

DISRUPTIONS AND TRANSFORMATIONS: THE INFLUENCES OF CULTURE AND
COMMUNITY ON PRE-SERVICE MUSIC EDUCATORS' OCCUPATIONAL IDENTITIES

By

Daniel Joseph Albert

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Music Education—Doctor of Philosophy

2016

ABSTRACT

DISRUPTIONS AND TRANSFORMATIONS: THE INFLUENCES OF CULTURE AND COMMUNITY ON PRE-SERVICE MUSIC EDUCATORS' OCCUPATIONAL IDENTITIES

By

Daniel Joseph Albert

With the intent of helping to reconceptualize music teacher education programs and improve the quality of music education for all students, the purpose of this study was to examine the interactions within the cultural cohort communities of a music teacher education program embedded within the culture of a school of music and the role that these interactions play in “disrupting,” or challenging, pre-service educators’ occupational identities and preconceptions of music education. Research questions for this explanatory sequential (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011) mixed methods study focused on determining which structural components of a music teacher education program (e.g., course curricula, University/College of Education/School of Music/music education program requirements, music education program sequence), if any, assist with “disrupting” pre-service music educators’ occupational identities; why certain communities, interactions, and persons within the cultural cohort are the most significant “disruptive” influences on pre-service music educators’ occupational identities; and how these “disruptions” manifested themselves in pre-service music educators’ conceptions of and beliefs and attitudes about music education.

Participants completed a Pre-Service Music Educator Survey to help indicate which courses, persons, social interactions, or other influences within or outside of the School of Music most influenced them to change their beliefs of music education and identities as music educators between matriculation into the School of Music and the time of taking the survey. Following data collection and analysis of the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey, I created

cohort groups of students from classes that were identified by undergraduate music education students as being highly “disruptive” to participate in focus group discussions. Additionally, all music education faculty members participated in a focus group discussion and each participated in an individual interview.

Results from the survey suggested changes in students’ occupational identities and preconceptions of music education during their time in the music teacher education program, changes in interests in occupational types of music teaching (e.g., early childhood music educator, high school performance-based ensemble teacher, etc.), and changes in means of teaching music (e.g., performance-based ensembles, teaching elementary general music, music technology, popular music, etc.). Additionally, focus group discussion revealed that several components of the music teacher education program are “disruptive” influences on students’ occupational identities and preconceptions of music education, including a “de-tracked” music teacher education curriculum, two introductory/foundational music education courses during the first and second years of study, and required fieldwork experiences embedded in most music education courses. Interactions within the “community” nature of the program between peers, faculty, and graduate student assistants also were “disruptive” influences.

Implications for music teacher education include creating opportunities for philosophical discussions regarding contemporary topics in music education throughout a music teacher education program, devoting time during music education courses for students to examine the present state of their occupational identities, facilitating fieldwork experiences in “disruptive” settings, and striving to create a sense of “community” within the music teacher education program.

Copyright by
DANIEL JOSEPH ALBERT
2016

For my students, who have been my best teachers.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

While the title page of this study bears only my name, the participants very much served as collaborators and co-authors. Their stories were incredible to listen to and I am so thankful that they so generously provided their time. I hope that my presentation of their contributions honored their voices and intent on improving music teacher education and, by extension, K-12 music education.

This study would not have been possible without the support of certain individuals in the College of Music. My committee chairperson, Dr. Cynthia Crump Taggart, provided her time so generously towards helping me be the scholar I am today. Her combination of a critical mind and encouraging mentor will always inspire me to do my best. Dr. Mitchell Robinson always welcomed me when his door was open and offered sage advice and answers to my many questions. I will continue to admire his belief for a music education for all, as well as his work-life balance. Dr. John Kratus was kind to introduce me to collegiate music teaching through his classes. I will never forget our many post-class conversations that served as mentoring sessions and his encouragement of my scholarly agenda. Dr. Sandra Snow is an amazing educator who listens so well to her students. I marvel at her ability to say and teach so much with just a few words or gestures. Dr. Michael Largey will always serve as my professional role model. His passion for excellence in teaching is clearly evident and he consistently helped me clarify my thinking for my benefit and the benefit of readers. Drs. Juliet Hess' and Marcie Ray's passion for social justice and equity in education have made me look at the world and its everyday interactions in a very different light. Both of you have inspired so many students to make the

world a better place for all. Finally, Dr. Judy Palac always provided encouraging words when I needed them the most.

I was incredibly fortunate to be able to learn from my graduate school colleagues and friends, who are enormously talented educators and brilliant thinkers. Thank you to Adam, Ryan, Josh, Stuart, Andrea, Mark, Becky, Ashley, Brandon, Holly, and Tyler for providing so many influential learning experiences. Thank you also to the many Michigan State University alumni—the Spartan “Family”—who have been so supportive and generously provided advice on a range of topics.

My family has always looked out for me and been such an important part of my education. I am so grateful for their support. I am sorry that my father did not live to see me receive my final degree, but, wherever he is, I know that he is proud.

Finally, my husband, Thomas, has been my foundation during three years of living apart. He calmed me down when things got stressful and provided clarity when I needed it the most. He truly is my “better half” and I am so thankful for him. I cannot wait to see what life has in store for us!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	xiii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Music Teacher Education Programs and Culture	3
Identity	6
Culture and Habits	8
Communities of Practice	10
Theories of the Development of Occupational Identity in Teachers.....	14
Sociological Theories.....	14
Social constructivism	15
Symbolic interactionism	15
Symbolic Interaction and Music Educator Identity Construction	17
Teacher Development Theories	17
Levels of Concern Model.....	17
Levels of Reflection	18
Theories of Occupational Identity	19
Occupational Identity and General Education	19
Occupational title	19
Commitment to professional tasks and knowledge	19
Institutional position and reference groups.....	20
Social position.....	20
Occupational Identity and Music Education.....	21
Primary socialization	21
Secondary socialization	23
Need for the Study	26
Purpose Statement and Research Questions	29
Researcher's Lens	30
Definitions.....	31
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	34
Program Evaluation Literature.....	34
Program Evaluation Literature in Undergraduate Music Teacher Education.....	34
Summary	39
Occupational Identity in Pre-Service Music Teacher Education Literature	40
Primary Socialization.....	41
Summary	49
Secondary Socialization.....	50
Summary	61
Literature on Student Teaching in General Education.....	62
Literature on Student Teaching in Music Education	65
Summary	70

Culture and Communities of Practice Literature in Higher Education	71
Culture and Communities of Practice in Collegiate Music Schools	72
Culture and Communities of Practice in Pre-Service Music Education	73
Summary	74
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	76
Methodological Overview	76
Theoretical Frameworks	78
Schein's (1985, 2004) Three Levels of Culture	79
Artifacts	80
Values	80
Assumptions	81
Setting and Description	81
Quantitative Methodology	83
Construction of Pre-Service Music Educator Survey	83
Survey Administration Procedure	85
Data Analysis	86
Qualitative Methodology	87
Participant Selection	88
Data Collection and Analysis	89
Timeline	90
Trustworthiness	91
Limitations	91
CHAPTER IV: QUANTITATIVE RESULTS	93
Survey Results	93
Demographic Data	93
Membership and Involvement in Collegiate Music Education Associations	96
Self-Identification	97
Influential Classes	100
Other Experiences	110
Past and Present Interest in Occupational Types of Music Teaching	112
Past and Present Interest in Means of Music Teaching	116
Interpretation	120
Moving Forward: Implications of Quantitative Results for Qualitative Procedures	122
Student Cohort Focus Groups Questions	124
Faculty Focus Group Questions	126
Individual Faculty Interview Questions	128
CHAPTER V: "HELPING STUDENTS FIND THEIR VOICES": "DISRUPTION" VIA STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS OF THE MUSIC TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM	132
Review of Qualitative Methodology	132
Description of Classes	133
MUS 125 – Women's Chamber Ensemble	133
MUS 171 – Class Strings I	134

MUS 177 – Introduction to Music Education	134
MUS 210 – Songwriting	136
MUS 277 – Principles of Music Education	137
MUS 336B – Ensemble Conducting II: Choral	138
MUS 455 – Teaching Instrumental Music	139
MUS 456 – Teaching Stringed Instruments	140
MUS 465 – Teaching Early Childhood Music	141
MUS 467 – Teaching Elementary General Music	142
MUS 468 – Teaching Choral Music	143
MUS 469 – Teaching Secondary General Music	144
MUS 495 – Student Teaching in Music	145
Influential Structural Components of the Program	146
“De-TrackeD” Program Sequence	146
Observation/Fieldwork Requirements	149
Student Teaching	156
Challenges to Occupational Identity Formation	161
Tensions Between Performance and Education Aspects	161
Stigmatization of Education Students	162
Focus on Performance Aspects	164
Lack of String “Community”	165
Music Education Admissions Policies	167
Summary	170

CHAPTER VI: “I HAVEN’T CHANGED THE ‘WHAT’ I WANT TO DO. I CHANGED THE ‘HOW’ I WANT TO DO IT”: “DISRUPTIVE” INFLUENCES WITHIN THE MUSIC TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM AND THEIR MANIFESTATIONS WITHIN OCCUPATIONAL IDENTITIES

MUS 177 & MUS 277: The Foundation of the Program	173
The “Weed Out” Classes	181
Timing of Philosophical Development in the Context of Lack of Experience ...	183
“Cloning”	187
Summary	189
MUS 125B: Empowerment	190
Empowerment through Ownership and Community as Ensemble Members	190
Empowerment as Women	192
MUS 336B & MUS 468: Ownership/Authenticity and Vulnerability	195
Ownership and Authenticity	195
Vulnerability	197
MUS 465 & MUS 467: Music for All, Dismantling Gender Barriers, and New Possibilities	198
Music for All	199
Dismantling Gender Barriers	201
New Possibilities	203
Developing a Community of Practice: Teacher Modeling, Peer Teaching, and Field Experience	206

MUS 210 & MUS 469: Reconnecting with and Rethinking Musicianship, New Possibilities, and Concerns about Practical Application.....	209
Reconnecting with and Rethinking Musicianship	209
New Possibilities.....	214
Concerns about Practical Application.....	220
MUS 455: “Jack of All Trades”	225
MUS 456: Diversity in the Classroom, Student Empowerment, and New Possibilities.....	227
Diversity in the Classroom.....	227
Student Empowerment.....	228
New Possibilities.....	230
MUS 171: Thinking Like Teachers	231
MUS 495: “Now It’s Real”	232
Overarching Theme: Community	234
Peer-Peer Influences	235
Faculty Influences on Students	239
Graduate Student Assistant Influences on Students.....	240
Graduate students and collegiate music education organizations.....	243
Summary	244
Centrality of Fieldwork Experiences	246
Communities of Practice.....	247
New Possibilities.....	248
Student Ownership and Empowerment	249
Gender.....	249
 CHAPTER VII: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH, AND CONCLUSION	250
Purpose and Research Questions	250
Summary of Methodological Approach and Design	251
Quantitative Methodology: Pre-Service Music Educator Survey.....	251
Qualitative Methodology	252
Summary of Results.....	253
Quantitative Results	253
Qualitative Results.....	256
“De-tracked” music education program.....	256
MUS 177 & MUS 277: The “foundational” courses	257
Timing of philosophical development in the context of lack of experience.....	257
Fieldwork experiences	258
Identity “shifting” & “safe spaces”	258
Stigmatization of music education students.....	259
Community	259
Admissions and scholarship policies	260
New possibilities.....	261
Student ownership and empowerment	262
Gender.....	263
Implications for Music Teacher Education.....	264

Introduction to Music Education courses	264
Fieldwork Experiences.....	265
Creation of New Courses	267
Evaluation of Existing Courses.....	268
Philosophy Units.....	269
Identity Development Discussions	270
Music Teacher Education Program Student Evaluations.....	271
Community	272
“De-Tracking” of Music Teacher Education Program	273
Admissions and Scholarship Policies	275
Suggestions for Future Research	277
Longitudinal Study of Participants	277
“Tracking” Through a Music Teacher Education Program	278
Replication of Study	278
Comparison of Music Teacher Education Curricula Revisions.....	279
Conclusion	279
APPENDICES	281
APPENDIX A: Institutional Review Board Approval Letter.....	282
APPENDIX B: Pre-Service Music Educator Survey.....	283
APPENDIX C: Student Cohort Focus Group Discussion Questions	293
APPENDIX D: Faculty Focus Group Discussion Questions	294
APPENDIX E: Individual Faculty Interview Questions	296
REFERENCES	302

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Participant Demographic Data ($N = 83$).....	94
Table 2: Membership and Involvement in Collegiate Music Education Association Chapters ($N = 83$)	96
Table 3: Changes in Occupational Identities (Questions 12 & 13)	97
Table 4: Classes that Changed Beliefs about Music Education (Question 12).....	100
Table 5: Classes that Changed Identities as Music Educators (Question 15).....	105
Table 6: Past and Present Interest in Occupational Types of Music Teaching (Questions 20 & 21) .	112
Table 7: Past and Present Interest in Means of Music Teaching (Questions 22 & 23)	116

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

“We do not reject our traditions, but we are willing to adapt to changing circumstances, when change we must. We are willing to suffer the discomfort of change in order to achieve a better future.” – Barbara Jordan

“Change is never easy, but always possible.” – Barack Obama

Over the past 30 years, just over a third of high school students have consistently participated in music courses (Elpus, 2014) with band and chorus being the most common secondary music courses offered (Abril & Gault, 2008). While many students may have meaningful musical and educational experiences in these ensembles, authors have argued that the music education profession has had difficulty adapting to cultural changes and has not responded to current cultural phenomena (Abril & Gault, 2008; Kratus, 2007; Williams, 2007, 2011a, 2014). They also argue that music educators need to work toward educating *all* students by creating learning experiences that are culturally relevant and personally meaningful so that students can create and perform music after graduation from secondary schools and colleges (Allsup & Benedict, 2008; Kratus, 2007; Williams, 2007, 2011a, 2014).

Due to increased access to and advances in technology, as well as the advent of the Internet, how we interact with, perform, and make music has changed substantially in recent times. Electronic instruments, portable electronic devices, and music composition software programs, to name just a few, have created potential for making music by oneself or with others without formal instruction or prior formal musical experience. Internet sites, such as YouTube, and cloud-based musical creation sites, such as Soundation, allow students to learn how to play instruments and create music without using traditional classical instruments. Students in garage

bands can collaborate and compose songs, improvise, arrange existing songs, and perform cover songs without the help of teachers. Additionally, mobile electronic devices and earbuds make the music experience much more individualized, portable, and accessible. Thousands of titles can be stored on a device that fits in a pocket, allowing one to experience any number of musical genres on command. Indeed, Tobias (2014) suggested that technology plays an important role in participatory culture—our current and public desire to not only consume music, but also participate in it—through collaboration, creation, and interaction with music.

Popularity of specific instruments has also changed. The guitar has surpassed all classical instruments in popularity and has been the most frequently sold instrument in the United States for more than a decade (National Association of Music Merchants, 2014). In 2014, sales of fretted string instruments (acoustic, electric, and other fretted strings) were double the sales of wind instruments and triple the sales of percussive instruments (National Association of Music Merchants, 2015).

Additionally, access to traditional, performance-based instrumental ensembles following graduation from secondary and collegiate schools has decreased. The community band, celebrated for being an ensemble open to all in the instrumental music world (Hazen & Hazen, 1987), is diminishing in numbers. In 1890, there was one community band for every 5,000 persons in the United States. In 2010, there was one community band for every 120,000 persons (Edmondson, 2013; Segell, 2006; United States Census Bureau, 2014).

Music teacher educators, by adjusting music teacher education curricula, can assist pre-service educators to respond and adapt to cultural changes and create educational experiences for K-12 students that are congruent with current cultural phenomena (Williams, 2007). Music teacher educators also can structure music teacher education programs to become communities—

groups of individuals that meet to share a common interest and develop skills by working together (Lave & Wenger, 1991)—that help pre-service educators adapt to societal changes and facilitate the development of culturally congruent methods of music education.

Music Teacher Education Programs and Culture

Since their inception, music teacher preparation programs have been situated within forms of community that are embedded in cultures. Teacher education programs in music education began in the 1820s with mobile teacher training “conventions” in larger cities and teacher trainers conducting sessions to train interested persons in music and basic music teaching skills¹ (Colwell, 1985). By the mid-19th century, conservatories created education programs for music supervisors. “Normal” schools—schools created to train high school graduates to be teachers—offered programs for aspiring music educators starting in the early part of the 20th century with college and universities starting to offer 4-year music education degree programs in the early 1920s (Colwell, 1985). However, degree programs incorporated a nineteenth century-based core curriculum with courses that all music students were required to take, including applied lessons with a faculty member, Western-based music theory and history, and participation in large, performing ensembles (College Music Society, 2014; Nettl, 1995). The present-day core curriculum at many schools and conservatories, influenced by the National Association of Schools of Music’s (NASM) accreditation requirements (National Association of Schools of Music, 2013), remains similar to what we expected of musicians in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (College Music Society, 2014; Nettl, 1995). The program consisted of:

- 4-6 semesters of music theory based in Western-based practices

¹ Note the conceptual and contextual difference between teacher “training”—development and practicing of skills—and teacher “education”—knowledge of theory and pedagogy to inform practice (Dove, 1986; Khan, 1994; Moore, 1986; Rao, 2004; Schofield, 1972).

