), *Metacognition in literacy learning: Theory, assessment, instruction, and professional development* (pp. 299–314). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- DuFour, R. (2003). Building a professional learning community. *The School Administrator, 60*(5), 13–18.
- Duke, R. A. (2007). *Intelligent music teaching: Essays on the core principles of effective instruction*. Austin, TX: Learning and Behavior Resources.

- Dutt, K. M., Tallerico, M., & Kayler, M. A. (1997). Assessing student teachers: The promise of developmental portfolios. *The Teacher Educator*, 32, 201–215.
- Fink, A. (2009). *How to conduct surveys: A step-by-step guide* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fitzpatrick, K. (September, 2011). *Bloggng through the music student teaching experience: Developing virtual communities of practice*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Music Teacher Education, Greensboro, NC.
- Forsythe, J. L., Kinney, D. W., & Braun, E. L. (2007). Opinions of music teacher educators and preservice music students on the national association of schools of music standards for teacher education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 16(2), 19–33. doi: 10.1177/10570837070160020104
- Fuller, F., & Bown, O. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher education, Part II: The 74th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 25–52). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Goolsby, T. W. (1997). Verbal instruction in instrumental rehearsals: A comparison of three career levels and preservice teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 45, 21–40. doi: 10.2307/3345463
- Green, L., & Mitchell, R. (1998). The effectiveness of an initial teacher training partnership in preparing students to teach art in the primary school. *The International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 17(3), 245–254. DOI: 10.1111/1468-5949.00133
- Hart, K. (2003). From an administrator's perspective: Practical survival skills for music educators. *Music Educators Journal*, 90(2), 41–45.
- Haston, W., & Leon-Guerrero, A. (2008). Sources of pedagogical content knowledge. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 17(2), 48–59. doi: 10.1177/1057083708317644
- Hewitt, M. P., & Koner, K. (2011, September). *A comparison of instrumental music methods course content at NASM-accredited institutions*. Paper presented at the Symposium on Music Teacher Education: Intersections of Practice, Research, and Policy, Greensboro, NC.
- Hord, S. M., Roussin, J. L., & Sommers, W. A. (2010). *Guiding professional learning communities: Inspiration, challenge, surprise, and meaning*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Hourigan, R. M. (2009). Preservice music teachers' perceptions of fieldwork experiences in a special needs classroom. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 57, 125–168. doi: 10.1177/0022429409335880

- Hourigan, R. M., & Scheib, J. W. (2009). Inside and outside the undergraduate music curriculum: Student teacher perceptions of the value of skills, abilities, and understandings. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 18*(2), 48–61. doi: 10.1177/1057083708327871
- Hoy, W. K., & Woolfolk, A. E. (1990). Socialization of student teachers. *American Education Research Journal, 27*(2), 279–300. doi: 10.3102/00028312027002279
- Husu, J., Toom, A., & Patrikainen, S. (2008). Guided reflection as a means to demonstrate and develop student teachers' reflective competencies. *Reflective Practice, 9*(1), 37–51.
- Isbell, D. S. (2008). Musicians and teachers: The socialization and occupational identity of preservice music teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 56*, 162–178. doi: 10.1177/0022429408322853
- Kaiser, K. A., & Johnson, K. E. (2000). The effect of an interactive experience on music majors' perceptions of music for deaf students. *Journal of Music Therapy, 37*, 222–234.
- Kamens, M. W. (2007). Learning about co-teaching: A collaborative student teaching experience for preservice teachers. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 30*(3), 155–166. doi: 10.1177/088840640703000304
- Kerchner, J. L. (1998). A model for educational partnerships. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 8*(1), 7–14. doi: 10.1177/105708379800800103
- Koerner, M. E. (1992). The cooperating teacher: An ambivalent participant in student teaching. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43*, 46–56. doi: 10.1177/002248719204300107
- Kounin, J. (1970). *Discipline and group management in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Lacey, C. (1977). *The socialization of teachers*. London: Methuen.
- Lawson, H. A. (1986). Occupational socialization and the design of teacher education programs. *Journal of Teaching Physical Education, 5*(1), 107–116.
- Legette, R. M. (1997). Enhancing the music student-teaching experience: A research review. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education, 16* (1), 25–28.
- Lenning, O. T., & Ebbers, L. H. (1999). The powerful potential of learning communities: Improving education for the future. *Higher Education Report, 26*(6). Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University, Graduate School of Education and Human Development.