- 4 or more semesters of Western-based music history coursework
- Private instruction focusing on development of Western-based performance skills and repertory
- Ensembles, with emphasis on large, conducted groups
- Keyboard classes to provide students with rudimentary executive skills

Today, nearly all music teacher preparation programs are housed in institutions of postsecondary education, including research universities, liberal arts colleges, and teachers' colleges (Nierman, Zeichner, & Hobbel, 2002). The environments of these institutions can influence behaviors through their physical features, the collective attributes of their constituents, the manner in which they are organized, and their collective social constructions (Strange & Banning, 2001). Students develop shared perspectives as they learn to cope with challenges experienced during the college experience. These shared perceptions, as well as mutual interests and common communities, become the principal mechanism for socializing newcomers and the catalyst for the creation of peer relationships (Dalton, 1989; Kuh, 1990). Colleges, therefore, can be viewed as socializing organizations as students develop a mutual attitude on the importance of extracurricular and co-curricular activities, academic performance, work, and social life (Kuh, 1990). Socialization and self-identification with a peer group can influence students' college development, as Chickering (1974) noted: "Once a person identifies himself with a group, that group becomes an anchor and a reference point. The values and behaviors approved by the group provide a background for developing individual attitudes and behaviors" (p. 88), suggesting that group membership has implications for how one interacts in a given environment and what one believes.

These peer interactions and mutual perspectives form the foundation for culture in higher education, provided by Kuh and Hall (1993):

Culture is viewed as the collective, mutually shaping patterns of institutional history, mission, physical settings, norms, traditions, values, practices, beliefs, and assumptions which guide the behavior of individuals and groups in an institution of higher education and which provide frames of reference for interpreting the meanings of events and actions on and off campus. (p. 2)

Kuh and Hall (1993) stated that this definition acknowledges the complexity of higher education, the influences of multiple factors, and the existence of distinct groups. Additionally, “. . . culture is not stagnant; it is a dynamic process of development, evolution, renewal, decline, and demise” (Love, Boschini, Jacobs, Hardy, & Kuh, 1993, p. 71).²

In higher education, culture is constructed socially through a dialectical interplay between individuals, their positionalities, and broader cultural patterns consisting of cultural cohorts—groupings consisting of individuals with shared habits, beliefs, and interests based in similarities of parts of the self (Turino, 2008), such as occupational interest with pre-service music educators. Purposefully organized cohorts within a music teacher education program, such as those created by introductory/foundational and instructional methods courses and student teaching, have the potential, given the right conditions, to be considered communities embedded within a cultural cohort—a music teacher education program—that is situated within the culture of a school of music. Contemporary literature regarding cultural and sociological theories suggest that a cultural cohort situated within a culture and the communities embedded within a cultural cohort can influence an individual’s occupational identity (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Turino, 2008;

² A more detailed discussion of “culture” begins on p. 9.

Wenger, 1998). Therefore, the implications of the cultural influence of the school of music and its curriculum on pre-service educators' could be substantial. However, schools of music and music education programs, by virtue of what is taught and assimilated through cultural interactions, may be jeopardizing the extent to which society values music education. Thus, examining how interactions within a school of music and the embedded cultural cohort communities of a music teacher education program influence pre-service educators' occupational identities could be useful to music teacher educators who seek to develop pre-service teachers who are able to create learning opportunities that are more congruent with children's cultural practices, thus facilitating musical experiences for *all* students, including those who do not already participate in a performance-based ensemble.

Identity

Throughout this study, I will examine pre-service music educators' identities as they relate to occupation, known as occupational identity—how one would describe oneself in relation to a work-related professional context. Understanding “identity” in the context of music teacher education can be challenging and confusing due to researchers' use of different terms and different uses of the same term (Roberts, 2000). Such terms have included “role-identity” (Brewer, 2009, 2014), “teacher identity” (Dolloff, 1999; Woodford, 2002), “teacher role identity” (Knowles, 1992), and simply “identity” (Roberts, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c, 2000). Compounding the issue, researchers do not always hold the same definition of “identity” itself (Paise, 2010). Furthermore, the meaning of identity and other closely related sociological constructs can change as sociologists continue to explore the concept and refine their thinking (Paise, 2010).

McCall and Simmons (1978) defined role-identity as

...the character and the role that an individual devises for himself as an occupant of a particular social position. More intuitively, such a role-identity is his imaginative view of himself as he likes to think of himself being and acting as an occupant of that position. [sic.] (p. 65)

Reinharz (1979) argued that identity is an ongoing constructive process shaped by socialization, which he defined as “not merely the transfer from one group to another in a static social structure, but the active creation of a new identity through a personal definition of the situation” (p. 374). Roberts (2003) supported Reinharz’s (1979) assertion, stating that identity is “constructed, confirmed, and maintained almost exclusively through interaction with others” (p. 5). Bouij (2004) argued that identity and socialization are grounded in and manifested via symbolic interactionism (Blumer, 1969) - the importance that symbols have in life:

We must all learn how to interpret our shared symbols in society; this being an important part of our human socialization. All human communication is also made through symbols. As social actors we all are constantly involved in negotiating the meaning of reality with one another. (p. 3)³

Bouij (2004) wrote “Our set of role-identities reflects our social experiences” (p. 4), reinforcing Roberts’ (1991b) assertion that pre-service music educators’ identities are socially constructed. Through occupational socialization, defined as the manner in which a person learns the attitudes and behaviors necessary to recognize sustainable competence within a context of employment (Marshall, 1994), pre-service music educators’ identities are validated in the act of teaching and being a member of a community that includes fellow pre-service music educators, K-12 music students, music teacher educators, and in-service teachers who interact with the

³ A more detailed discussion of symbolic interactionism begins on p. 15.

music teacher education program (Roberts, 1991b). Additionally, through symbolic interaction, humans develop a sense of “self” and “other” by placing meaning on the actions (gestures) of others, thus informing future behavior (Blumer, 1969; McCall & Simmons, 2009). Therefore, individuals seek to understand why other people act in certain ways, and, based on this understanding, may or may not align their own actions with a particular role or identity.

Turino (2008) defined identity as “the partial selection of habits and attributes used to represent oneself to oneself and to others by oneself and by others; the emphasis on certain habits and traits is relative to specific situations” (p. 95). Turino found that identity is one part of the self that encompasses the *total* sets of habits specific to an individual that develop through the ongoing dialogue of the individuals with their surroundings. When one conceptualizes her identity, one does not include all possible aspects of herself. Rather, we highlight what is relevant or productive within a given situation—what is socially important in a given context—while minimizing what is not. People often fashion their self-representation to fit their goals for particular situations and rarely reveal all the habits that constitute the self, which Turino defined as “the composite of the total number of habits that determine the tendencies for everything we think, feel, experience, and do” (p. 101). Pre-service music educators, for example, can assume an identity of music educator at socially appropriate times, such as during teacher education classes, observations, and microteaching opportunities.

Culture and Habits

Culture became a central concept of anthropologists with the work of Edward Tylor, who argued that culture consisted of habits, knowledge, and beliefs acquired by people as a member of society (Tylor, 1871). Alfred Kroeber later argued that culture is inherited and impermeable to influence by individuals (Kroeber, 1952).

Campbell (1996) opined, however, that the word “culture” is problematic. It can possess multiple meanings, including:

- (a) the works and practices of the intellectual and artistic elite (commonly referred to as “high culture”)
- (b) organic growth and development
- (c) a set of species-specific characteristics, “the distinctive ways of life which all people share by virtue of being human” (Blacking, 1986)
- (d) “the mass of learned and transmitted motor reactions, habits, techniques, ideas, and values—and the behavior they induce” (Kroeber, 1948)

Turino (2008), believing that culture and identity influence each other, proposed the use of a framework based on Bourdieu’s (1977) concept of habitus. According to Bourdieu, habits are tendencies toward the repetition of any particular behavior, thought, or reaction in similar circumstances or in reaction to similar stimuli in the present and future based on such repetitions in the past. Bourdieu argued that a person’s habits and internalized dispositions are products of relations to the environment around her and her experiences in and of the environment. Habits are achieved through active learning and imitation, develop as a result of socialization, and guide practices. These practices and objects that we produce affect our environment, which, in turn, affect our practices and our dispositions. A phenomenon of environment and practices affecting each other then establishes itself in a perpetual cycle. Dialectical interactions between individuals and their social and physical surroundings become realized through observable practices that contribute to shaping individuals, as can be observed through the lens of constructivist and symbolic interaction theories.

Turino (2008) argued that the influences of habits on an environment have direct implications for the culture of that environment. Turino defined culture as “the habits of thought and practice that are shared among individuals” (p. 95) and stated that the focus on the supraindividual (environmental factors that partially influence actions) character of culture has been augmented by an interest in the dialectical interplay between individuals and broader cultural patterns. Additionally, students’ positionalities and the memberships that they hold within multiple groups can affect their interactions in an intersectional-type manner, with some memberships having more influence and prominence than others, depending on the context in a particular moment. He found that, since individuals develop habits from their personal experience, it follows that the habits people hold in common are derived from having similar experiences and being in similar social positions and circumstances in relation to the environment. Shared habits unite people in social groups according to specific aspects of the self (class, gender, occupation, interests), known as cultural cohorts. Students of music teacher education programs can be considered a cultural cohort of the culture of a school of music due to the common interest that students share (teaching music) and the occupational identity that they assume (music educator).

Communities of Practice

Wenger (1998) argued that identity is mediated through experiences, being engaged in knowledge creation, and interaction with multiple varieties of situations and people. A community of practice, a term coined by Lave and Wenger (1991), is defined as a group of individuals that meets to share a common interest and develops skill through working together. Wenger (1998) believes that communities of practice form out of necessity to accomplish tasks, provide learning avenues, and exist within, between, and outside defined organizations. Learning

in such a community of practice is participatory, based in principles of constructivism and symbolic interactionism, and known as “situated learning” (Wenger, 1998). Furthermore, Bielaczyc and Collins (1999) believe that, within a community of practice, a culture of learning is promoted, which requires a community goal of learning, stressing ways of learning how to learn, and developing ways of sharing this knowledge. Purposefully organized learning cohorts within a music teacher education program, such as those created by introductory/foundational and instructional methods courses, student teaching, and even professional collegiate organizations, such as the National Association for Music Education (NAfME), can be considered communities of practice.

The three foundational characteristics of communities of practice are:

- (a) the domain: a shared competence that distinguishes group members from other people and is not necessarily recognized as “expertise” outside the group;
- (b) the community: members who engage in joint activities and discussion, interacting and learning together;
- (c) the practice: a shared repertoire comprised of experiences, stories, tools, and ways of addressing recurring problems (Wenger, 2002)

The building and maintenance of relationships that occur as a result of individuals sharing with the group are of utmost importance to developing a community of practice. For example, in music education, occupational identity is mediated through experiences in the university school of music first as a musician (the domain)—interacting with applied faculty and ensembles directors, who, in turn, reinforce the shared skills of the principal instrument performance or vocal performance. Second, the population within the school of music is delineated further into those choosing to teach, through specific classes aimed at constructing

shared experiences needed for identification as teachers (the community). Social interactions during pre-service training are fundamental to the construction of music teacher identity, which continue through music teacher education classes, peer teaching experiences, school observations, student teaching and induction into the profession and beyond (the practice).

Wenger (1998) discussed the relationship between communities of practice (purposefully organized cohorts within a music teacher education program), cultural cohorts (the music teacher education program), and culture. Communities of practice are organized individually to satisfy or address a specific need. For a music teacher education program, this can include learning how to teach and play woodwind instruments and how to teach an instrumental ensemble or elementary general class, among other needs that must be satisfied to prepare a pre-service music teacher for induction into the field. To treat these communities of practice broadly as one large community of practice ignores the individual uniqueness of each sub-group that is based on the need that they satisfy. Rather, Wenger (1998) suggested that communities of practice that are related to each other within a large configuration, such as a factory, office, or school, can be viewed as constellations of interconnected practices—in other words, a cultural cohort situated within a culture. Echoing principles of constructivism and symbolic interactionism, Wenger (1998) also suggested that culture is created and sustained by the interaction and borrowing of ideas among its constituent communities of practice.

Communities of practice produce artifacts (Schein, 1985, 2004) and histories that aid in the transfer of knowledge and the increase of understanding (Wenger, 1998). Knowledge is expanded through discussion (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999); thus, a main function of a community of practice is to help establish discussion. Facilitation, a concept embedded within constructivism, also applies to communities of practice (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999; Fischer, 1998; Palloff &

Pratt, 1999). Palloff and Pratt (1999) recommended that instructors of classes should act as “gentle guides” or facilitators, who “nudge” discussion and learning in the right direction. This includes the instructor’s duty of opening the community environment for discussion of the following: (1) goals, criteria for meeting goals, (2) evaluation of whether the goals have been met, plus (3) peer evaluation and self-evaluation. Rogers (2000) described the instructor’s role as a moderator or coach. Powers and Guan (2000) emphasized that identifying self-motivating factors within and enabling self-direction of participants is essential, far exceeding any motivation brought about by lecture or training brought about by content transfer between the instructor and the participants. Squire and Johnson (2000) added that the facilitator role of an instructor is more valuable than a content provider or an information source.

Facilitation allows two aspects of collaboration to develop: peer interaction and expert-to-apprentice interaction. As it applies to communities of practice, peer interaction allows for negotiation and co-construction of the community of practice (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999), which, in turn, mediates identity (Wenger, 1998). That is, the experience and collaboration of the community are worked out and transformed into “artifacts” (e.g., symbols, procedures, rules, technology, products), while also influencing the identity of the participants (Wenger, 1998).

Expert-to-apprentice relationships are key in communities of practice (Soden & Halliday, 2000). This type of relationship is known as “legitimate peripheral participation,” which conceptualizes novices at the periphery and experts at the center of a community of practice (Gherardi & Nicolini, 2000; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). In communities of practice, peripheral roles (e.g., apprentices or novices) play an important part in the community of practice by developing and using skills that require collaboration and mixing different types of expertise.

Theories of the Development of Occupational Identity in Teachers

Music education researchers have suggested that a pre-service music educator's occupational identity is derived from the interactions and eventual merger of three dimensions: teacher-self (self-perceived teacher identity), teacher-other (one's teacher identity as inferred by others), and musician (Austin, Isbell, & Russell, 2012; Haston & Russell, 2012; Isbell, 2006). Therefore, for the purposes of this study, I define occupational identity as a merger of teacher-musician (facets of teacher identity and musician identity) and self-other (how we are understood or defined by others) dimensions (Austin, Isbell, & Russell, 2012) based on influences from symbolic interactionism (Blumer, 1969; Bouij, 2004) and occupational socialization (Marshall, 1994).

The phenomenon of identity is mediated by culture, experiences, and interactions with people within multiple varieties of situations (Bourdieu, 1977; Turino, 2008; Wenger, 1998). However, additional sociological and teacher development theories based on social interactions within an organization, such as a community of practice, can further illuminate how pre-service educators' occupational identities are constructed.

Sociological Theories

Sociological theory literature has suggested that interactions within communities and cultures influence the formation of knowledge and identities (Buechler, 2008; Burke, 2006; Jenkins, 2008; Turino, 2008). Furthermore, based on sociological theory literature, interactions within communities and across communities embedded within the cultural cohort can influence identities (Buechler, 2008; Burke, 2006; Jenkins, 2008; Turino, 2008). Two sociological theories in particular—social constructivism and symbolic interactionism—are among the most pervasive

theories employed in recent studies regarding music educator occupational identity (Isbell, 2006; L’Roy, 1983; Paul, 1998; Roberts, 1991b; Wagoner, 2011; Wolfgang, 1990; Woodford, 2002).

Social constructivism. Social constructivists believe that learner construction of knowledge is the product of social interaction, interpretation, and understanding (Vygotsky, 1962). There are four key assumptions of social constructivism that describe how humans interact with each other and the world to construct knowledge and meaning:

- (a) Knowledge in the world is not learned; rather, knowledge is created.
- (b) The knowledge created has no meaning without social interactions to assign it meaning.
- (c) Human construction of meaning and knowledge take on significance through our social interactions.
- (d) Humanity is dependent on the ways in which we reflect on the construction of meaning, through our past, present and future (Gergen, 2009).

As Wenger (1998) stated, learning in a community of practice is partly based in principles of social constructivism. Dialectical interactions between individuals within a community of practice and their social and physical surroundings not only construct knowledge, but also shape individuals’ identities (Bouij, 2004; Reinharz, 2003; Roberts, 1991b, 2003; Wenger, 1998).

Symbolic interactionism. As previously discussed, symbolic interactionism further delineates constructivism through a focus on symbols and the meanings human beings ascribe to the symbols. Although symbolic interactionism originated with the work of Mead (1934), Herbert Blumer, one of Mead’s students, coined the term (Buechler, 2008). According to Blumer (1969):

The term “symbolic interaction” refers, of course, to the peculiar and distinctive character of interaction as it takes place between human beings. The peculiarity consists in the fact that human beings interpret or “define” each other’s actions instead of merely reacting to each other’s actions. Their “response” is not made directly to the actions of one another but instead is based on the meaning which they attach to such actions. Thus, human interaction is mediated by the use of symbols, by interpretation, or by ascertaining the meaning of one another’s actions. This mediation is equivalent to inserting a process of interpretation between stimulus and response in the case of human behavior. (p. 180)

Symbolic interactionism then may be summarized as the following: (a) the symbol itself only has meaning when humans attach meaning to it, (b) all meaning is derived from social interaction, (c) meanings are altered within different social contexts and interactions (Buechler, 2008; Delamater, 2003; McCall, 2006; McCall & Simmons, 2009; Stryker & Vryan, 2003). Therefore, identities arise from social, situational, and personal symbolic constructions of meaning (Buechler, 2008). Individuals use symbolic constructions within a community to identify who is a member of that community and who is not. Such constructions are determined through relationships between the individual and the collective group, all of which are formed through social interactions and the meanings they are ascribed (Jenkins, 2008). The ability to examine oneself as a member of a community leads to a shared meaning among members of who one is within this community and helps the individual construct his or her identity (Burke, 2006). Individual reflexivity, the ability to internalize and think about oneself critically (Schön, 1983, 1987), works to stabilize the social construct of community, reinforcing patterned behaviors of individuals within the group (Burke, 2006).

Symbolic Interaction and Music Educator Identity Construction

According to Woodford (2002), symbolic interactionism has been the most pervasive sociological model employed in recent music education research. Additionally, researchers have used symbolic interactionism in their attempts to acquire a better understanding of pre-service music educator identity development. L’Roy’s (1983) dissertation on the occupational identity of music education students is a groundbreaking work in this area of music education research. She used symbolic interaction theory to show how music students’ identities may reflect their perception of how others view and respond to them. In addition to L’Roy, Roberts (2000) used symbolic interactionism in his investigation of identity construction and socialization in music. His research indicates that the construction of music students’ identities as performer or musician rather than teacher during undergraduate years involves an interaction between their self-perceptions and their public reputations within the university. Paul (1998) used the theory as a lens to investigate the effect of peer teaching experiences on the professional teacher role development of undergraduate instrumental music education majors. Paul concluded that the peer teaching episodes were successful in helping students develop from a teacher-centered perspective to one that was more focused on students. Symbolic interactionism also was used by Wolfgang (1990) to study early field experience in music education. Through structured field experiences, students in Wolfgang’s study were able to gain a better understanding of the professional teacher’s role.

Teacher Development Theories

Levels of Concern Model. Researchers have constructed other theories that, when used alone or in tandem, can assist with assessment of pre-service educators’ occupational identity and occupational identity development. Based on previous research (Fuller, 1969), Fuller and

Brown (1975) identified three levels of concern exhibited by novice teachers to understand the depth of commitment to one's professional role that is influenced by the development of occupational identity: (1) worried about their own survival as teachers and often concerned with mastery of subject matter, classroom management, and supervisor evaluations (concern for self), (2) attempting to make connections and applications to what is taught in teacher education classes, but are not yet concerned about whether pupils are learning (concern about self as teacher), and (3) having enough confidence in their teaching abilities and awareness of their strengths and limitations to now focus on their students and their educational needs (student concerns). Prior to the first level, pre-service educators occupy a pre-teaching phase where they are usually judgmental and critical of the in-service practitioner's practices, have undeveloped or shallow views of the complexities of classroom culture, and have difficulty making connections to teacher education classes.

Levels of Reflection. Based on his three-level theory of reflection (1977), Van Maanen (1991) argued that reflection functions within a four-level cognitive hierarchy. In the first level, reflection and action are separated and are two distinct entities. Reflection is more specific in the second level, focusing on occurrences. Reflection on one's personal experience and that of others occurs in the third level. The fourth level features reflection on how one reflects and how external conditions influence experience. Van Maanen's (1991) levels of reflection theory can be used in conjunction with other theories, such as Fuller and Brown's (1975) levels of concern model, to assess the development of pre-service educators' occupational identity development (Coleman, 1999).

Theories of Occupational Identity

Occupational Identity and General Education

Carper's (1970) theory of occupational identity provides a theoretical basis for the study of occupational identity development through socialization and has been applied to multiple fields, including teacher development (Broyles, 1997; Cox, 1994; Isbell, 2006; Paul, 1998). Carper studied self-perception and occupational identity among three occupational groups (philosophy, mechanical engineering, and physiology) through a series of informal interviews with 51 students ranging from first-year graduate students to those about to complete their doctoral program. The researcher suggested four major categories of occupational identity that influence career success: occupational title, commitment to professional tasks and knowledge, institutional positions and reference groups, and social position. Although the three occupational groups were quite disparate, they showed "a considerable degree of inner consistency" (Carper, 1970, p. 187), suggesting the existence of relatively stable combinations and perceptions that could be useful in the study of occupational identity among varied groups, including teacher education.

Occupational title. Individuals tend to associate themselves with others who label themselves in a similar manner. Self-categorization according to occupational title implies preference of group association and how one desires to be identified professionally. Music educators have several identities to choose from, including teacher, musician, and performer.

Commitment to professional tasks and knowledge. One's occupational identity is dependent upon the degree to which one becomes committed to specific kinds of work related to the occupation. Therefore, people may gain occupational identity by developing an increase in commitment to professional tasks and knowledge. For pre-service educators, these can include

undergraduate experiences such as performing in recitals and ensembles, participating in classes, and attending music education events like conferences. Those who have spent an amount of time developing specialized skills have a greater commitment to the occupation and, as a result, have a more positive self-perception towards their occupation.

Institutional position and reference groups. This heading includes two categories. The position a person may or may not hold within an institution is the first category; the reference group within the organization is the second category. The kinds of organizations to which an individual belongs provide a sense of identity that can range from broad to narrow. Many people find that they occupy one position within an institution and another position outside of the institution. Music teachers, for example, are musicians in the general sense (reference group), but are also teachers, required to function within one of society's institutions. Pre-service educators may be educated to eventually become independent of society's organizations and institutions (Griff, 1963), but they are also seeking to join the institution known as education—a highly structured institution in society (Anderson, 1981).

Those holding an occupational position also place themselves in reference to others upon whom their success depends (colleagues, professors, administrators). As with symbolic interactionism, individuals assume the role of significant others imagining how others perceive them, then act accordingly—the self is strongly related to how we perceive others evaluate us rather than on how others actually evaluate us (Shrauger & Schoeneman, 1979). These reference groups have an important impact on the formation of student attitudes, expectations, and norms.

Social position. Social position refers to the status a person holds within a hierarchy of other groups. Based on the chosen occupation, society places individuals on a hierarchy of occupations ranking them higher, lower, or side by side with each other (Pavalko, 1971).

Reference groups play a role in the hierarchical structure of occupations. Additionally, friends, relatives, colleagues, and teachers influence the occupational identity of an individual as well.⁴

Occupational Identity and Music Education

Socialization is the process by which an individual acquires the beliefs, values, skills, and resources needed to live and participate in society (Handel, 2006; Musolf, 2009). Furthermore, occupational socialization is the manner in which a person learns the attitudes and behaviors necessary to recognize sustainable competence within a context of employment (Marshall, 1994). It is through the process of socialization that occupational identity develops. Although socialization is a lifelong process, children and adolescents choose occupational roles in society relatively early in life. Separate stages have been defined to assist in studying how each contributes to the development of occupational identity. The first stage, primary socialization, is roughly defined as extending from preschool through high school.

Primary socialization. University music education students bring with them existing perceptions and beliefs about music teaching based on previous experiences in school music programs and ensembles that influence their values and identities as teachers (Bergee, 1992; Bergee et al., 2001; Campbell, 1999; Cox, 1997; Dolloff, 1999; Draves, 2012; Ferguson, 2003; Fredrickson & Williams, 2009; Isbell, 2008; Kelly, 2000; Madsen & Kelly, 2002; Mark, 1998; Rickels et al., 2010; Roberts, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c; Schmidt, 1998; Thompson, 2000; Thompson & Campbell, 2003). Researchers (Bergee et al., 2001; Fredrickson & Williams, 2009; Hellman, 2008) have found that the goal of the majority of undergraduate music education majors is to teach high school ensembles following graduation. Others (Bergee, 1992; Bergee et al., 2001;

⁴ Given the current corporatization of education (Clay, 2008), I should note that I refer to occupational identity not in a capitalistic neoliberal sense, but as an ingenuous facet of individuals' identities.

Cox, 1997; Fredrickson & Williams, 2009; Jones & Parkes, 2010; Kelly, 2010; Madsen & Kelly, 2002; Rickels et al., 2010; Schonauer, 2002; Thornton & Bergee, 2008) have found that high school ensemble directors tend to be the strongest influence on K-12 students' decisions to become music teachers—so much so that many express a desire to be like their high school directors, thus supporting the belief that high school music education programs are significant factors in the music teacher socialization process (Bergee, 1992; Campbell, 1999; Isbell, 2008).

Many music education majors come from homes in which music is present on a regular basis (Cox, 1997; Mark, 1998). Furthermore, music education students often commit to the music education major while still in high school (Bergee et al., 2001; Bergee & Demorest, 2003; Cox, 1997) and may assume music teacher roles in that context before they matriculate as undergraduate music education majors (Beynon, 1998; Cox, 1997; Duling, 2000; Gillespie & Hamann, 1999; L'Roy, 1983; Mark, 1998; Prescesky, 1997; Roberts, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c). As a result, they enter the music teacher preparation program with preconceived notions about how and what to teach.

Researchers have suggested that in-service music teachers encourage their students to pursue careers as musicians rather than as music teachers (Cox, 1997; Frink, 1997; L'Roy, 1983; Roberts, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c), resulting in music education majors being socialized during K-12 schooling as performers or general musicians, and not as future educators. More recently, however, researchers have suggested that family members and music teachers exert a positive influence on students' decisions to pursue a music education degree (e.g., Austin, Isbell, & Russell, 2012; Isbell, 2008).

Research by Cox (1997) indicated that primary socialization may influence the identity construction of undergraduate music students to a greater extent than secondary socialization—

the undergraduate music teacher education program. Undergraduate music education majors typically are socialized as performing musicians when they are children, likely because most of them know music only through performing at that age. As students progress through secondary school, their musician or performer identity is reinforced by additional experiences and social recognition of their musical ability.

Secondary socialization. Secondary socialization occurs when people enroll in higher education programs or the workforce and begin to assume roles and responsibilities of a specialized group within society (Wallace & Wolf, 1999). Several factors reinforce pre-service music educators' self-identities primarily as performers upon matriculation (Aróstegui, 2004; Bernard, 2005; Beynon, 1998; Bouij, 1998, 2004; Froehlich & L'Roy, 1985; L'Roy, 1985; Mark, 1998; Pellegrino, 2009; Roberts, 1991c; Scheib, 2006; Woodford, 2002). Due to the higher institutional emphasis accorded to performance in American schools of music, the role of performer-musician has a higher social status than that of educator and other majors within music, creating a sense of tension and conflict within music education majors (Kingsbury, 1984, 1988; Nettl, 1995; Woodford, 2002). Furthermore, music education majors may feel stigmatized by being labeled as educators and are praised more for their musicianship than for their teaching skill by influential collegiate figures, including applied faculty and ensemble conductors (Austin, Isbell, & Russell, 2012; Conway et al., 2010; Dolloff, 2006; L'Roy, 1983; Prescesky, 1997; Roberts, 1991c; Woodford, 2002). Music education students find that social status is afforded to them on the basis of their musicianship more often than because of their teaching expertise (Roberts, 1991b).

Additionally, music education majors may feel drawn to a well-structured field like performance for its clarity of purpose and more clearly delineated body of Western-based

knowledge within the university setting. Participation in this well-structured field may promote a stronger sense of professional identity, as opposed to development of identity in music education, which draws upon knowledge and skills from overlapping fields, within and outside of music (L’Roy, 1983). Roberts (1991b) found that music education majors lacked any sense of teacher identity and thought of themselves rather as “well-rounded musicians.” More than half of participants in L’Roy’s (1983) study of North Texas State University music education program thought of themselves as performers rather than educators. In particular, the overall undergraduate curriculum for string music education students at L’Roy’s institution had little influence on their self-concepts as educators.

Prescesky (1997) also found that music education majors who conceived of themselves as performers felt conflicted in their professional identities. Those who sought more balance between identities as performers and educators appeared better adjusted to music teaching. L’Roy (1983) found that a strong sense of professional identity is important for professional achievement and success, whereas a weak sense of professional identity leads to confusion and inaction. Self-identification as a performer, with concomitant identity conflicts and loss of professional interest, may lead to confusion in professional goals. Using the extant literature as examples, Woodford (2002) suggested that American and Canadian schools of music may have problems in the professional socialization of undergraduate music education majors. In fact, Cox (1997) wrote that, due to their prior socialization as performers, students can identify and respond as musicians only and cannot begin to develop a teacher identity until they have started to teach.

Isbell (2008) argued that identity is not simply a dichotomous arrangement of “teacher” and “musician.” Rather, the teacher aspect of identity can be separated into two differentiated

constructs: “self” (how one views herself and her ability as a teacher) and “other” (how others—peers and teacher educators—view one as a teacher). The distance between “self” and “other” has ramifications for how feedback is received and incorporated into one’s identity. For example, if a music teacher educator praises the work of an insecure student teacher, the student teacher may continue to believe that his work is inadequate because the views of self (the insecure student teacher) and other (the praise given to the insecure student teacher from the music teacher educator) are disparate. Similarly, a confident student teacher may reject suggestions for improvement as invalid due to the distance between self and other. A replication of this study (Austin et al., 2012) with a smaller sample size, however, did not provide similar findings.

Researchers have started to note how pre-service educators’ prior conceptions regarding their subject area and teaching can be challenged in a phenomenon called “disruption.” Walker and Smith (2004) sought to prepare British pre-service visual art teachers to become creative educators who, rather than teach visual art in the standard, traditional manner, embrace diverse and innovative teaching methods that appeal to all primary and secondary British students. The visual art educators examined how a gallery workshop program challenged visual art pre-service educators’ preconceptions and attitudes towards art by employing critical thinking techniques and having students create unit activities for primary/secondary school students and reflect on contemporary art that defied conventional visual art norms. Walker and Smith (2004) termed this process of challenging and re-aligning of thinking and attitudes “creative disruption.” Schein (2004) argued that this type of learning requires possible destabilization and reorganization of long-established cognitive structures. While no researchers have explicitly studied the phenomenon of “disruption” in a pre-service music teacher education program, some have

documented the outcomes of a “disruptive” influence within a music education class (Shouldice, 2013a; Woodward, 2013).

Need for the Study

Past K-12 music learning experiences form the basis for pre-service students’ values and identities as teachers as well as inform their emerging definitions of effective teaching, expectations for student learning, and teaching metaphors (Brewer, 2009, 2014; Campbell, 1999; Miranda, Robbins, & Stauffer, 2007; Schmidt, 1998; Thompson, 2000; Thompson & Campbell, 2003). These values and identities may influence pre-service educators to “teach as they were taught,” as Campbell (1999) stated that “the reproductive nature of the values and practices and definers of successful teaching as filtered through high school music education performance programs” is a significant factor in the music teacher socialization process (p. 21). Additionally, the high school director has considerable influence on a student’s decision to become a music teacher and that some students may even desire to be like their directors (Bergee, 1992; Bergee et al., 2001; Cox, 1997; Fredrickson & Williams, 2009; Jones & Parkes, 2010; Kelly, 2010; Madsen & Kelly, 2002; Rickels et al., 2010; Schonauer, 2002; Thornton & Bergee, 2008). Partly due to this self-perpetuating cycle and due to the lack of change in the collegiate music teacher education program curriculum in the last 150 years (Campbell, 2007; Cutietta, 2007; Emmon, 2004; Jones, 2005, 2007; Robinson, 2002), the music education profession has had difficulty changing and moving forward to adapt to cultural changes (Abril & Gault, 2008; Kratus, 2007; Williams, 2007, 2011a, 2014). Schools of music indirectly dictate what is to be taught in grades K-12 through music teacher education curriculum, thus perpetuating the status quo.

The traditional performance-based ensemble (concert band, orchestra, chorus) continues to serve as the dominant paradigm of secondary school music teaching and learning in the United

States (Abril & Gault, 2008). Depending on how it is used by the educator, it can be an excellent vehicle for music teaching and learning. However, in some school districts, it is the sole means of delivering musical instruction. Students may be interested in learning about music in a school setting, but some are not interested in performing in a band, chorus, or orchestra, or cannot participate because they have never played a classical instrument or do not have the financial means to acquire one (DeLorenzo, 2012).

Researchers have studied successful secondary music teaching settings in addition to the traditional performance-based ensemble. These music making, teaching, and learning opportunities, including the use of informal music making and popular music,⁵ composition and improvisation,⁶ and technology,⁷ are congruent with children's cultural practices outside of the music classroom. Although these means of music teaching and learning are intended to expand access to a wider population of students, regardless of prior formal music education experience, researchers and authors have also discussed how to implement these approaches to music teaching and learning in traditional ensemble settings.⁸

Additionally, several authors have discussed the need for music educators to heighten their awareness of *who* they are educating in their classrooms and create classroom environments that are more inclusive and respectful of students' backgrounds and identities. Discussions continue regarding how to engage social justice issues in the classroom (Allsup, 2003; Allsup &

⁵ See Allsup, 2003; Cayari, 2014; Clements, 2013; Green, 2001, 2005, 2008; Jaffurs, 2004; Karvelis, 2016; Kratus, 2016; Kastner, 2012; Kruse, 2016; Rodriguez, 2004; Woody, 2007, 2012.

⁶ See Clements, 2013; Freedman, 2013; Freer, 2010; Hickey, 1997a, 1997b, 1999, 2003, 2012; Karvelis, 2016; Kaschub & Smith, 2009a, 2009b, 2013; Kratus, 2016; Kruse, 2016; Randles & Stringham, 2013; Strand, 2009; Watson, 2011; Webster, 2009; Woody, 2012.

⁷ See Albert, 2015; Bauer, 2014; Cayari, 2014; Clements, 2013; Dorfman, 2013; Freedman, 2013; Giebelhausen, 2015; Hickey, 1997a, 1997b; Rudolph, 2004; Rudolph & Frankel, 2009; Watson, 2006, 2011; Williams, 2011b; Williams & Webster, 2008.