- Lewis, D., & Allan, B. (2005). *Virtual learning communities: A guide for practitioners*. New York, NY: Open University Press.
- Major, J. E. (1994). Student teaching: Full-time, multilevel, and concurrent. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 3(2), 30–32. doi: 10.1177/105708379400300205
- Marks, M. J. (2002). *From coursework to classroom: A qualitative study on the influences of preservice teacher socialization* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://etd.ohiolink.edu>
- McDowell, C. (2007). Are they ready to student teach? Reflections from 10 music education majors concerning their three semesters of field experience. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 16(2), 45–60.
- McIntyre, D. J., Byrd, D. M., & Foxx, S. M. (1996). Field and laboratory experiences. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (2nd ed., pp. 171–192). New York, NY: MacMillan.
- 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, 364–381. doi: 10.1177/0022429409351655
- Morin, F. (2000). Developing collaborative partnerships for student teaching in music. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 10(1), 6–15. doi: 10.1177/105708370001000103
- NASM (2010). *National association of schools of music handbook 2010-11*. Reston, VA: NASM.
- NASM (2011). *State accredited institutions*. Reston, VA: NASM. Retrieved from http://nasm.arts-accredit.org/index.jsp?page=List_Accredited_Members
- Ontario Principals' Council (2009). *The principal as professional learning community leader; Leading student achievement series*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Poulou, M. (2007). Student-teacher's concerns about teaching practice. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 30, 91–110.
- Qualtrics Labs, Inc. (2011). <http://www.qualtrics.com>. Provo, UT: Qualtrics Labs, Inc.
- Raths, J., & Lyman, F. (2003). Summative evaluation of student teachers: An enduring problem. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 54, 206–216. doi: 10.1177/0022487103252006

- Roberts, S. M., & Pruitt, E. Z. (2009). *Schools as professional learning communities: Collaborative activities and strategies for professional development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.
- Rogers, G. L. (1995). The student-teaching portfolio. *Music Educators Journal*, 82(2), 29–31, 68.
- Scheib, J. W. (2006). Policy implications for teacher retention: Meeting the needs of the dual identities of arts educators. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 107(6), 5–10.
- Schmidt, M. (2010). Learning from teaching experience: Dewey's theory and preservice teachers' learning. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 58, 131–146. doi: 10.1177/0022429410368723
- Shulman, L. S. (1986). Those who understand: Knowledge growth in teaching. *Educational Researcher*, 15(2), 4–14.
- Slick, S. K. (1997). Assessing versus assisting: The supervisor's role in the complex dynamics of the student teaching triad. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 13, 713–726.
- Slick, S. K. (1998a). The university supervisor: A disenfranchised outsider. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 14, 821–834.
- Slick, S. K. (1998b). A university supervisor negotiates territory and status. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 49, 306–315.
- Snyder, D. W. (1996). Classroom management and the music student teacher (Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1996). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 58(01A), 117.
- Snyder, D. W. (1998). Classroom management for student teachers. *Music Educator's Journal*, 84(4), 37–40.
- Stegman, S. F. (2007). An exploration of reflective dialogue between student teachers in music and their cooperating teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 55, 65–82. doi: 10.1177/002242940705500106
- Stevanson, B. A. (2005). A study of a pilot support program for first-year elementary music teachers (Doctoral dissertation, Texas State University-San Marcos). *Dissertations Abstracts International*, 66(04A), 1307.
- Tillema, H. H. (2009). Assessment for learning to teach: Appraisal of practice teaching lessons by mentors, supervisors, and student teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 60, 155–167. doi: 10.1177/0022487108330551