⁸ See Albert, 2015; Bauer, 2014; Cayari, 2014; Clements, 2013; Freer, 2010; Giebelhausen, 2015; Hickey, 1997b, 2012; Randles & Stringham, 2013; Sindberg, 2012; Woody, 2007, 2012.

Shieh, 2012; Bates, 2012; Carter, 2011; DeLorenzo, 2012, 2015; Fitzpatrick, 2012; Hess, 2014, 2015; Shieh & Allsup, 2016; Taylor, 2011), as well as practice culturally responsive pedagogy (Delpit, 1995; Fitzpatrick, 2012; Gay, 2000; Ladson-Billings, 1994; Lind & McKoy, 2016; Shaw, 2012), and affirm and support music students who identify on the LGBTIQA spectrum (Bergonzi, 2009; Carter, 2011; Fitzpatrick & Hansen, 2010; Garrett, 2012; McBride, 2016; Spano, 2011) and those who identify as trans (McBride, 2016; Nichols, 2013; Palkki, 2015, 2016).

If music education is to move forward as a profession and teach *all* students in the schools, then music teacher educators will need to break the cycle of self-perpetuation of repeating practices that have been in place for decades, in part due to the influence of secondary school educators on pre-service students' occupational identities. This will require a reconceptualization of what a music education curriculum can be—how it can meet a student's goals for a music education experience and give that student the skills to make music over one's lifetime.

An evaluation of how the cultural cohort and communities of a music teacher education program embedded within the culture of a school of music interact with and “disrupt” pre-service music educators' occupational identities and preexisting conceptions of music education can help music teacher educators lead pre-service educators to heightened awareness and interest in multiple music making, teaching, and learning opportunities that are congruent with children's cultural practices outside of the music classroom. Additionally, this evaluation can assist pre-service teachers with understanding how to create musical experiences for K-12 students who do not already participate in an ensemble, and encourage pre-service educators to explore music teacher career paths other than that of the secondary school music director (e.g., elementary general, secondary general, music technology, etc.). The result may influence K-12 students to

participate in music as a lifelong experience—a goal held by many music educators (Isbell & Stanley, 2011)—influence the identities, career intentions, and career goals of future pre-service music educators, and improve the quality of music education for *all* students.

Purpose Statement and Research Questions

The purpose of the current study is to examine the interactions within the cultural cohort communities of a music teacher education program embedded within the culture of a school of music and the role that these interactions play in “disrupting” pre-service educators’ occupational identities, including occupational identities already formed when they begin music teacher preparation studies and throughout the music teacher preparation program. The guiding research questions for this explanatory sequential design mixed methods study are as follows:

Quantitative research questions:

1. Which structural components of the music teacher education program (e.g., course curricula, University/College of Education/School of Music/music education program requirements, music education program sequence), if any, assist with “disrupting” pre-service music educators’ occupational identities?
2. Which communities, interactions, and persons within the cultural cohort and the culture are the most significant “disruptive” influences on pre-service music educators’ occupational identities?

Qualitative research questions:

1. How do structural components of the music teacher education program (e.g., University/College of Education/School of Music/music education program requirements, music education program sequence) assist with “disrupting” pre-service

- music educators' occupational identities?
2. Why are certain communities, interactions, and persons within the cultural cohort and the culture the most significant “disruptive” influences on pre-service music educators' occupational identities? How are those “disruptions” created?
 3. How do these “disruptions” manifest themselves in pre-service music educators' occupational identities? How do these “disruptions” manifest themselves in pre-service music educators' conceptions of and beliefs and attitudes about music education?

Researcher's Lens

I bring to this study my past experiences as a pre-service and in-service music educator. I was educated to be a band director during my time as a pre-service music educator in my undergraduate music teacher education program, both due to my instrumental music background and my career inclinations. When I first began teaching, my school district had general music classes whose curriculum was in need of updating. I knew that my students were doing some very interesting things with music outside of school—practicing in garage bands, working with electronic music—but those sorts of practices were not welcome in the formal music education context. The only other way students could learn about music in a school setting was the traditional performance-based ensembles: band, orchestra, and chorus. If a student was not interested in playing in an ensemble, or being in a somewhat dated general music class, that student could not learn about music during the school day. I was only serving a fraction of the total school population and excluding many students who wanted to learn about music...not the music that was being taught in the school, but music that was meaningful and relevant to them and how they were making music.

Towards the end of my public school teaching career, I had worked to infuse technology into the general music curriculum and infuse informal music learning practices in my ensembles in an effort to connect with how many students were using music outside of school. Because of this, music instruction in the schools was more meaningful and relevant to students than I had ever experienced before. I also worked with several student teachers who co-taught these classes with me. These pre-service educators, who self-identified as up-and-coming band directors, experienced a sense of “disruption” when they worked with my students and realized how much more they could teach and how many more students they could reach.

After I had started my doctoral studies in music education, I had a phone conversation with my partner, who was, at the time, teaching middle school band and music technology. He told me that he started in his position as a band director, but he now viewed himself as a music *teacher*. He was no longer interested in teaching band—what he was taught to do in his undergraduate program—and much more interested in teaching music technology. Interest in his music technology class, a recent conversion from a “traditional” general music class, was tremendous and it was the most popular elective in the school. It had a cross-section of the school population: those who had never participated in formal music experiences, those who had participated in ensembles, those who had played in garage bands, etc. I thought the change in his identity and corresponding interest in teaching areas was fascinating. I then started to wonder if “disruption” of occupational identities could take place during the pre-service portion of one’s career, within a school of music with so many cultural influences and, if so, what the implications could be for the pre-service educator and for future K-12 students.

Definitions

Change: Rather than using the term “from-to,” which implies two-dimensional beginning and

ending points, Saldaña (2003) suggested using the term “from-through,” which “. . . implies a more temporal-based perspective that details the complexities of the journey” (p. 8):

Analyzing change requires at least two reference points *through* [emphasis mine] time, such as “then” and “now,” 1996 and 1999, sophomore year and senior year. But a Point A-Point B longitudinal model or a before-and-after chart limits the ability to discern evolutionary processes. (Saldaña, 2003, p. 7)

Community: a group of individuals that meets to share a common interest and develop skills by working together (Lave & Wenger, 1991)

Cultural cohort: social groups whose members share habits according to specific aspects of the self (e.g., class, gender, occupation, interests) (Turino, 2008)

Culture: the habits of thought and practice that are shared among individuals (Turino, 2008, p. 95)

Disrupting/Disruptive: the process of challenging preconceptions, which results in reflection and realignment of thinking and attitudes (Walker & Smith, 2004)

Pre-service educator: a collegiate student enrolled in a music teacher education program that is preparing her to become a certified in-service music educator

Student teaching: a specified time period at the end of the degree program when pre-service music education students are placed in an elementary and/or secondary school setting to work with a cooperating teacher to master tasks that accompany being a music teacher (Rideout & Feldman, 2002)

In this study, the term “change” will be used to describe differences, whether subtle or major, within pre-service music educators’ identities and conceptions of music education (Paise, 2010).

Furthermore, pre-service music educators’ identities should be understood as “a space of

continual becoming rather than an endpoint culminating in a singular identity construction”
(Alsup, 2006, p. 7).

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The present study will examine how the interactions within the cultural cohort communities of a music teacher education program embedded within the culture of a school of music change or “disrupt” pre-service educators’ occupational identities and preexisting ideas of music education. Therefore, this review of literature will focus on three main areas. First, I will discuss selected program evaluation literature from undergraduate teacher education and then review related literature in undergraduate music teacher education. Second, I will discuss influential and recent research in occupational identity in pre-service music teacher education. Finally, I will discuss culture and communities of practice in higher education and music teacher education.

Program Evaluation Literature

Program evaluation can serve several purposes, such as determining a program’s effect, providing justification for funding, and collecting data to assist with making decision on future directions (Ferguson, 2007). Researchers and evaluators have published numerous program evaluations in undergraduate teacher education. While it is not within the scope of this paper to review all existing program evaluations, I will include those that are within music education and are particularly pertinent to the current study because they have purposes that are similar to the purpose of this study or use similar methodology and methods of data collection to be employed.

Program Evaluation Literature in Undergraduate Music Teacher Education

Colwell has written extensively on program evaluation in music education (1985, 2006a, 2006b). In these three publications, he lamented the dearth of quality studies in music teacher program evaluation and how data rarely has been used to substantiate the structure and requirements of most teacher education programs. While data from well-designed music teacher

evaluation studies would be of assistance, he also claimed that a philosophical dialogue was needed to create a vision of how music education can support the creation of musically educated humans and the teaching of values that perpetuate democracy. Data from studies can help only after music teacher educators can agree and articulate what is required in a music teacher education curriculum to assist teacher candidates with creating musically educated students.

Colwell (1985, 2006a, 2006b) argued that the present criteria used for entrance into teacher education programs—sufficient musical competence in Western-based classical music and an adequate grade point average—have too much weight. He also stated that music teacher education faculty need to also consider a person's beliefs, efforts, and disposition, and their potential to guide K-12 students' ethical, moral, physical, emotional, and civic development. Since these traits must already be present, Colwell thought those traits are impossible to teach in teacher preparation courses, so considering them as a part of admissions to make sure that they are present makes sense. Additionally, he argued that the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), the accrediting body for schools of music in the United States, should reevaluate its requirements for amount of credits devoted towards applied study and reallocate those credits to time spent in other areas of music, such as electives, that may be more beneficial in the classroom and better prepare students for teaching.

Addressing Colwell's (1985) criticisms of program evaluation projects that examine only the survey responses of graduates of one institution, Conway (2002) evaluated the pre-service music teacher preparation program at a Big Ten University (BTU) by examining not only the perceptions of beginning teachers ($n = 14$) of various demographic contexts, but also their mentor teachers and administrators. Employing a qualitative formative program evaluation model, Conway (2002) found that both the students and their mentor teachers and administrators

identified pre-service fieldwork, improvement of musicianship through ensembles and applied lessons, and student teaching as the most valuable aspects of the teacher education program. Students cited the lack of consistency in instrumental methods classes, early required observations without context, and College of Education teacher education courses as being the least valuable aspects of the program. Administrators, mentors, and beginning teachers all agreed that the teacher education program should be “detracked” so that future teachers can participate in experiences outside of the content area in which they specialized and, as a result, become more prepared to teach in a position that requires a music teacher to perform diverse duties at the school (e.g., band and choral music at a middle school with general music at an elementary school). Members of all three participant groups also stated that the semester student teaching practicum should be extended to a yearlong experience. Administrators and mentors also suggested improved preparation for administrative tasks, such as working with budgets and parents, while mentors suggested improved preparation to work with young instrumentalists. Conway (2002) concluded that the data from her investigation provided support for changes within the music teacher education program, including elimination of the “tracked” specialization, a requirement to take a general music methods course in addition to instrumental or choral methods, and coordination of instrumental methods classes by a music education faculty member to improve consistency.

Conway conducted an inquiry with the same participants 10 years later to examine their current reflections on their past perceptions of pre-service music teacher preparation (Conway, 2012) and gather their opinions on current pre-service music teacher preparation. Using data from participants’ written reflections and individual interviews, Conway (2012) found that the now experienced educators agreed with the perceptions made 10 years before: student teaching,

pre-service fieldwork, and musicianship were among the most valuable aspects of the program, while College of Education courses and classroom observations without context were the least valuable aspects. Participants encouraged music teacher educators to maintain fieldwork requirements and have students work in urban, rural, and suburban programs. As in the 2002 study, participants encouraged teacher educators to explore the possibilities of creating a yearlong student teaching experience and allow students to take classes outside of the content area in which they specialized.

Conway, Eros, Hourigan, and Stanley (2007) replicated Conway's study (2002) but examined only the teaching of secondary instruments portion of the pre-service curriculum at her institution, the University of Michigan. Participants for the study included four beginning teachers and data included observations, individual interviews, email survey responses, a focus group interview, and self-study teacher-researcher logs from Eros, Hourigan, and Stanley, who were also the secondary instrument course instructors. The researchers suggested that the beginning teachers valued the resource notebooks, handouts, and other materials provided in the instrument techniques classes but remembered few of the class activities and assignments. Additionally, the participants stated that faculty or assistants who had previously taught music in K–12 schools should teach music education courses, including secondary instrumental methods classes. Participants also suggested that strategies for teaching specific instrument techniques are best learned during in-service teaching, as little of that content can be learned outside of the context of a music classroom.

Ballantyne and Packer (2004) investigated the knowledge, skills, and capabilities that novice secondary school music educators perceive to be necessary to function effectively in the classroom, as well as their perceptions of the effectiveness of teacher education programs in

preparing them to teach. The researchers analyzed questionnaires from 76 Australian educators who attended universities in Queensland and were early career teachers. Items on the questionnaire assessed participants' beliefs on the relevance of pre-service preparation for their current position and satisfaction with their pre-service preparation. Ballantyne and Packer also constructed questions that assessed participants' perceptions of 24 traits relating to music teachers' knowledge and skills that general education and music education theorists consider desirable for success in the classroom (Leong, 1996; Shulman, 1987) and how well pre-service education programs addressed those traits. Based on responses measured on a four-point scale, 55% of participants reported being "somewhat satisfied" (three on a four-point scale) with their music teacher preparation program. Only 16% were "very satisfied" and 29% reported being either "somewhat dissatisfied" or "very dissatisfied." Furthermore, 52% reported that their pre-service education program was "mostly relevant" (three on a four-point scale) to their needs as early-career music teachers. Only 12% considered the program to be "definitely relevant" and 36% found the program to be "not really relevant." Although participants considered all of the 24 items of music teacher knowledge and skills derived from Shulman (1987) and Leong (1996) to be at least moderately important, the performance of music teacher education programs in addressing them was mostly perceived to be barely adequate. Specifically, participants gave low ratings to their pre-service education program in regards to items dealing with knowledge and skills specific to the teaching of music in the classroom. The participants rated preparation from music teacher education programs for teaching secondary classroom music, extracurricular musical activities, and administrative skills even lower. Pre-service music teacher education programs addressed applied performance skills and music history knowledge very well, but these were not valued by early-career teachers as highly as other categories.

Roulston, Legette, and Womack (2005) designed a similar study and examined beginning music teachers' perspectives concerning their work in schools, including their perspectives on their preparation for teaching in schools. Nine first- and second-year music teachers who taught in a range of socioeconomic settings participated in semi-structured face-to-face or phone interviews. Participants spoke highly of their experiences in the music teacher education program with two testifying to the elementary methods classes and its authentic field experiences influencing them to teach elementary general music. These novice educators especially valued the practicum setting matching experiences—having authentic and “real” experiences during the student teaching experience. However, some participants cited a “disconnect” between theories learned in the classroom and applicability to a “real world” working context, such as student teaching or their present classrooms, as a detriment to the program. Also, due to the broad nature of preparing pre-service educators for K-12 certification, some participants felt unprepared for certain specific aspects relevant to their current work. The researchers stated that although pre-service teacher education programs are a positive influence in the preparation of novice educators, they recommended that music teacher education faculty provide contexts in which students can discuss the various settings, problems, and issues that they could face in their beginning years as a teacher.

Summary

Analysis of the reviewed literature in this paper reveals that most program evaluators' means of data collection are surveys or questionnaires. However, several did use interviews (Conway, 2002, 2012; Conway, Eros, Hourigan, & Stanley, 2007; Roulston, Legette, & Womack, 2005), focus group discussions (Conway, Eros, Hourigan, & Stanley, 2007), written reflections/journals (Conway, 2002, 2012; Conway, Eros, Hourigan, & Stanley, 2007), and

observations (Conway, 2002, 2012; Conway, Eros, Hourigan, & Stanley, 2007). Demir (2015) employed a mixed method methodology for his study, but it could have been strengthened by interviewing the student teachers following administration of the questionnaire to illuminate the quantitative findings via qualitative means, as with an exploratory design (Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). To date, no researchers have employed mixed methods methodology for a program evaluation. My intent with the present study is to employ multiple means of data collection—both qualitative and quantitative—and mix those data sets, allowing for greater illumination and exploration of the research problem than by using one form of data alone.

Additionally, none of the reviewed studies included pre-service educators other than student teachers: those who are about to graduate from the program. While it is understandable that student teachers and recent graduates have valuable insight into the effectiveness of the knowledge gained from the program, current members of the cultural cohort also have the perspective of being in the program in the present and can offer their thoughts on pre-service education experiences readily, rather than attempting to assess courses several years later. The present study will attempt to determine how experiences within communities embedded in the cultural cohort of a music teacher education program “disrupts” identities and preconceived notions of music education. Therefore, inclusion of all pre-service music educators—first-year students through student teachers—is essential. The subsequent review of literature here reflects studies in pre-service music teacher occupational identity for this wide range of population.

Occupational Identity in Pre-Service Music Teacher Education Literature

Construction of occupational identity in pre-service music educators is a complex process that begins early in one’s life with family attitudes and experiences, continuing through formal K-12 schooling and an undergraduate degree program. Pre-service music educators usually

matriculate into a music teacher preparation program with an identity formed by experiences that included significant figures in their lives—parents, siblings, teachers, prominent relatives, and community figures. Pre-service educators use this identity as a lens through which to view their pre-service music teacher preparation program experiences. The purpose of the current study is to examine the interactions within the cultural cohort communities of a music teacher education program embedded within the culture of a school of music and the role that these interactions play in “disrupting” pre-service educators’ identities, including identities that have already emerged when they begin music teacher preparation studies and throughout the music teacher preparation program. An examination of early and contemporary studies in pre-service music teacher identity is necessary to understand current scholarship in music teacher identity. I will review literature first in primary socialization, then review literature in secondary socialization and student teaching.