- Valencia, S. W., Martin, S. D., Place, N. A., & Grossman, P. (2009). Complex interactions in student teaching: Lost opportunities for learning. *Journal of Teacher Education, 60*, 304–322. doi: 10.1177/0022487109336543
- VanWeelden, K., & Whipple, J. (2005). The effects of field experience on music education majors' perceptions of music instruction for secondary students with special needs. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 14*(2), 62–68.
- Veal, M. L., & Rikard, L. (1998). Cooperating teachers' perspectives on the student teaching triad. *Journal of Teacher Education, 49*, 108–199.
- Ward, J., Baumgartner, C. M., Bucura, E., Draves, T., Greene, J., Jeffs, K., & Parkes, K. (2012, March). *Using technology to facilitate music mentoring*. Workshop presented at the 2012 Biennial Music Educators National Conference, St. Louis, MO.
- Weiss, E. M., & Weiss, S. (2001). Doing reflective supervision with student teachers in a professional development school culture. *Reflective Practice, 2*, 125–154. doi: 10.1080/14623940120071343
- Wilson, B., & McCrary, J. (1996). The effect of instruction on music educators' attitudes toward students with disabilities. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 44*, 26–33.
- Yourn, B. R. (2000). Learning to teach: Perspectives from beginning music teachers. *Music Education Research, 2*(2), 181–192.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. *Harvard Educational Review, 57*(1), 23–48.

APPENDIX A

Music Student Teaching Seminar Survey

1. In which state is the institution located?

	Arkansas	Illinois	Iowa	Kansas	Kentucky	Missouri	Nebraska	Oklahoma	Tennessee
State									

2. On average, how many music students are enrolled for student teaching during the fall semester?

3. On average, how many music students are enrolled for student teaching during the spring semester?

4. How long is the student teaching internship?

Number of Years: _____

5. Does your institution have a limit for the distance of the student teaching placement from the college/university campus?

- Yes
- No

If “No” is selected, then skip to Question 7.

6. How many miles from campus are student teachers allowed to be placed?

7. Who makes formal observations of the student teacher in the classroom during the internship (check all that apply)?

- Student Teaching Seminar Instructor
- Other Music Education Faculty
- Music Education Graduate Students
- Adjunct Staff (non-terminal degree)
- Other (please specify): _____
- Unsure

8. Does your institution offer a seminar that coincides with the student teaching internship?

- Yes
- No

If "No" is selected, then skip to Question 38.

9. How often does the seminar meet throughout the student teaching internship (check all that apply)?

- Once a Month
- Twice per Month
- Once a Week
- Daily (prior to the internship)
- Other (please specify): _____

If "Daily (prior to the internship)" is selected, then answer Question 10.

10. If prior to the internship, how many days does the seminar meet?

11. What is the average length of your seminar meetings?

	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5	5.5	6	6.5	7	7.5	8	8.5	9
Number of Hours																	

12. Which best describes the meeting location of the student teaching seminar?

- On-Campus Classroom/Meeting Room
- Off-Campus Private Location (e.g., school, meeting room, etc.)
- Off-Campus Public Location (e.g., restaurant, coffee shop, etc.)
- Virtual Meeting (i.e., Internet Conferencing)
- Hybrid (mix of face-to-face and virtual meetings)

13. If student teachers are unable to attend in person, what methods of attendance are used for the seminar (check all that apply)?

- Teleconference
- Internet Video Conference
- Other (please specify): _____
- None

14. Which best describes the demographic of the seminar participants?

- All Music Education Majors
- Education Majors of Various Specialization
- Other (please specify): _____

15. Are music student teachers required to attend seminar meetings?

- Yes
- No

16. Do students receive a grade for the seminar that is separate from the student teaching internship?

- Yes
- No

17. What is the current rank of the seminar instructor?

- Professor
- Associate Professor
- Assistant Professor
- Instructor/Lecturer
- Graduate Student
- Other (please specify): _____
- Unsure

18. What is the highest degree received by the seminar instructor?

- Doctorate
- Certificate
- Masters
- Bachelors
- Associates
- Unsure

19. In what area was the highest degree earned by the seminar instructor?

- Music Education
- Applied Music
- Conducting
- Other (please specify): _____
- Unsure

20. How many years of public school teaching experience does the seminar instructor have?

Number of Years: _____

21. What is the primary teaching area of the seminar instructor?

- Education
- Music Education
- Music Performance
- Large Ensembles/Conducting
- Music Theory/Composition
- Music History
- Graduate Student
- Other (please specify): _____
- Unsure

22. If there is any other information that you feel is important in understanding the structure of the student teaching internship or seminar at your institution, please explain:

23. Is there a required text for the music student teaching seminar?

- Yes
- No

If "Yes" is selected, then answer Question 24.

24. Please list the following information for the required text.

Author:

Title:

Edition:

25. Does your seminar offer an introductory orientation before student teaching placement begins?

Yes

No

If "Yes" is selected, then answer Question 26.

26. Who is required to attend the orientation (check all that apply)?

Student Teacher

Cooperating Teacher

University Supervisor

Seminar Instructor

School Administration

Other (please specify): _____

27. To what extent do you address the following internship-specific topics in music student teaching seminar?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot
Transition to student teaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cooperating teacher relationships	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student teacher responsibilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student teacher preparedness	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student teacher motivation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assessment of the student teacher	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

28. To what extent do you address the following classroom management topics in music student teaching seminar?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot
Organization	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Behavior management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Motivating students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Gaining student respect	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Pacing	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teacher confidence/apprehension	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

29. To what extent do you address the following curriculum topics in music student teaching seminar?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot
Teaching philosophies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Music learning theories	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Curriculum development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson/Rehearsal planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Standards-based education	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Choosing performance literature	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Designing classroom activities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Assessment and evaluation of student learning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Cross-discipline integration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

30. To what extent do you address the following instructional strategies in music student teaching seminar?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot
Sequencing instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Effective feedback	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Differentiated instruction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Adjusting instructional techniques	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Experimenting with instructional strategies	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Developing transfer	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

31. To what extent do you address topics from university coursework in music student teaching seminar?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot
Music education methods	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Instrumental techniques	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Vocal techniques	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Conducting techniques	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Music theory/history concepts	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

32. To what extent do you address the following student needs in music student teaching seminar?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot
Student well-being	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Students with special needs in the music classroom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Addressing students' personal issues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

33. To what extent do you address the following administrative topics in music student teaching seminar?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot
Working with school administration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Advocacy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Educational policy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parent/Booster programs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Parent – Teacher relationships	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Program handbooks	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

34. To what extent do you address the following employment topics in music student teaching seminar?

	Not at all	Very little	Somewhat	A lot
Applying for teaching positions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Interviewing for teaching positions	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Licensure	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professionalism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Mentoring in the first year	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Professional development	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teacher burn-out	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

35. Please list and describe topics NOT included in the previous topic areas that are covered in your student teaching seminar:

36. Which activities or assignments do you include in the music student teaching seminar (check all that apply)?

- Reading/discussing music teaching articles
- Article reviews
- Compose a philosophy of teaching
- Creating lesson plans
- Viewing/Discussing intern teaching videos
- Analyzing intern teaching videos
- Constructing a résumé and cover letter
- Conducting mock interviews
- Daily/Weekly written reflection journals
- Written teaching reflections
- On-line discussion boards/web-logs
- Peer group discussions
- Portfolios/e-Portfolios
- Sharing student teacher artifacts (lessons, unit plans, materials, etc.)
- Guest speakers
- Other (please specify): _____
- None

37. Which type of culminating project is included in the music student teaching seminar (check all that apply)?

- Hard-copy portfolio
- Electronic portfolio
- Teacher work sample
- Synthesis project/paper
- Other (please specify): _____
- None

38. Is there anything else you would like to add that you feel is important in understanding the content of your music student teaching seminar?

39. If you feel comfortable sharing your syllabus, assignments, classroom activities, or other supporting documents from your music student teaching seminar, please submit electronic copies here. You may remove identifying information before uploading; otherwise please be assured that confidentiality will be maintained by removing personal and institutional names in any presentation of the findings.

APPENDIX B



Campus Institutional Review Board
University of Missouri-Columbia

485 McReynolds Hall
Columbia, MO 65211-1150
PHONE: (573) 882-9585
FAX: (573) 884-0663

October 21, 2011

Principal Investigator: Baumgartner, Christopher M
Department: School of Music

Your Application to project entitled *An Examination of Music Student Teaching Seminars in Midwestern Universities* was reviewed and approved by the MU Campus Institutional Review Board according to terms and conditions described below:

IRB Project Number	1198268
Funding Source	
Initial Application Approval Date	October 21, 2011
IRB Expiration Date	October 21, 2012
Level of Review	Exempt
Project Status	Active - Open to Enrollment
Regulation	45 CFR 46.101b(2)
Risk Level	Minimal Risk