Primary Socialization

Socialization of teachers begins at an early age due to the nature of schooling in the United States. Students who decide, at whatever age, to become teachers are provided the opportunity to observe and study occupational role models for hours almost daily. This “apprenticeship of observation” (Lortie, 1975) can have a very powerful effect upon young people. When pre-service teachers enter college degree programs, they frequently bring with them conceptions of the teaching field that are not in agreement with conceptions held by professionals (Froehlich and L’Roy, 1985). Yet, the beliefs and preconceptions about teaching that have been created by this type of “apprenticeship” can be difficult to alter during undergraduate studies (Roberts, 1991b) due to teachers who are a strong influence on students (Thompson, 2000), leading pre-service teachers to emulate their past music teachers and their

practices once they enter the music teaching profession (Thompson, 2000).

Parents, siblings, friends, and community members, in addition to music teachers, also are also responsible for shaping the attitudes and beliefs of college students. These prominent figures and K-12 musical experiences can influence students' musical development, musical successes, and career choices (Froehlich & L'Roy, 1983; Howe & Sloboda, 1991).

Cox (1994) investigated the role of influential persons in the socialization of music educators as musicians and teachers. Cox collected data (29-item questionnaire and informal interviews) about primary socialization from a stratified random sample of 310 Arkansas music educators and considered whether the influence of significant people (teachers, administrators, teachers, ensemble directors) from primary socialization continued throughout undergraduate study into in-service teaching. Participants reported that their identities as musicians developed from and was reinforced by social interactions with prominent figures in their lives, including secondary school ensemble directors and family members, prior to choosing a major for college study. Participants in Cox's study recalled family members, such as parents, who enjoyed their childhood musical performances and encouraged further participation in music study. During adolescence, school music teachers or ensemble directors similarly encouraged and recognized students' accomplishments as musicians.

Cox (1994) also investigated relationships between participants' gender and the teaching positions occupied by influential people in their lives. Prior to matriculation into a music teacher education program, women were more likely than men to identify private music teachers as significant influences, while men were more likely than women to identify ensemble directors or school music teachers as significant influences. Other findings revealed that gender accounted for most of the participants' perceptions of influential persons. Participants in Cox's study

seldom were encouraged to consider themselves as teachers or to assume the role of educator and likely were encouraged to become musicians during their middle and high school years. This influence continued through participation in a music teacher education program, overpowering influences from college faculty. Cox's (1997) findings suggest that the primary socialization process influenced participants to adopt a musician identity before students chose a college major. However, Cox (1997) also noted that professional socialization of music educators is a lifelong process.

Frink (1997) explored the pre-collegiate musical experiences of undergraduate string majors, their high school orchestra instructors as teachers and counselors, their future career plans, and string teaching as a profession. Frink found that 71% of participants (187 students at Big Ten universities) were encouraged to pursue a college degree in music by their high school orchestra directors, but only 40% of the respondents received similar encouragement to pursue a college degree in music education. Frink's (1997) findings suggested that high school string instructors may be reinforcing their students' identities as musicians but neglecting to cultivate interest in music teaching as an occupational choice. Frink also found that positive and affirming orchestral experiences and encouragement from orchestra directors could influence some string players to choose a career in music education.

Gillespie and Hamann (1999) explored career choice among 153 string music education students at 17 American colleges and universities. Through a survey, the researchers provided information about students' backgrounds, reasons for choosing teaching as a profession, and recommendations for how teachers might interest students in string teaching. The top four factors that influenced students' decision to major in strings/orchestra music education were, in order, "liked teaching as a profession, rewarding work," "enjoyment and love of music," "desire to

enrich and share joy of music with others,” and “love of children, people, working with groups.” “Influence of a school orchestra teacher” ranked fifth and the influence of a private teacher was ranked even lower.

Thompson (2000) studied pre-service music educators’ preconceived beliefs about teaching prior to enrollment in music education and education courses. Twelve freshmen, selected through purposeful selection techniques, participated in a qualitative study that included an open-ended questionnaire, a semi-structured interview, an interactive interview that included sort tasks and case analysis, and examination of participants’ uses of metaphor. Results revealed strong beliefs about the people and processes involved in teaching, including the need for experiential, active learning and providing opportunities for learning how to teach through early field experiences and observations. Participants’ beliefs about teaching were connected strongly to their experiences as students and were influenced by their former music teachers. Some of the influences of past teachers, such as how they treated students, along with teaching strategies and approaches, were viewed as negative and some were positive. Thompson (2000) suggested that music teacher educators create and/or participate in activities involving K-12 students and that they model in their own teaching the pedagogical strategies that they would like to see their students develop. Additionally, given the strong influence of high school teachers on the participants’ formation of beliefs, Thompson (2000) suggested that in-service music teachers identify and mentor students who indicate an interest in music education as a career. Teachers can offer role development opportunities by conducting sectionals/full ensemble, participating in the selection of music, and engaging in other such roles and duties.

Bergee and Demorest (2003) discussed the results of a report in which music education majors across the country identified salient experiences, events, organizations, beliefs, and

people that influenced their decisions to choose music education as a career. A team of researchers (Bergee et al., 2001) mailed questionnaires to collegiate MENC members ($n = 1,537$) using a linear systematic selection technique. Four hundred thirty-one members responded. Most of the participants chose to enter the music education profession during high school, while 20% percent of respondents made this decision while in college. High school music teachers were highly influential in students' decisions to enroll in music education programs, as were private instructors and parents/guardians, supporting prior research (Bergee, 1992; Gillespie & Hamann, 1999). The experiences that were most influential for students to pursue a career in music education included participation in the school ensemble, All-District/All-State ensembles, and solo and small ensemble events, which was also supported by past research (Madsen & Kelly, 2002). For those respondents who were given the opportunity to teach while in high school, over half indicated either a "significant" or "very strong" influence, which was once again supported by previous research (Gillespie & Hamann, 1999).

Isbell (2008), seeking to improve upon studies that drew upon participants from only one institution or state, examined socialization and occupational identity using a national sample of pre-service music teachers enrolled in traditional baccalaureate degree programs. Using a random-numbers table, Isbell selected 90 NASM accredited institutions to participate in the study. Department chairs from 30 institutions administered Isbell's survey to students ($N = 578$), although for some institutions, the survey could not be administered to all students in all classes, including student teachers. Sixty-seven percent of participants chose to pursue music education as a career while in high school. Additionally, 37% identified their school music teachers as being most influential in helping them decide to continue participating in musical activities during adolescence, followed by parents (33%) and private music teachers (17%). School music

teachers were the most influential in guiding students to become music teachers (63%), followed by private music teachers (13%) and parents (12%). Contrary to findings from previous research (Beynon, 1998; Froehlich & L’Roy, 1985; L’Roy, 1983; Roberts, 1991b), pre-service teachers received a great deal of support in making their decisions to become music teachers. Experiences in primary socialization also were found to be positively influential. Performing- and teaching-related experiences, such as performing at school concerts, leading sectionals, and conducting school ensembles, were viewed as having a very positive or somewhat positive effect on participants’ decisions to pursue music teaching as a career. Isbell (2008) also found university music faculty, including ensemble directors and private studio instructors, to be strongly supportive of pre-service educators pursuing music education as a career.

In contrast to previous studies, correlational and regression analyses revealed a stronger correlation between secondary socialization variables and occupational identity variables than for primary socialization. Furthermore, experiences associated with primary and secondary socialization, rather than people, were significant predictors of occupational identity. Isbell (2008) noted that secondary socialization experiences account for less than 20% of the variance in occupational identity and primary socialization less so, suggesting that other more significant factors might influence occupational identity development among pre-service music teachers.

Austin, Isbell, and Russell (2012), based on prior researchers’ suggestions that the culture surrounding music schools inhibits or negatively influences music teacher identity development (Bouij, 1998, 2004; Froehlich & L’Roy, 1985; Roberts, 1991b) examined the secondary socialization and occupational identity among music majors enrolled in one of three NASM-accredited music schools. One music school, School A, was situated as an autonomous college within a public, doctoral degree-granting university in the Western part of the United States.

Another music school, School B, located in the Southern United States, operated as a department of music within a college of arts and sciences at a public, doctoral degree-granting university. The final music school, School C, was an autonomous school within a private college in the Eastern United States with limited graduate school and research activity. The survey sample ($N = 454$) completed a 115-item survey instrument, the Undergraduate Music Major Questionnaire (UMMQ) and was found to be “highly representative” of the combined music major population with respect to student gender, major applied area, degree program, and class standing. As with Bouij (1991) and Roberts (1991), Austin, Isbell, and Russell (2012) found that studio teachers were the most commonly identified musician and teacher role models, followed by music major peers and ensemble directors, respectively. However, they also found that occupational identity has underlying dimensions that reflect different musical roles/occupations than the simple dichotomy of musician as being distinct from teacher. Other dimensions of occupational identity (e.g., conductor/composer, entertainer/entrepreneur), perhaps reflective of the different contexts, people, and experiences of a school of music (e.g., applied studio, academic classes, ensembles, concert and recital hall experiences, laboratory teaching), were salient as well, suggesting that students may hold multiple identities during the ongoing process of identity construction. Additionally, the researchers found that students attending Music School C (in which the number of music education and performance majors is balanced, the dual degree in performance and education is popular, and performance skills are considered an important part of teacher preparation) reported stronger teacher identities. Students attending Music School A (which has a preponderance of undergraduate majors in music performance and a culture where performance and education are often juxtaposed) reported weaker teacher identities. Findings also implied that career commitment is enhanced when students can see themselves as both strong musicians and

strong teachers and when support to pursue a career in music comes from both within and outside the music school culture. Austin, Isbell, and Russell (2012) suggested that future researchers examine how schools of music can facilitate holistic identity development that “optimize the teaching, learning, performing, and appreciation of music in all of its manifestations” (p. 82).

Draves (2012) examined the perspectives of high school music students who planned to pursue a career in the music education profession. She selected four high school choir students who were participating in an outreach honor choir and intended to become music teachers. Forms of data included one formal interview with each participant, field notes from five observations of the outreach choir’s rehearsals, and participants’ visual representation of music teachers (Dolloff, 1999; Stake, 1995; Thompson & Campbell, 2003). As with previous studies, participants identified their high school music teachers as highly influential in their decision to pursue a career teaching music. Additionally, music activities, such as participating in and assisting with honor choirs, holding leadership positions in school and extra-curricular musical groups, and teaching music to others in various settings were additional positive influences. Participants also identified their love of music as a driving force and believed that teaching music would allow that drive to be satisfied continuously. All four participants also described beliefs as to the ideal music teacher, and they already held an image of who and how they would be as music teachers based on prior experiences and role models. Some held an image of a teacher-centered disposition, discussing what the teacher needed to know and should have her students do, while others held a student-centered disposition, concerned with treating students fairly and instilling in them a lifelong love for music. One participant held a subject-centered approach, focusing on music and performances.

Summary. There were limitations with some of the reviewed studies. Isbell (2008) relied on department chairs of selected schools of music to administer his survey. However, in some cases, the surveys were unable to be administered to all music education students, including student teachers, possibly missing valuable insight as a result. Draves' (2012) participants represented a single geographic area (the American southwest) and music discipline (choral) from an extra-curricular ensemble. Cox's (1994) sample included only teachers in the state of Arkansas.

Gillespie and Hamann's (1999) results appear to contradict those of other researchers investigating primary socialization. Cox (1994), Frink (1997), Isbell (2008), and Draves (2012) found that ensemble directors and private teachers exert a great deal of influence upon the primary socialization of pre-service teachers. Gillespie and Hamann (1999), however, suggested that high school ensemble directors and private teachers do not exert primary influence upon the socialization of future string music teachers. It is possible that secondary orchestra teachers influence young students in different ways than band or choir teachers. It also appears that many orchestra teachers may not be interested in encouraging their students to become teachers. There were, however, a number of similarities with the reviewed studies. Musical activities, such as participating in a school ensemble, honor choir, leading sectionals, and conducting an ensemble were seen as positive influences for students who chose to pursue a career in music education. Ensemble directors and music teachers were found to strongly influence students' beliefs about the music education profession, which could have implications for their identity development in a music teacher education program (Roberts, 1991b). The influence of these beliefs and preconceptions and how they may change due to interactions within communities situated within a cultural cohort is of prime interest in the present study. Additionally, given the powerful

influences of students' beliefs from multiple sources, it would be of interest to note if "disruption" of these beliefs could take place during the pre-service phase of one's career and, if so, how that "disruption" takes place and to what extent.

Secondary Socialization

Researchers also have investigated secondary socialization, the period of socialization when pre-service music teachers participate in professional training programs. L'Roy's (1983) dissertation is an early and groundbreaking work in the body of knowledge of occupational identity in undergraduate music education majors. Basing her study on the work of Becker and Carper (1956), as well as Carper (1970), she analyzed three aspects of the teacher education and socialization process: the occupational norms and values of undergraduate music education majors, the commitment of undergraduate music education majors to specific skills and knowledge, and undergraduate music education majors' career commitments.

L'Roy collected data from 165 undergraduate music education majors at North Texas State University via questionnaires and also conducted 38 follow-up interviews. She asked students to select the title that they preferred to be referred to by others, such as "Performer," "Music Educator," "Musician," and "Band Director." The title "Performer" was most frequently chosen by participants, as they revealed relatively weak orientations to teacher roles and strong orientations to musician roles. Additionally, participants chose to pursue music education as a career because it offered stable employment opportunities. L'Roy (1983) attributed the lack of commitment to the occupational norms of teaching to the limited teaching opportunities offered to undergraduate students. Those students who had previous teaching experience reported a stronger perception of themselves as music educators and also expressed a stronger commitment to continuing in music education than those who had no previous teaching experience. L'Roy

(1983) argued that these pre-service teachers' development of identity resulted from the symbolic interaction of the faculty, students, and the university environment.

Building on L'Roy's (1983) dissertation, Froehlich and L'Roy (1985) studied undergraduates' career commitment and commitment to developing specific skills and knowledge common to music education. The researchers distributed questionnaires to 118 students and randomly selected 39 participants for interviews. Froehlich and L'Roy found that, regardless of the teaching areas (choir, strings, band), students were less committed to music education the longer they studied within the school of music. Froehlich and L'Roy determined that the participants in their study showed little commitment to occupational norms and values that are associated with being a music educator and concluded that music teacher preparation did not contribute towards the development of pre-service teachers' identities as professional educators.

Paul (1998) investigated the effects of a 2-year peer teaching laboratory experience at the University of Oklahoma that combined both conducting and secondary methods courses on the professional role development of undergraduate music education majors. Students in the class taught in short "microteaching" and 10-minute "rehearsal" episodes. Paul interviewed three students who had completed the program shortly after their student teaching semester with questions focused on the four categories of professional role development as outlined by Carper (1970). Paul (1998) then analyzed responses according to Fuller's (1969) stages of teacher concerns. He found that participants' occupational titles and identities varied considerably, perhaps due to factors outside the scope of the peer-teaching experience, such as personal musicianship and experience being in front of people. Paul (1998) found that the peer-teaching laboratory appeared to help the three students progress through Fuller's (1969) stages and found

that participants' commitment to professional tasks and knowledge were connected strongly to the peer-teaching laboratory experience. Paul (1998) found that peer teaching episodes can assist pre-service teachers with developing their own identity and professional knowledge base as it can facilitate the sharing and teaching of ideas. Paul (1998) also noted a lack of authenticity and anxieties about peer evaluation as limitations of the laboratory experience.

Conkling (2003) studied the reflective process of five choral pre-service choral music teachers working with in-service educators at a middle school in a small, suburban district that served as a professional development site. Three participants were third-year undergraduate music majors and two were graduate music majors, all of whom were seeking initial teaching certification in music. Data collection over the course of 15 weeks included observational field notes, content analysis of participants' electronic journal entries, and transcriptions of unstructured interviews with the participants. Conkling (2003) found that the K-12 practitioners' sense of professionalism, inner strength of character, and depth of relationships with their K-12 students served as important models for the pre-service educators. She suggested that access to the decision-making processes of an experienced practitioner during the initial stages of learning to teach was a powerful influence on pre-service educators' professional growth and identity development. Additionally, pre-service educators valued the benefits of learning to teach as part of a cohort group and valued peer feedback as contributing to their emerging teacher identity.

Haston and Russell (2012) examined the occupational identity development of undergraduate music education majors as they participated in a yearlong authentic context learning (ACL) experience situated within a professional development school (PDS). Participants included five undergraduate music education majors who participated in either string pedagogy or instrumental methods classes and taught in band or string projects two days a week

after school at a public K-5 magnet school located on the campus of a private university. Using data from formal interviews, observation of participants, and participants' teaching reflections, Haston and Russell (2012) found that some students experienced a transformation of occupational identities. As students' general pedagogical knowledge increased, their knowledge and confidence as persons and as teachers also increased. Others, however, did not experience improved teacher confidence due to becoming more aware of the challenges and complexities of teaching. Students also developed a realistic understanding of their personal responsibility for student learning, thereby assisting with progressing to Fuller and Brown's (1975) third stage of teacher concern, and felt more confident that they could succeed as music teachers. Participants also attributed critical examinations of and learning from the teaching practices of others, including their own applied instructor, to the PDS experience. Echoing findings from Conkling's (2003) study suggesting that teaching experiences could inform undergraduate music education majors' performance practices, some students also assumed more of a teacher role with their peers in their chamber ensembles. Also, as with Conkling (2003), Haston and Russell (2012) found that the participants valued peer feedback and that peer interaction and growth are an important part of the development of teacher identity.

Roberts has published extensively on the secondary socialization of undergraduate music education majors (1990, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c, 1993, 2000, 2003). For his dissertation, Roberts (1990) developed a theory to account for the social construction of a musician identity by music education students in Canadian universities. Based on data gathered by interviews and participant observation at several Canadian universities, Roberts found that music education students often feel isolated from other music students, resulting in the development of a separate music education community within music schools.

Building upon his dissertation, Roberts (1991c) explored how undergraduate music education majors' professional beliefs and understandings are shaped by social forces within the university. Roberts gathered data via interviews and observations from 116 undergraduate music education majors at five Canadian universities. Roberts was critical of cultures within schools of music and demonstrated that the self-perceptions of pre-service music teachers are shaped by societal and institutional norms that privilege being a competent musician over being a competent teacher. As a result, pre-service music educators may wish to be seen by others as a "musician" rather than a "teacher." Furthermore, when music education students idealize themselves as musicians, their pursuit of performance status may decrease their motivation and commitment to music teacher education and detract from other important endeavors within music teacher practice and identity development.

Roberts (1991b) then studied the interaction of music education students in Canadian universities as they come to construct an identity as musician. Based on observation and interview data with 108 students over a period of 36 months at five Canadian universities, Roberts found that schools of music contain hierarchy of musical types and social roles—the role of performer being the pinnacle status for one to achieve. As a result, music education majors may engage in competition with performance majors to gain social status and may lack any semblance of teacher identity.

Dolloff (1999) summarized studies that involved examining the development of music teacher identity among students prior to student teaching. In one study, she asked undergraduate and graduate students to write about memorable experiences in music education settings. The teachers in these stories often were significant role models for students and helped to comprise their images of self-as-teacher. Some images also were "composite," not representing specific

teachers but rather their influential teachers in general. Dolloff (1999) then asked the students to reread their stories and relate them to their own identities, having them explain what the stories told them about the teacher they were, the teacher they would like to be, and the teacher they feared becoming. As a result, some students identified with the teacher in their stories while others created theories of what music education is based on their individual needs as a learner. For example, some students described the need to maintain control of their classrooms, while others spoke of emulating their teacher or creating leadership opportunities for students.

In another study, Dolloff (1999) asked undergraduate elementary music students to draw a picture of their “ideal” teacher. Some students drew a heart to represent compassion. Others drew ears as a sign of being a good listener. After drawing the “ideal” teacher, Dolloff (1999) had them draw themselves as teachers. Within this activity, she found evidence of a “collective ideal teacher.” Some students drew pictures of teachers behind desks or with messy, disturbed hair as they had seen either in real life or as stereotypes in the media. Dolloff (1999) found that writing stories helped pre-service teachers remember the role models in their educational experiences. Additionally, she opined that asking music education students to draw their ideal teacher and self-as-teacher can provide hope to pre-service music educators as to what music teaching could be.

Based on his analysis of Swedish pre- and in-service music teachers based on interviews and questionnaires, Bouij (1998) created four role-identity categories: Musician/all-round musician, Performer, Pupil-centered teacher, and Content-centered teacher. The four categories are based on two larger categories of musician and teacher. Bouij argued, as did Roberts (1991b, 1991c), that the role with the highest status in schools of music is the performer and that many students choose music education as an alternative, rather than as a primary intention. When a

student's performance ability is insufficient compared to performance majors, she may claim to be an "all-round musician" to self-preserve her status in the music program. Other students identified themselves as teachers but focused on musical ability and content rather than students. Bouij, however, found that most students do not identify with pupil-centered teaching and that more than half also worked as musicians on the side following graduation, suggesting the presence of an ongoing struggle between musician identity and teacher identity.

Building on Bouij's (1998) work and employing his theory of role-identities as a framework, Draves (2014) sought to explore how three undergraduate music education majors perceived themselves as pre-service music teachers, including the role-identities that they embodied, the experiences or people that were influential in their selection of role-identities, and how their role-identities had changed since their enrollment in the Introduction to Music Education class at Draves' institution. Using individual interviews, field notes from videotapes of peer teaching episodes, a focus group interview, and two Bouij (1998) frameworks completed by the participants, Draves (2014) found that the role-identities showed little change over the course of a year, leading her to agree with Teachout and McCoy (2010) that more authentic learning experiences across multiple courses might be needed to influence identity development. The three participants expressed a desire to embody parts of all four of Bouij's role-identities, suggesting an understanding of music teacher identity as multi-faceted. As a result of this, participants found it difficult to assign themselves one specific role-identity, perhaps due to the clear delineation of each role and the development of the role-identities framework in a different culture (e.g., Sweden). As with Haston and Russell (2012) and Isbell (2008), peers were positive and influential during the secondary socialization process. Certain general education and music education courses and experiences, including authentic teaching and field experiences, also were

found to be positively influential with the development of teacher identity, supporting the findings of Ballantyne et al. (2012). Draves (2014) also suggested that music teacher educators should teach conceptions of identity and the forces that contribute to them in their classes, sharing their challenges of identity development to assure them that trials are a normal part of the process.

Brewer (2009) studied the conceptions of effective music teaching held by five pre-service music teachers and the influence of these conceptions on the participants' developing teacher role-identities. He interviewed and observed the participants for two years and examined artifacts related to their teaching. Brewer (2009) found that the participants' conceptions of effective teaching were related closely to their music teacher role identities, which were based on their goals and interactions with both their peers and other teachers. He then created a theoretical model indicating what he found to be the three broad categories of the participants' role identities: personal skills and qualities, teaching skills and knowledge, and musical skills and knowledge. Brewer (2009) suggested that these three categories form the contents of these individual's identities and overlap, creating a person's unique music teacher role identity. He also found that a person's identity included the interaction between their own perceptions of self and the perceptions of others.

Using narrative inquiry techniques (Barone, 1992, 1995; Barrett & Stauffer, 2012; Stauffer, 2014), Brewer (2014) examined how his participant's nontraditional status and background interacted with the music teacher role-identity development process within a traditional collegiate music teacher education program. Alex, the participant, grew up amidst a difficult home life but used electric guitar as an outlet for his emotions and played in a band during high school. He had a brief moment of interest with the saxophone during elementary

school but was not able to participate in the school band due to his tumultuous family life and lack of financial resources to rent the instrument. During high school, Alex transferred his guitar skills to learn how to play the bass. He learned to play songs by ear but had no formal music education and little knowledge of traditional music notation. After an on-again-off-again relationship with music performance for almost 20 years, Alex realized that he wanted to be a music teacher. He successfully auditioned for music schools due to his success in performing the audition and relying on his aural skills. Throughout his time in the undergraduate music education degree program, Alex felt anxious, living in fear of being “found out” for his weak music-reading abilities and self-perceived weak teaching skills. Although he eventually found his “niche” in the degree program, Alex initially felt out of place, searching for a community that accepted him regardless of his older age and family—factors that made him a “nontraditional” student. In his band setting, Alex was viewed as quite successful, even with the “mismatch” of musical identities (Hargreaves & Marshall, 2003) that he felt due to the musical identities and practices of the school of music being quite different from his own identity. During his student teaching, Alex was, at first, very concerned about his ability to manage a classroom. He then became concerned with his teaching performance, attempting to make connections and applications to what was taught in teacher education classes. Towards the end of his placement, having worked through Fuller’s (1969) levels of teacher concern, Alex transformed into a student-centered teacher, focusing on their needs. He also felt that his nontraditional music education benefitted him in the classroom with implementation of informal music learning techniques (Green, 2001, 2008).

Brewer (2014) suggested that Alex’s nontraditional musical background could be a change agent for a profession that is confined by Western classical traditions and needs

innovative teaching strategies and activities to make formal music education congruent with children's current interests. Brewer (2014) also noted the lack of diversity in ensemble types and pedagogies in K-12 music course offerings (Allsup, 2003; Green, 2008; Woody, 2007, 2012) as well as homogeneity among K-12 ensemble students (Brewer, 2010; Elpus & Abril, 2011), music education audition candidates (Rickels et al., 2013), in-service educators (Feistritzer, 2011), and music teacher educators (Hewitt & Thompson, 2006). He also noted that the music teacher education curriculum has been largely resistant to change (Cutietta, 2007; Jones, 2008). Brewer (2014) speculated that the homogeneity of the teaching force and collegiate faculty that prepare pre-service music educators for the work force have a direct influence on the resultant lack of diversity seen in K-12 music education.

Although researchers have studied primary and secondary socialization of pre-service music educators, they have just started to address the relationship between pre-service music teacher identities and career choices. Robinson (2010) investigated the reasons given by music educators who were instrumentalists for choosing to teach elementary general music rather than instrumental music in school. Participants were seven recent graduates who were chosen purposefully based on their self-expressed interest in being an instrumental teacher upon entrance to the music teacher education program, their major instrument (woodwind, brass, strings, percussion), and current teaching assignment of elementary general music. Robinson (2010) gathered data via email questionnaire. Drawing upon Holland's (1973, 1976, 1985) studies that investigated the relationship between personality types (Realistic, Investigative, Artistic, Social, Enterprising, and Conventional) and vocational choices, Robinson found that his participants were able to determine intuitively that instrumental music teaching environments were "incongruent" with their personality types. Participants strongly preferred working with

young children, had concerns regarding work/life balance and the perceived difficulty instrumental music teachers have in maintaining this balance, had an aversion to the emphasis on competition that they perceived in the band culture with which they were familiar as instrumentalists, and were concerned with a perceived privileging of performance that excluded other types of music teaching and learning in band settings. Thus, they chose another environment within music education (i.e., elementary general music) that represented a better match to their perceived career goals and offered them a better chance to attaining satisfaction in their careers.

Shouldice (2013a) used an instrumental case study design to examine one male undergraduate instrumental music education student's ("Pete") decision to pursue a career in teaching elementary general music rather than secondary instrumental music. Data sources included video footage of Pete's teaching, semi-structured interviews, and pre-existing journal entries from two music education methods courses. Pete, who strongly identified as being a musician since childhood and wanted to teach music since middle school, was strongly influenced by his coursework. His "Introduction to Music Education" class, a discussion-based course that required students to think critically and philosophically about the profession to challenge their belief system, played a major role in the "evolution" of his views about music teaching and learning and helped him change his identity from conductor to that of teacher. Additionally, Pete desired to be a student-centered "teacher" who focused on experiences of the students and would help them develop independent musical skills and understandings to become lifelong music-makers. He viewed a "director" as someone who embraces teacher-centered teaching and is more concerned with content (repertoire) and outstanding performance than student learning and progress. Pete also desired to broaden the traditionally narrow focus of

performance in many performance-based programs to include composition and improvisation. However, Pete was somewhat pessimistic that implementing creativity activities and developing personal musicianship skills in a performance-based ensemble was possible, due to the band culture's status quo culture of rigidity and adherence to tradition. He therefore thought that teaching at the elementary level would be the best professional "fit" for his identity.

Pete's perceptions of the differences between "teachers" and "directors" are similar to those of participants in Shouldice's previous study (2009). She found that those who described themselves as "teachers" were more likely to have their students be engaged in creative activities (such as composition and improvisation) than those who described themselves as "directors." The "teachers" also disagreed more strongly with the notion that the ultimate goal of a music class is performance. Similar to Isbell (2008), Mark (1998), and Roberts (1991b), Shouldice (2013a) argued that these distinctions in role identity likely develop from primary socialization factors that begin at an early age.

Summary. Researchers have suggested that pre-service students enter degree programs primarily socialized as musicians rather than educators due to experiences and influences from primary socialization. Additionally, due to schools of music elevating the status of musician and privileging higher level of musicianship and performance-based endeavors, such as ensembles and applied lessons, any emerging teacher identity present may be reduced or replaced by the drive to compete in musician-centered higher education institutions.

Prior teaching experience seems to play a major role in the formation of occupational identity during secondary socialization. Those pre-service teachers who have had teaching or leadership experiences prior to their matriculation into a music teacher preparation program tend to identify more as an educator and have less difficulty continuing to construct an educator

identity. Researchers also have suggested that pairing of pre-service educators with experienced K-12 educators and teaching experiences embedded within the teacher preparation sequences (such as peer teaching within methods classes and microteaching opportunities with K-12 students in fieldwork experiences) and peer interaction and feedback may also foster teacher identity development among pre-service teachers.

Researchers have begun to explore the relationship between pre-service music teacher identities and career choices. The present study can continue to expand on this line of inquiry by determining if and how the culture of a school of music and/or the cultural cohort of a music teacher preparation program influences students to choose to teach in an area outside of their concentration. Furthermore, the scope of the present study will allow for a broader view of multiple interactions within the cultural context of a school of music, rather than discrete experiences contained within singular methods classes.

Literature on Student Teaching in General Education

Many researchers have explored the concept of teacher identity formation during the student teaching process. Knowles (1992) studied the formation of beginning teachers' identities both prior to and during student teaching based on their biographies. He defined the term biography as "those formative experiences of pre-service and beginning teachers which have influenced the ways in which they think about teaching and, subsequently, their actions in the classroom" (p. 99). Additionally, in contrast to other definitions of "role-identities" that are based on symbolic interactionism and social experiences (Bouij, 2004; Roberts, 2003), Knowles described teacher role identity as "the way in which individuals think about themselves as teachers—the images they have of self-as-teacher" (p. 99).

In his article, Knowles (1992) summarized three of his previous studies, which included

five separate cases of student and beginning teachers. In the first study, Knowles observed three female student teachers; two eventually became successful beginning teachers and one failed in student teaching. In another study, he examined a male student who was enrolled in an undergraduate, secondary internship program. In a third study, Knowles observed a female in an undergraduate, pre-service secondary teacher education program similar to those in the first study. The purpose of the composite article was to examine the links between beginning teachers' practices in the classroom and their life stories. Specifically, Knowles (1992) wanted to know how beginning teachers solved problems in the classroom and how their biographies related to or impacted their problem solving and coping strategies with those problems. Knowles defined coping strategies as "ways in which student and beginning teachers manage difficult situations in the classroom," (p. 114), while problem solving strategies were defined as "ways in which individuals think about a problem, the subsequent alternatives they consider, and...what they judge to be the actions most likely to resolve the particular difficulty" (p. 114).

Knowles found that two of the participants had positive experiences in school and with their families and consequently, had strong teacher role identities. The two participants with weak teacher identities had unstable family lives and/or poor teacher role models. The fifth participant had both negative and positive experiences in her background and developed a moderate to strong teacher role identity. Knowles (1992) argued that, "personal biography seems to have profound effects on what occurs in the individual's classroom and the concept of teacher role identity is central for understanding the process by which prior experiences are transformed into classroom practice" (p. 126). He found that early teacher role models, early childhood experiences, and early teaching experiences were essential in the development of pre-service educators role identities.

Knowles (1992) suggested that beginning teachers enter teacher education programs already possessing a sense of teacher role identity that is based on their previous life experiences. Teacher education programs can influence pre-service teachers role identities in either negative or positive ways but would be most influential to those pre-service teachers who possess a moderately strong teacher identity. Knowles (1992) also argued that beginning teachers with strong positive teacher role identities were more able to cope with challenging issues in teaching than those with weaker identities. He also suggested that those with very strong or very weak role identities tended to teach in the ways in which they were taught.

Samuel and Stephens (2000) examined the contextualized self (Nias, 1989) of two South African student teachers. Specifically, they wished to understand the relationship between the participants' personal self, shaped by family and other experiences and their professional self, as shaped by the university. The researchers collected forms of data that included journal reflections of English teaching experiences, teachers' self and peer reports of professional performance, and the researchers' observations of lessons taught.

Samuel and Stephens (2000) addressed two key relationships in this study: the relationship of self and identity, as well as cultural context and professional environment. Self and identity relationships occur at the level of the individual, whereas cultural context and professional environment relationships are at the level of the society in which an individual resides. According to Samuel and Stephens:

The self can only attempt to define itself in relation to a host of other competing selves, which do not necessarily share the same fundamental principles, values, and beliefs.

What constitutes a professional identity and a role is thus a "percolated" understanding and acceptance of a series of competing and sometimes contradictory values, behaviors,

and attitudes, all of which are grounded in the life experiences of the self in formation. (p. 476)

The authors suggested that teacher educators can learn more about their students by looking at the identities students bring with them to the university, as much of their identity is formed in their early years and can influence the emerging conceptions of what a music educator should be. Identity develops in a quickly changing context, and this process includes many competing components that pull student teachers in different directions. Samuel and Stephens identified three main forces: inertial, programmatic, and contextual.

Inertial forces are derived from an individual's life experiences and occur in primary socialization spaces (e.g., one's home and the K-12 school), programmatic forces come from a university's teacher education curriculum, and contextual forces come from changing school culture and policies. The authors concluded by saying that it is important to ask the question, "What do we bring with us?" in addition to "Who are we?" and "What do we wish to become?" when examining teachers' developing identities. Suggestions for teacher educators included studying student teachers' conceptions of their roles and identities as teachers, helping student teachers develop concepts of personal and teaching identity by including episodes for reflection throughout a teacher education program, and supporting novice educators further with the development of their teacher identity during the early stage of their careers.