The principal investigator (PI) is responsible for all aspects and conduct of this study. The PI must comply with the following conditions of the approval:

1. No subjects may be involved in any study procedure prior to the IRB approval date or after the expiration date.
2. All unanticipated problems, serious adverse events, and deviations must be reported to the IRB within 5 days.
3. All modifications must be IRB approved by submitting the Exempt Amendment prior to implementation unless they are intended to reduce risk.
4. All recruitment materials and methods must be approved by the IRB prior to being used.
5. The Annual Exempt Certification Form must be submitted to the IRB for review and approval at least 30 days prior to the project expiration date.
6. Maintain all research records for a period of seven years from the project completion date.
7. Utilize the IRB stamped consent documents and other approved research documents located within the document storage section of eIRB.

If you have any questions, please contact the Campus IRB at 573-882-9585 or umcresearchcirb@missouri.edu.

Thank you,

Charles Borduin, PhD
Campus IRB Chair

APPENDIX C

Informed Consent

The purpose of this research study is to acquire data concerning music student teaching seminars across National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) in accredited institutions in the Midwest. You were contacted because of you have been identified as a supervisor of music student teaching at your institution. The results, which will describe current practices for the structure and content of music student teaching seminars and identify how these seminars address the concerns of music student teachers and their cooperating teachers, as detailed by extant literature, will provide information and ideas that should be useful for those who serve as teacher educators and seminar instructors.

Please complete the short questionnaire that follows. This should take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. While I hope you will complete the whole survey, you will be free to decline to answer any items, as you choose. You may remove yourself from the research at any point without penalty.

Your responses to the survey questions will be completely confidential – there will be no way for me to connect survey responses with respondents. Near the end of the questionnaire, you will be given the option to upload any supporting documents, such as syllabi and assignments, that you feel enhance the data collected from the survey. You are encouraged to remove any identifiable information before uploading, but if that is not convenient, please be assured that no identifying information will be used in any manner in the presentation of findings from these documents. This information will be downloaded only to the researcher's computer, which is password protected.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the University of Missouri Institutional Review Board (IRB) at XXX-XXX-XXXX, or my doctoral advisor, Dr. Wendy Sims, XXX-XXX-XXXX. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions about this research.

Thank you very much,

Christopher Baumgartner at the University of Missouri, XXX XXXX Hall, Columbia, MO 65211; XXX-XXX-XXXX; XXXXX@mizzou.edu.

By clicking to enter the survey, I am giving my informed consent to participate in this research project.

[Click Here to Enter Survey](#)

APPENDIX D

October 31, 2011

Dear Professor {LastName},

I am a doctoral student in music education at the University of Missouri, conducting a dissertation study examining the structure and content of music student teaching seminars at NASM accredited institutions. I am writing to request your help in completing a research survey. If you are not the individual responsible for music student teaching internships at your institution, please forward this message to the appropriate instructor. If you do not wish to receive reminder messages, feel free to reply with the name and email address of the individual to be contacted and I will remove you from my list and contact that person directly.

Your participation in the research is strictly voluntary. The Informed Consent Form will be provided as the first page of the survey.

The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. It may be accessed through at: https://umissourieducation.qualtrics.com/WRQualtricsSurveyEngine/?SID=SV_3U8hgx076k2s9RG&_=1

Near the end of the survey, you will be given the option to submit any supporting documents that you feel enhance the data collected from the questionnaire, such as course syllabi and assignments. You may remove all identifying information before uploading them, but if they do contain identifiable information, I assure you that both you and your institution will remain anonymous in the presentation of any findings.

The survey link will be active from October 31, 2011 to November 28, 2011. If you have any questions, you may contact me at XXXXXX@mizzou.edu. Questions about your rights as a research participant may be addressed to the University of Missouri IRB at XXX-XXX-XXXX.

If you would like a summary of the results once the study is completed, at the end of the survey you will find a separate e-mail address where you can send a request. Thank you for your help with this project!

Sincerely,
Christopher M. Baumgartner

APPENDIX E

November 14, 2011

Dear Professor {LastName},

Please accept this reminder regarding my research study on music student teaching seminars. Below is my previous message that includes a description of the research project and a link to the online survey, which will remain active a little while longer.

If you have already responded to the questionnaire, I thank you for your time! Your participation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,
Christopher M. Baumgartner

APPENDIX F

November 21, 2011

Dear Professor {LastName},

If you have already responded to my survey regarding music student teaching seminars, I thank you very much. Your time and efforts are greatly appreciated!

If you have not yet responded, please accept this final reminder as an invitation to participate. I have listed my initial message below, which includes a description of the research project and a link to the online survey. **The survey will only remain active through the end of this month.** Thank you for your consideration!

Sincerely,
Christopher M. Baumgartner

APPENDIX G

Question 22. If there is any other information that you feel is important in understanding the structure of the student teaching internship or seminar at your institution, please explain.

Responses Rate: 22

- No.
- All education majors enroll in the same seminar during their semester of student teaching.
- First, we are on a tri term schedule and do not have student teachers in the spring, only fall and winter. Secondly, as our student teachers are supervised by our own faculty and not hired-out, there is no real limit to the distance students student teach. In most cases, they are placed in schools within 40 miles. On two exceptions, they were placed in a satellite location 100 miles away, still supervised by our faculty. Thirdly, the seminars are staffed by more than one faculty, but your survey does not permit that information.
- Our state will soon undergo a significant overhaul regarding the format of student teaching. As of fall 2013, all students seeking teacher certification will be required to complete a "residency 1" semester and "residency 2." Residency 1 will be a five-week placement in the semester prior to student teaching. Residency 2 will be the full student-teaching placement. While this model may work well in some areas, it is not ideal for music programs and most music departments are struggling to make current curricula fit this model.
- We include guest speakers at each seminar. Typically, it is an administrator (principal or superintendent).
- The student teaching seminar is administrated by a professor in the School of Education. Often outside speakers are engaged to present during these large group sessions, attended by ALL collegians who are student teaching that semester. In addition to the large group, students (typically 4-5) meet for an hour with their observation supervisor. The music education students meet with the music education supervisor, who also makes their observations in the music classrooms where they student teach.
- We share evaluation of interns, but the education observer evaluates the portfolio.
- We offer all-level licensure for our graduates. They spend half the student teaching semester in a secondary setting and half in an elementary music setting.

- The University of XXXXX, offers both the traditional one semester of undergraduate student teaching and the fifth-year, year-long, graduate-level internship, which must be taken during one academic year, fall and spring, in that order. Students choose one of these two options to complete licensure. About 80% of our music education majors take the traditional one semester of student teaching. The graduate interns are expected to return to campus for a sixth year of course work to complete the Master of Music degree with a concentration in Music Education. Interns receive a year of teaching experience and enter their first job as a second-year teacher on the Tennessee pay scale. As for the Student Teaching Seminar, I instruct one section for the instrumentalists and our vocal music education specialist teaches a section for the vocal and vocal/keyboard student teachers. We have the interns join the student teachers during fall semester only. Regarding limits on student teaching and intern placements, they must be assigned to a public school (no private schools) and the placement school must be in state. So the only limit distance-wise is of our choosing, and we normally won't go farther than XXXXX, so about 200 miles.
- Even though one professor is responsible for doing the observations of the student teachers, we often ask another teacher to go out and do one of the three observations. This is true especially when the student teacher is a vocal/choral emphasis since our student teacher supervisor is an instrumentalist.
- In selecting the student teaching placement, the Director of Field Placement, The music education coordinator and one supervisor are involved in making the placement selections.
- The student teaching seminar consists of five on campus meetings and online blog discussions that occur approximately two times per week through the experience. Student teaching consists of two eight-week blocks at two different levels.
- Students have a seminar that is for all current student teacher candidates (all majors), but the music supervising teachers hold additional meetings periodically to help the candidates throughout the student teaching semester.
- The student teaching and seminar are graded as one unit.
- One semester (16 weeks) prior to the student teaching semester, our students have their Clinical Observation Experience. This semester consists of 100 hours of observation and teaching in their area of study (strings, choir, band). The students are placed in a specific school. Usually their clinical experience and student teaching are in different levels, one is in middle school and the other is in high school.