Literature on Student Teaching in Music Education

Several researchers have sought to determine what, if any, occupational identity develops during music student teaching. Broyles (1997) explored the effects of videotape analysis on the role development of music student teachers, specifically examining students' progression through Fuller's (1969) levels of teaching concerns, students' commitment to Carper's (1970)

role development categories, which of Carper's (1970) role development factors can be directly linked to a structured videotape analysis procedure, and what difficulties and advantages may be associated with the procedure. Broyles (1997) collected questionnaires and journals from 12 music student teachers at three universities in central Oklahoma. She also employed observation reports while viewing videotaped samples of their teaching. Twenty public school cooperating teachers and eight university supervisors also participated in the study. Broyles (1997) found that all of the student teachers exhibited some type of role development during the practicum. Additionally, in regards to Fuller's (1969) levels of teaching concern, self-concerns of the student teachers appeared to fade and concerns for pupil learning increased during the semester. Student teachers also came to develop more of a teacher identity and perceive themselves more as teachers and less as musicians as a result of "real" teaching experiences during the student teaching experiences.

Coleman (1999) employed Fuller's (1969) stages of concern and Van Maanen's (1977, 1991) levels of reflection as frames to investigate relations between the music student teaching experience, the university music teacher preparation program, the school music classroom culture, and scheduled interventions (coaching, guided reflection, re-teaching, and adopt-a-class⁹) designed to help music student teachers focus and reflect on teaching and learning. Coleman observed three female student teachers from the same undergraduate institution over a 12-week time period during three consecutive semesters. Practica took place at the same elementary school with the same cooperating teacher. All student teachers participated in three videotaped teaching and re-teaching episodes that were viewed as soon as the lesson was

⁹ Each student teacher spent time with a non-music class and focused on watching routines in the classroom and rapport established between the teacher and students. The intent of this was for student teachers to look for commonalities and/or individualities of student behaviors and observe students behaving outside the music classroom context.

completed.

Through cross-case analysis, Coleman (1999) concluded that the three student teachers did not advance beyond Fuller's (1969) survival stage due to concerns about themselves and their performance (e.g., doubts about their content knowledge, anxiety over supervisor evaluations) that prevented them from focusing their attention on the students. Furthermore, Coleman (1999) found that student teachers made little or no connection between their experiences as teachers and their music teacher preparation experiences. Implications for teacher education included the need for modeled teacher reflection in the music teacher education program so that pre-service teachers could implement these strategies during the student teaching experience.

Draves (2008) examined the nature and depth of the student teacher/cooperating music teacher relationship, including how cooperating music teachers describe their relationship with their student teachers and which characteristics (personal, musical, educational, and professional) of the student teachers contribute to the development of the relationship. Following data collection and analysis, Draves added an additional research question concerning how the relationship impacts the teacher identity of both the student teacher and cooperating teacher. Four student teacher/cooperating teacher cohort pairs from a large Midwestern university served as participants. Draves collected data from several different sources, including individual interviews, focus group interviews, and observational field notes. She found that, over the course of the student teaching experience, teacher identities in the student teachers evolved as relationships grew stronger between the student teachers and cooperating teachers. Similar to Conkling's (2003) findings, the very act of being in another teacher's presence or having an occupational reference group (Carper, 1970; Paul, 1998) facilitated student teachers' visions as

educators and help construct teacher identity. Draves' findings also slightly contradicted those of Isbell's (2008), as both experiences and people played important roles in occupational identity development in pre-service music educators. Draves (2008) implored music teacher educators to provide opportunities for pre-service educators to interact with in-service educators and K-12 students earlier in the music teacher preparation program, including field observations, maintenance of a portfolio that highlights critical reflection on their work, and a focus on reflective thinking on peer teaching and field teaching experiences.

Paise (2010) examined what pre-service music teachers discussed while describing themselves in the role of music teacher prior to, during, and after student teaching. She also sought to determine if and/or in what ways those descriptions changed over the course of a year. Data sources included observational field notes, audio and video recordings, structured interviews with pre-service educators, professors and cooperating teachers, and artifacts that included lesson plans, assignments from methods classes, and emails. Participants included six pre-service educators in the institution's vocal/general track, four collegiate music teacher educators, and one administrator. Paise (2010) found that the pre-service educators' role identities changed during the student teaching process and went through several stages that she defined as follows:

1. Imagined music teacher role identity: prior to student teaching, participants had an "imagined" music teacher role identity (Dolloff, 1999; Weber & Mitchell, 1995) and spoke of themselves only in terms of how they hoped they would be as a teacher. They spoke of teaching music in the future tense and were not yet using musical and instructional skills in a teaching setting.
2. Transitional music teacher role identity: as participants began to adapt their

ideological, musical, and instructional selves to actual teaching experiences, they experienced a conflict between the reality of the classroom and their “imagined” music teacher role identity. Some were in teaching “limbo” and described themselves as no longer being a student but not having their “own” classrooms. Others struggled with their previously constructed ideology of teaching versus the ideology of the cooperating teachers with whom they were working.

3. Emergent music teacher role identity: Due to the student teaching experience, participants had a more realistic view of who they were as a teacher. Paise (2010) chose the term “emergent” for this stage to be consistent with the view of identity having no real end point. An educator’s role identity is never stable due to the continuous growth and change that occurs due to interactions with the physical environment—identity is always emerging (Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004; MacLure, 1993) and shifting (Dolloff, 2007).

Fitzpatrick (2014) investigated the use of a blog designed to complement a face-to-face student teaching seminar and provide opportunities for sustained interaction. Nine student teachers enrolled in student teaching at an American university participated in the interpretative case study (Merriam, 1998). In addition to the once-weekly in-person meeting with the instructor, students were required to contribute one entry on the class blog on a topic of their choice weekly. Students also were required to comment on at least two entries from classmates during the week. Data sources consisted of blog posts and comments collected during the 13-week semester, a descriptive survey in which participants reflected on the process of blogging, and a researcher journal.

Participants found that the blog helped to develop a sense of community within the cohort

through strategies of communication that included in-depth reflection and interaction via statements and comments that connected students during a traditionally isolating period in their degree program. Participants also shared experiences for their mutual benefit based on the shared domain of interest (music student teaching) beyond the weekly seminar, eliciting positive feedback, suggestions, and sense of support from the community of peers. Finally, participants themselves acted as resources—teachers and learners—drawing upon their own experiences from student teaching and other trusted sources, recommending learning resources that were helpful and serving as a network of social support that facilitated student teachers' development and improvement of reflective thinking skills (Zeichner & Liston, 1996). Fitzpatrick (2014) also found the blogging to provide a space for student reflection on both classroom teaching experiences and their emerging identity development from student to teacher during the course of the semester.

Summary. Studies by Knowles (1992) and Samuel and Stephens (2000) were similar in that they found that experiences from childhood were important in the development of identity. Although these studies are important for understanding the origin of identities and how aspects of one's identity continue to develop, these studies do not address some of the specific issues that may confront those completing their teacher education programs in the field of music.

Studies on identity development during music student teaching have somewhat contradictory findings. Researchers have shown mixed results on advancement of Fuller's (1969) stages of teacher concern (Broyles, 1997; Coleman, 1999) and the influence of individuals and experiences in pre-service music teacher identity development (Draves, 2008; Isbell, 2008). The present study seeks to understand how the subculture of a music teacher education program and/or the culture of a school of music—which, inherently, would include both contact with

individuals and experiences—influence students’ occupational identities. Thus, the present study would add to the extant literature and assist with further understanding of influences within the secondary socialization experience on pre-service educators occupational identities.

Culture and Communities of Practice Literature in Higher Education

There are varying definitions of culture due to different interpretations within different fields, including anthropology, ethnomusicology, and psychology. Conceptions of culture have also changed over time. Geertz (1973), an anthropologist, defined culture as “an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic forms by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes towards life” (p. 89). Drawing parallels to symbolic interactionism (Blumer, 1969), Geertz (1973) argued that one must understand the symbols of a culture to gain insight into the “common world in which men look, name, listen, and make” (p. 119). Geertz (1983) also acknowledged that any effort to analyze culture requires speculating about meanings, assessing assumptions, and drawing explanatory conclusions, and he claimed that cultural phenomenon needed to be analyzed from the native’s point of view. But, scholars also have emphasized the importance of assessing culture from multiple perspectives (Benedict, 1934), as meanings attached to a culture can be unclear even to those within it (Cumings, 1997).

Several management and administration scholars have studied the concept of culture as it pertains to organized, professional entities, such as businesses and educational units (Chaffee & Tierney, 1988; Schein, 1985, 1991, 2004; Tierney, 1989). Since organizations develop distinctive beliefs and patterns over time (Wenger, 1998), organizational culture, therefore, is created via individuals’ interpretations and can be used to analyze and understand the mechanics of an institution (Tierney, 1989). Foreshadowing principles of Wenger’s (1998) *Communities of*

Practice, Chaffee and Tierney (1988) defined the culture of an organization as “grounded in the shared assumptions of individuals participating in the organization” (p. 7).

Culture and Communities of Practice in Collegiate Music Schools

Nettl (1995) examined the culture and community of one major school of music in the United States, writing of how the social hierarchy is arranged both vertically (administrators, faculty, students) and horizontally (functions that are more central or peripheral in importance to the mission of the school of music). Nettl found that social boundaries and class structures within a school dictated roles for members of each class. Those areas that concentrated on performance-based activities, such as the student performance major, applied faculty, and ensembles, were perceived as being more important within the school. Non-performance activities, including music theory, musicology, and music education were relegated more to the periphery in terms of importance. Additionally, areas/departments that are more central in importance may compete for dominance and perceive themselves as the most important group within the school of music. Nettl’s observations demonstrate that researchers need to consider the power of perceived social hierarchy within the environment of an organization when examining its culture and community.

Landes (2008) compared the student cultures at two collegiate music institutions: a Conservatory of Music and a School of Music within a liberal arts environment, as well as identified and described the values and beliefs that inform the student cultures. Landes drew upon stakeholders in each context to be participants, including administrators and students, and data collection techniques that included interviews, focus group discussions, researcher’s field log notebook, and participant observations. She found that the student culture can have a powerful influence on the student experience, including on how students acclimate to the environment, students’ experiences throughout a degree program, and the retention and

persistence of students within the program. Landes suggested that program administrators clearly communicate the mission, goals, and expectations of a program so all students understand what is and is not condoned in a program, as well as understand what to expect during a program. Landes also implored faculty and administrators that, given the implications of her study, they study and become acutely aware of the institutional culture, particularly if they wish to make changes to an institution's program, such as changes to curricula or program requirements to assist musicians to succeed in an ever changing 21st century society. She also noted that successful institutional changes require consideration of both the student and institutional cultures.

Culture and Communities of Practice Literature in Pre-Service Music Education

Aróstegui (2004) undertook an ethnographic case study of three undergraduate music education students' participation in the University of Illinois' (Urbana-Champaign) School of Music and music education program to understand how they created musical and educational knowledge and what kind of knowledge was produced based on their participation within the implementation of the school of music and music education curriculum. Aróstegui (2004) observed the students during the 2002 spring semester and collected data via observations, field notes, and interviews. As with Nettl (1995), Aróstegui (2004) argued that the School of Music privileged the performance-based activities, including applied lessons and band rehearsals, and found those type of courses to be the implicit core of the curriculum as students concentrated their efforts towards that those ends. Courses outside of performance, including music theory, history, and education, were given less priority. Additionally, the School of Music tended to place a priority on western European classical music and considered music from the Baroque era through the mid 20th century to be the "central repertoire . . . that the music school considers to

be par excellence” (Nettl, 1995, p. 84). Jazz, folk, and contemporary music were, de facto, marginalized from the “normal” music that comprised western European literature.

Music education students stated that one must be a good musician in order to be a good teacher, demonstrating the musician/teacher dichotomy in previous pre-service music teacher identity studies (Bouij, 1998, 2004; L’Roy, 1983; Froehlich & L’Roy, 1985; Roberts, 1990, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c, 1993, 2000, 2003), possibly due to the perceived need to compete against performance majors for similar status and prestige. Compounding the issue, Aróstegui (2004) suggested that he found a disconnect between K-12 school music programs and collegiate music programs, noting the weak to nonexistent practical connection between the music performance requirements in the School of Music and music education practices in schools. He also found that the concentration on performance and obligations placed on students, such as performing at concerts and basketball games, detracted from important instruction in music education practices and methods.

Summary

Researchers have discussed culture and communities of practice within higher education (Kuh, 1990; Kuh & Hall, 1993; Schein, 1985, 2004), collegiate music schools (Landes, 2008; Nettl, 1995), and pre-service music teacher education (Aróstegui, 2004; Fitzpatrick, 2014). Despite these and other studies that investigate culture and communities within the K-12 and collegiate music classroom (Shouldice, 2013b; Woodward, 2013), no studies to date have studied the interaction of culture and communities of practice from a program evaluation perspective. The present study may yield important data that could be of assistance to music teacher educators and administrators who wish to understand how the culture of a school of music and the subculture of a music teacher education program embedded within it influences students’

identity development. Implementation of results may influence pre-service teachers' conceptions of music education, allowing them to devise new trajectories for the profession and allow more students to participate in formal music education activities.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the method used to examine how the cultural cohort and communities of a music teacher education program embedded within the culture of a school of music change or “disrupt” pre-service educators’ occupational identities and preexisting ideas of music education. I will discuss the methodological approach and design, the selection of participants, and the setting of the study.

Methodological Overview

Occupational identity and occupational identity changes are complex constructs to examine. Successful exploration of occupational identity change requires several different data sources to provide a comprehensive picture of the phenomenon. Incorporating both qualitative and quantitative modes of inquiry—mixed methods—has the potential to provide a comprehensive understanding of the phenomenon.

Onwuegbuzie and Teddlie (2003) defined mixed methods research as a research design with multiple philosophical assumptions and methods of inquiry. It involves philosophical assumptions that guide the collection of data, analysis, and mixture of quantitative and qualitative research paradigms throughout the phases of the research process. As a method, it focuses on collecting, analyzing, and mixing both paradigms either in a single study or series of studies. Its central premise is that the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches has the potential to provide a better understanding of some research problems than either one alone (Creswell, 2014; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). By mixing the data sets, the research provides a deeper understanding than if either data set had been used alone. By using mixed methods, researchers may be able to offset the weaknesses of both qualitative and quantitative research and help to answer questions that cannot be answered by either single

methodology (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Jick, 1979). For example, with quantitative research, the voices of the participants are not directly heard with their own words and the researchers seldom discuss their own personal biases (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). On the other hand, some may argue that a weakness of qualitative research is the lack of generalizability to a large group because of the limited number of participants and the inherent bias of the researcher that is present when creating interpretations from the data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). Therefore, with mixed methods research, the strengths of one approach may ameliorate the shortcomings of the other approach.

Researchers wishing to employ mixed methods research must be cognizant of three major tenets of the paradigm: timing, weighting, and mixing (Creswell, 2014; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Tashakkori & Teddlie, 1998). Timing, also known as implementation or sequence, refers to the order in which the data is collected and the order that the researchers use the data within the study (data is analyzed or interpreted) (Morgan, 1998). This can be concurrent or sequential. Weighting refers to the relative importance of qualitative and quantitative methods in answering the research questions. The worldview of the researchers can determine the weighting. For example, a postpositivist researcher may be more prone to embrace qualitative weighting regardless of the research questions (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011; Slife & Williams, 1995). Additionally, there may be practical considerations that affect the weighting of the data, such as experience with either paradigm. The final major idea, mixing, refers to the explicit combining of the two data sets. A strong mixed methods study explicitly presents both types of data and includes them throughout discussion by merging them, or transforming one type of data into another, i.e., qualitative data into quantitative data (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011).

Four types of mixed methods designs exist: triangulation, embedded, explanatory, and exploratory (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011). The explanatory sequential design—a two-phase design that uses qualitative data to build upon quantitative results—was the best choice for the present study. Using data gleaned from a quantitative survey, I was able to identify specific classes and experiences that students indicated most “disrupted” their ideas of music education. Then, I created cohort groups that allowed me to “dig” more deeply using qualitative methodology into the forces behind the disruptions. Specifically, I created both student and faculty focus groups (Morgan, 1997) and interviewed faculty (Patton, 2002; Seidman, 2006). Therefore, the quantitative data gleaned from the survey drove the qualitative research part of the study, which, in turn, informed the quantitative results and illuminated the phenomena of interest (Morgan, 1998).

In a study like this, the quantitative data usually is weighed more heavily due to the study having started with quantitative data collection. However, the researcher may change the weighting depending on the research questions and which research paradigm may be more illuminating for the phenomenon that is being studied. In this study, the qualitative data had more weight, as it was more illuminative and gave richer information that allowed me to suggest implications for music teacher educators and their programs.

Theoretical Frameworks

For the purposes of this study, I drew upon Wenger’s (1998) communities of practice model and Schein’s (1985, 2004) model of organizational culture, known as the Three Levels of Culture, as theoretical frameworks. Both models were most relevant for this study due to their framing of culture as created and sustained by interactions. Furthermore, both models suggest that artifacts created by participants within a culture aid in the transfer of knowledge and assist in

understanding the culture itself. Finally, both models are applicable towards the analysis of the culture of a school of music—an entity with multiple departments that co-exist, interact, and function within an organization that consists of multiple constituents, including faculty, administrators, and students.