- Half of the seminar time is spent with University Supervisors, in their specialty area, and the other half is spent with education majors in special topics and guest speakers.
- It is handled by the Ed Dept.
- I am unable to accurately answer several of the previous questions. Seminar is taught through the college of education and the music department has little contact and information about how it functions. I believe there may be multiple sections of seminar each semester, but I am guessing as to the frequency (i.e., monthly, weekly) and duration (i.e., # of hours) they meet. Additionally, I do not know which college of education professors teach those seminars nor anything about their rank/background, etc... Our music faculty supervises the music student interns, but that is the extent of our role. Unfortunately, we do not have a stand alone seminar for music student interns.
- Music Education Student Teaching is administered by Education Department. Music faculty have been invited to participate in observation.
- One important aspect of our program is that the seminar is NOT a Music Ed seminar, but is run by the School of Education. Our students are in the seminar along with education majors from every conceivable field.
- Our student teaching is currently 16 weeks, but by 2013 we will have a year long student teaching structure. Our university supervisors are music education faculty, retired music education faculty, or recently retired K-12 music teachers. We have seminars within the department of music for all music education majors and outside the department in the College of Education across disciplines. As Coordinator of Music Education, I conduct the first seminar of each semester. I also make all of the student teaching placement. No graduate students observe student teachers.
- Yes. We have 3--4 scheduled seminar days for the entire student teaching class of the university. For music education majors, there are 15 additional hours of professional development required, but they are not required on a weekly basis, rather at the discretion of the supervisor--often incorporated into state music association professional development.

APPENDIX H

Question 35. Please list and describe topics NOT included in the previous topic areas that are covered in your student teaching seminar.

Response Rate: 22

- None.
- Most of the topics in the questions were addressed in the music methods coursework. The seminar is structured more as a seminar, not an instructional class.
- Professional resources/organizations.
- Professionalism. What expectations will a building administrator have for you, the new music teacher. We also discuss student teaching Portfolio Assignments.
- Résumé -writing and electronic Portfolio assignments and completion.
- 1. Online portfolios of interns for instruction and assessment. We use TaskStream.
2. Before I came to this university all music interns were only observed/assessed by School of Ed. personnel. I am in music dept. and now do half of observations except in cohort situations. 3. Praxis 4. Cohorts.
- Our seminar is not designed specifically for music, but for ALL education majors.
- I'd note that many of the issues surveyed in this section are covered in our senior-level teaching methods classes. I use our "Senior Seminar" meetings for student teachers/interns to discuss the goings-on in their classrooms and to prepare them for final licensure and job searches. As for the student teaching/intern orientation, we hold that in my office several months before student teaching or interning begins. I cover all the rules and regulations then.
- Our students develop a portfolio during their undergraduate degree. The final part of the portfolio is designing, teaching and assessing a unit or concert during their student teaching semester. They have to address students with special needs and how they made accommodations for these learners in their lessons.
- School District Structure, Assessment, Types of Music Classes, Educational programs (no child left behind, etc.).
- Legal issues School Safety Tutorial Mandatory Reporting.
- Reflection on individual lessons; discussion of required projects for the School of Education.

- Issues of a ethical nature.
- Diversity, Teacher Work Sample, Video Case Studies Presented by Students.
- State mandates for the teachers - our state has an intensive internship year following student teaching, so most of the time we see our student teachers during seminar we need to help them learn to navigate through these materials. They are also the same documents we use for student teaching lesson plans, unit plans, assessment, etc.
- The work sample required by the state for teacher licensure.
- Most of the topics ranked as "somewhat" in the previous pages are discussed and studied intensively in the methods class taken during the same semester as clinical observation experience. There is also a seminar for clinical observation experience. Also, reflective journals are written by ST's and discussed in seminar.
- Networking, assessment of both teacher and learning.
- At our institution, the music students attend a few seminars per semester with all other education majors of various disciplines, so nothing about music is specifically covered there. The music education professor, while not the person teaching the seminar sessions, is the instructor responsible for supervision and university level assessment of the student teacher. This professor meets with students a few times a semester during their student teaching and together they cover more music specific content as well as some of the additional areas such as behavior management (without pen and paper in the class), the differences of teaching elementary music, choral music and instrumental music and specific activities suitable to specific grade levels.
- Teacher Work Sample (i.e., student teaching portfolio).
- These last series of questions are covered in my methods class...Music Specialists don't conduct the seminar.
- A music student teaching seminar does not exist at our university, only a seminar for all content areas taught by the college of education. As such, I was not able to answer any of the previous blocks of questions because they are not applicable to our situation. My best guess is that the college of education seminar covers general pedagogy topics in addition to interview/professional dispositions. I do not believe they cover anything specifically related to teaching music.

APPENDIX I

Question 38. Is there anything else you would like to add that you feel is important in understanding the content of your music student teaching seminar?

Response Rate: 19

- No.
- When a student desires to go more than 90 miles away, we contract with a local retired teacher to supervise their internship. This has worked well. Someone from the university still has to be responsible for grading and paperwork.
- Students at our university are required to pass all certification exams before the student teaching semester. Therefore, we do not discuss licensure processes and exam content review. This is also the first year that music student teachers have been observed/evaluated by music faculty (still in the transition process).
- Everything's been covered.
- We are fortunate to have an excellent working relationship between the School of Education and the Department of Music. The music education area head, along with an adjunct professor, handle all details with music ed student teachers as well as observing and supervising all music student teachers. The music education area head also grades and checks all electronic portfolios of all music ed student teachers.
- Although I have supervised student teachers for several years now, I do not teach the seminar class. The professor who has taught it for years is now Dean of Arts and Humanities, and the professor who will teach the class next is a new hire who doesn't have a complete syllabus yet. I answered to the best of my knowledge, having worked with all of the above!
- I, music faculty, attend as a guest only. I do not get to speak to the music students except in breaks.
- We do use electronic portfolios, but they are part of the student teaching experience grade, not the seminar course.
- It is a very important culminating experience for their undergraduate degree. Student teaching pulls all their course work, ensembles, private studio lessons, theory, history together.
- It is tough to balance what I feel I need to present with what they often need to vent about/talk about.

- Reflective practice informed by inquiry and ethics is the conceptual basis. Problem posing and problem solving are key features.
- The college of education is where our student teacher seminar is technically "housed." A specific music student teaching seminar does not technically exist as part of our department or university, although we (music supervisors) do schedule extra meetings throughout the semester to help the student teachers.
- Advocacy and Philosophy are discussed early on in the music education curriculum. By the time Student Teaching takes place, Advocacy and Philosophy are well covered. Articles on all topics brought up in this survey are, again, read and discussed in methods class and other music education classes.
- I like the idea of peer video viewing and critique. We'll implement that next year. We see them every week for 1.5 hours for 16 weeks. So we have more contact time than many other programs.
- At this current time, I, the music education professor am an interim instructor while a National search is conducted. Generally, the music education position is filled by someone with a doctorate who is at the level of assistant professor. I have answered to the best of my ability. Good luck with your research!
- Many of the topics indicate[d] in this survey (i.e., mock interviews, teaching philosophy, literature selection, vocal/instrument technique, etc.) are discussed through our professional sequence that leads up to the student teaching experience. They are not emphasized in the seminar, but we will discuss them if a specific concern arises as part of a discussion.
- This seminar is not the most crucial portion of the student teaching experience...the teaching is...
- No, other than to add that the music department does not teach the music student teaching seminar. As such, my knowledge is very limited and I could not provide useful information for many of your questions. It appears the approach to the questionnaire may be built on the assumption that all colleges/universities in the Midwest region have a music student teaching seminar taught by a music education faculty member. While I believe this would be ideal, it is not the reality at our institution. This may also be true, unfortunately, at other Midwest institutions.
- We have journals and various assignments weekly, as well as monthly meetings via Skype for our interns.

VITA

Christopher Baumgartner attended Bowling Green State University in Bowling Green, Ohio, earning a Bachelor of Music Education degree in 2003. After four years teaching instrumental and general music in the public schools of Ohio, he received a Master of Music degree in music education from Bowling Green State University in 2009, followed by a Doctor of Philosophy in Curriculum and Instruction, Music Education in 2012 from the University of Missouri. Christopher taught courses in brass techniques, instrumental rehearsal clinic, and music student teaching seminar while attending graduate school. He assisted the band program at the University of Missouri, frequently serving as a guest conductor for many ensembles in the School of Music, including the Mizzou New Music Ensemble. A regular clinician for school band programs, Dr. Baumgartner plans to continue his involvement in public school music education, focusing his research on music teacher preparation, the student teaching experience, and teacher effectiveness in the music classroom.