Schein's (1985, 2004) Three Levels of Culture

Schein (1985) provided a thorough description of the characteristics associated with an organization's culture and argued that all of these characteristics relate to or reflect culture in that they concern attributes that group members share or hold in common. Schein (1985) identified them as follows:

1. Observed behavioral regularities when people interact: the language they use, the customs and traditions that evolve, and the rituals they employ;
2. Group norms: the implicit standards and values that evolve in groups;
3. Espoused values: the articulated, publicly announced principles and values that the group claims to be trying to achieve;
4. Formal philosophy: the broad policies and ideological principles that guide a group's actions;
5. Rules of the game: the implicit rules for getting along;
6. Climate: the feeling that is conveyed in a group by the physical layout and the way in which members of the organization interact;
7. Embedded skills: the special competencies group members display in accomplishing certain tasks;
8. Habits of thinking, mental models, and/or linguistic paradigms: the shared cognitive frames that guide the perceptions, thought, and language used;

9. Shared meanings: the emergent understandings that are created by group members; and,
10. Root metaphors or integrating symbols: the ideas, feelings, and images groups develop to characterize themselves (p. 8-10)

Based on these characteristics, Schein (2004) then went on to define organizational culture as:

a pattern of shared basic assumptions that was learned by a group as it solved its problems of external adaptation and internal integration, that has worked well enough to be considered valid and, therefore, to be taught to new members as the correct way to perceive, think, and feel, in relation to those problems. (p. 17)

Schein's (1985, 2004) Three Levels of Culture are arranged from the most explicit to the most tacit, as a means towards understanding how culture functions within organizations: artifacts, values, and assumptions.

Artifacts. Artifacts are the tangible structures and processes that exist in an organization and include the visible products of the group, including physical artifacts (e.g., condition and location of buildings, environmental layout), verbal artifacts (e.g., symbols, language, stories) and behavioral artifacts (e.g., rituals, ceremonies, and means and types of interactions) (Kuh & Hall, 1993; Manning, 1993; Schein, 1991, 2004).

Values. Values reflect the espoused and enacted ideals of an institution and served as the basis by which members of a culture judge circumstances, behaviors, objects, and people. Values are widely held beliefs that are manifested in actions but may be explicitly articulated or implicit in nature (Kuh, Schuh, Whitt, Andreas, Lyons, Strange, Krehbiel, & MacKay, 1991). Espoused values take the form of assertions of the organization, such as expecting students to act or participate in a certain manner in order to represent a group's beliefs, but the enactment of these

beliefs may or may not occur.

Assumptions. The third layer, assumptions, are the beliefs that members use to tacitly define their role, their relationships to others, and the nature of the organization in which they live. Assumptions comprise the core of a group's behavior and are important because they determine how a group perceives and feels about the world around it (Cumings, 1997). Additionally, Kuh and Hall (1993) described the assumptions stage as institution-specific patterns of values and principles that invoke a sense of belonging to a culture, include beliefs about treating members with equity and fairness, and help people distinguish between appropriate and inappropriate types of behavior for the culture.

Setting and Description

This study was situated within a school of music at a suburban public research university located in the Midwestern region of the United States. As of 2014, the total enrollment at the school, graduate and undergraduate populations, was approximately 50,000 students with approximately 5,000 faculty members and 17 degree-granting colleges.

As of 2015, the School of Music enrollment was slightly over 550 with approximately 50% from within the state, 30% from outside the state (but within the United States), and 20% from countries other than the United States. Beyond the general education requirements, all undergraduates within the School of Music at the time of data collection were required to take four courses in musicology (one of which must be in ethnomusicology) and seven courses in music theory. Music education majors were required to apply for admission to the university's college of education and satisfy the following degree requirements:

- Participation in a major ensemble as designated by the school of music for every semester enrolled in the program except during student teaching

- Class piano or waiving of class piano requirement
- Applied instruction on major instrument/voice
- “Creativity” courses with selections that include songwriting, music technology, composition, improvisation, instrumentation/orchestration, and jazz
- Two music education foundations courses
- Secondary instrument technique classes, including vocal techniques for those whose performance area is not voice
- College of Education classes
- Ensemble Conducting classes
- General Music Course: Either elementary or secondary
- Teaching instrumental or choral music
- Instrumental or Choral Ensemble Conducting
- Electives that include teaching early childhood, elementary, or secondary general music, stringed instruments, marching band methods, jazz pedagogy, Suzuki methods and materials
- Student Teaching seminar

Completion of the Bachelor of Music degree in Music Education leads to K-12 music teacher certification. At the time of data collection, the total number of credits required for graduation was 132-150. This school of music does not have a master’s of music education degree program with teacher certification, but students can have sought post-BA certification, possibly in conjunction with a master’s degree.

I chose this school of music for this study for several reasons. Just prior to data collection, the cultural cohort’s faculty had been in residence as a cohesive unit for over 10 years. The lack

of transience in the faculty may have allowed for a philosophical understanding to emerge, congeal, and be implemented throughout the culture of the cohort in several ways, including in coursework and interactions between constituents of the cultural cohort and the culture of the School of Music. The cohort's faculty was highly regarded throughout the United States, each with strong opinions and developed philosophies within their area of specialization. The cohort's faculty also offered courses that are not traditionally offered at other institutions, such as two foundation classes in music education, a secondary general methods class, an early childhood methods class and a songwriting class. Additionally, students were required to take a "creativity" class that compelled students to participate in activities that may not have been required for their performance area. Finally, graduates of the cultural cohort had been successful in obtaining teaching positions immediately or soon after graduation.

Quantitative Methodology

Construction of Pre-Service Music Educator Survey

The survey consisted of a mix of 24 open-response and closed-response questions, some of which were answered via a Likert scale. Questions captured basic demographic information, self-comparisons in occupational identity and teaching interest, and "disruptive" influences within the music teacher education program, School of Music, and the University. Burke and Tully (1977) recommended that data collection tools for identity exhibit four important properties: (1) produce a quantitative measure that can be used in multivariate data analysis, (2) incorporate the multidimensional character of identity (3) adequately define the underlying anchor points or dimensions that give meaning to the quantitative scores, and (4) integrate the concepts of self and role (p. 881). Additionally, Adams, Bennion, and Huh (1989) recommended using a 6-point Likert scale (1 = "strongly agree", 6 = "strongly disagree") to measure student

responses regarding identity. I incorporated these recommendations into the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey where applicable.

After stating survey instructions adapted from Isbell's (2006) study, (see Appendix B), I asked for basic demographic information (e.g., gender, race, ethnicity, instrument/voice, standing with the University, School of Music, and music education, and membership in collegiate music education organizations). For questions 1-4, rather than choosing from a pre-determined list of choices for gender, race, and ethnicity—none of which may accurately reflect one's identity—students self-identified via open-response questions, hence the variation in categories.

Results from the collegiate music education association participation questions (#8-9) in this section had the potential to demonstrate a correlation between pre-service music teacher identity and peer interactions within these communities of practice, as socialization and self-identification with a peer group can influence students' college development (Chickering, 1974) and identity (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999; Conkling, 2003; Haston & Russell, 2012; Isbell, 2008; Wenger, 1998). I then attempted in questions 10 and 11 to understand how students viewed themselves at the beginning of their time in the cultural cohort and their present views according to musician, performer, educator, music educator, conductor, and teacher identities (L'Roy, 1983; Roberts, 1990, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c, 1993, 2000, 2003) and Carper's (1970) Occupational Title using language modified from Isbell's (2006) survey.

Questions 12 through 17 focused on interactions that take place within communities of practice—courses within the music teacher education program, as well as influential persons and social interactions situated within the culture of a school of music. I used the School of Music's undergraduate handbook to create a list of all required courses for a music education major, including music education courses, School of Music courses, College of Education courses, and

University general education courses. Participants indicated which courses, persons, and social interactions most influenced them to change their beliefs of music education and identities as music educators, if any. Additionally, question 19 asked respondents to list experiences besides classes and persons that influenced them to think of themselves differently as music educators or influenced them to change their preconceptions of music education, if any. Questions 13, 14, 16, 17, and 19 were open-ended questions that yielded responses rich with data that illuminated specific moments, experiences, persons, and social interactions that were transformative for participants, if any. To avoid the potential of a participant becoming fatigued by the survey, I gave students the option of providing only one example rather than discussing each class that was identified in questions 12 and 15.

Data gleaned from questions that address past and present areas of teaching interest (#20-23) were of assistance with detecting a shift in students' occupational identities and teaching areas of interest. Areas of teaching included both traditional areas of music teaching (i.e., performance-based ensembles), as well as emerging modalities of music teaching (i.e., music technology, popular music, etc.). At the end of the survey, I asked for participants' contact information if they were willing to participate in a focus group discussion or interview, or were willing to answer questions via email. Some respondents to this question were asked to take part in the focus groups for the qualitative phase of the study. Disclosure of the email address did not make the survey anonymous, but results were still kept confidential through means specified by the Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Survey Administration Procedure

Once I secured Institutional Review Board approval (see Appendix A for IRB Approval Letter), I first administered the survey to five music education undergraduates to serve as a pilot

with the intent of revising the survey based on their feedback. This cohort represented diversity in class, gender, instrument/voice part, and occupational interest (e.g., elementary general music, high school band, middle school chorus, etc.). Feedback from the students resulted in slight changes in wording of questions, groupings of classes as answer options, and elimination of miscellaneous errors (e.g., misspellings, duplicated answer options).

The chairperson of the music education area then distributed the link to the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey to all students in the undergraduate music education cultural cohort three times over the course of three weeks via an email listserv that he administered. The survey was hosted online at SurveyMonkey.com. I included an informed consent form for all students to read and to which they needed to agree prior to completing the survey. In addition to the research purposes being served by the survey, I informed students that their participation in the study could assist with the improvement of pre-service music education programs. Survey data were anonymous, and I did not offer incentives for participation. I requested that the department chair re-send the link to students as a reminder once I noticed the beginning of a survey response “plateau,” as that can be one indicator that a reminder is needed.

Data Analysis

After calculating observed means, standard deviations, changes in observed means, and changes in standard deviations, I analyzed survey results for patterns and themes that helped me determine which experiences were most influential for students throughout their time in the cultural cohort. I also employed coding procedures (Saldaña, 2013) for open-ended response questions that assisted with the creation of emergent themes. Finally, I used a field note logbook/journal to write down emerging thoughts and key quotes from the open-ended response questions (Saldaña, 2013).

Qualitative Methodology

Following data collection and analysis of the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey, I created cohort groups of students from classes that were identified by undergraduate music education students as being highly “disruptive” to participate in focus group discussions. Focus group discussions (Morgan, 1997; Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990) are an appropriate data collection tool as they can elicit data from a group of people in an efficient manner and allow participants to build upon each other’s answers in an interactive fashion. They also allowed me to interact with and gather information from participants in real time with observation of nonverbal gestures and opportunities to ask follow-up questions in an effort to clarify and extend understandings (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990). As moderator, I made sure that everyone’s voices were heard, as some focus group members were somewhat reticent to speak in a group context. I also monitored my behavior so that I did not provide cues to lead participants to answers I may have thought were the most appropriate based on emerging findings (Stewart & Shamdasani, 1990, p. 17). I arranged for focus group discussions to take place on days and times that were mutually agreeable for both students and me.

I created focus cohort groups only from classes for which 80% or more of the students who had taken the class indicated that the class changed their beliefs about music and/or for which 60% of the students who had taken the class indicated that the class had changed their identities on the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey. Those classes were as follows:

MUS 125 – Women’s Chamber Ensemble

MUS 171 – Class Strings I

MUS 177 – Introduction to Music Education

MUS 210 – Songwriting

MUS 277 – Principles of Music Education

MUS 336B – Ensemble Conducting II: Choral

MUS 455 – Teaching Instrumental Music

MUS 456 – Teaching Stringed Instruments

MUS 465 – Teaching Early Childhood Music

MUS 467 – Teaching Elementary General Music

MUS 468 – Teaching Choral Music

MUS 469 – Teaching Secondary General Music

MUS 495 – Student Teaching in Music

Analysis of qualitative open-ended responses on the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey supported examination of these classes, as well as interactions between undergraduate music education students and their peers in that cultural cohort, undergraduate music education students and music education faculty, and undergraduate music education students and music education graduate students. Results of the survey also led me to examine the influences of collegiate music education associations (e.g., Collegiate National Association for Music Education, American Choral Directors Association).

Participant Selection

Following the creation of prompts for the student focus group discussions (see Appendix C), I employed maximum variation sampling (Patton, 2002) to solicit student focus group participants. I approached music education faculty members and asked for suggestions of thoughtful students from previous classes who speak articulately to the issues at hand in the focus group discussion from a wide variety of perspectives. I also asked them to suggest students who could provide disconfirming evidence from the evidence provided by the survey, as students

who volunteered to participate in the qualitative phase of the study might provide only confirmatory evidence that further support the survey's findings, leaving this study with an incomplete picture of the phenomenon. As the researcher, I also was concerned about the human cognitive bias toward confirmation (Mahoney, 1991). Therefore, I also sought disconfirming evidence that would run counter to primary themes as this would help to achieve rigor (Erickson, 1986). According to Patton (2002):

Confirmatory cases are additional examples that fit already emergent patterns; these cases confirm and elaborate the findings, adding richness, depth, and credibility. Disconfirming cases are no less important. These are the examples that don't fit. They are a source of rival interpretations as well as a way of placing boundaries around confirmed findings. They may be "exceptions that prove the rule" or exceptions that disconfirm and alter what appeared to be primary patterns. (p. 239)

All music education faculty participated in a focus group discussion and each participated in an individual interview.

Data Collection and Analysis

I formulated student cohort focus group discussion questions (see Appendix C) based on analysis of survey results with the intent of having the qualitative data informing the results of the quantitative survey and illuminate the phenomena of interest. I then convened a cohort focus group for every class within the school of music that was deemed particularly "disruptive" by survey participants, both through quantitative-based questions and qualitative-based open-response questions. I then devised faculty focus group discussion questions (see Appendix D) following data analysis of responses from students in the cohort focus group discussions and responses from the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey. Finally, I devised faculty interview questions (see Appendix E) following data analysis of responses from the faculty focus group discussion. I recorded all focus group discussions, interviews, and observations with my MacBook laptop and Yeti microphone. During the interviews, I used a field note logbook/journal

to write down emerging thoughts and key quotes from focus group/interview participants (Saldaña, 2013). I utilized a semi-structured interview format (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003; Seidman, 2006), which includes the use of formal, prepared questions, as well as open-ended questions in response to answers given to the formal questions to clarify and gather more information on a particular point that was made, for all focus group discussions and interviews.

I asked participants to member-check (Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994) their respective interviews immediately following transcription. After edits were received from participants, I read interview transcripts and logbook/journal entries multiple times to become intimately familiar with the data, jotting notes to myself in margins when appropriate. I then used In Vivo (Charmaz, 2006; Saldaña, 2013) and descriptive coding (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Saldaña, 2013) techniques to create an inventory of codes. Then, I analyzed the codes to develop within-case themes (Charmaz, 2006; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Saldaña, 2013). I also kept a separate codebook with analytic memos to assist with reflection and document the progress and process of inquiry and my interpretation of the data (Saldaña, 2013), while also taking into consideration disconfirming evidence (Creswell, 2007). Finally, overarching themes were developed from comparing, contrasting, and analyzing codes from all transcripts.

Timeline

Quantitative data collection took place from mid-September through mid-October 2015. Data analysis took place from mid-October through November 2015. I then interviewed students in focus group discussions and transcribed all focus group discussions in December 2015. The faculty focus group discussion and faculty interviews took place in January 2016. I transcribed as soon after all interviews and focus group discussions as possible. I then analyzed all qualitative

data and merged quantitative and qualitative data to create results and implications for music teacher education and suggestions for future research from February through April 2016.

Trustworthiness

I used substantive significance (Patton, 2002) to determine what in the data was meaningful. Multiple forms of data that allow for data triangulation also provided a richer data set than using one form of data by itself (Merriam, 1998; Yin, 2009). Each interview participant also member-checked his/her transcripts for accuracy (Creswell, 2007; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Miles & Huberman, 1994). Finally, I subjected my initial codes and data sources to a peer audit process with music education colleagues who are qualitative researchers and familiar with this topic to strengthen my analysis and reporting (Creswell & Miller, 2010; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1998; Patton, 2002).

Limitations

The findings of this study are not generalizable to all contexts, although the reader may use “logical situational generalizability” (Schwartz, 1996, p. 7) to transfer findings to other populations: if the reader can logically assume that participants in another population are in a situation similar to the one described in the study, it may be possible that results from this study are relevant in other contexts.

Study participation was limited to those pursuing a traditional baccalaureate degree (Bachelor of Music) in music education with influences that were examined restricted to those that occur at the undergraduate level (i.e., undergraduate methods courses, student teaching, foundations courses, etc.). Graduate level experiences (i.e., graduate classes, thesis construction, etc.) or graduate programs in education leading to teaching certification were not examined.

Participation in the online survey was strongly encouraged, but not required. Therefore,

students' perspectives that could have been illuminative to the purposes of this study may be missing.

CHAPTER IV: QUANTITATIVE RESULTS

The purpose of this chapter is to present the results of the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey, discuss its findings, and detail how it informed the direction of the qualitative phase of the study. The following research questions guided this phase of the study:

1. Which structural components of the music teacher education program (e.g., course curricula, University/College of Education/School of Music/music education program requirements, music education program sequence) assist with “disrupting” pre-service music educators’ occupational identities?
2. Which communities, interactions, and persons within the cultural cohort and the culture are the most significant “disruptive” influences on pre-service music educators’ occupational identities?

Survey Results

Following edits based on students’ suggestions from the pilot survey, the area chair for music education sent the survey link to all music education undergraduates in the School of Music ($N = 130$) via institutional email. To facilitate a better response rate, the music education area chairperson sent a follow-up email to all students in the undergraduate music education cultural cohort three times over the course of three weeks. Eighty-three students participated in the beginning of the survey, resulting in a survey response rate of 63.8%. However, only 62-65 students completed the last three open-ended questions, resulting in a survey response rate for these questions of 47.7-50%.

Demographic Data

Table 1 contains participant demographic data, including gender, race, ethnicity, and years in attendance at the institution, School of Music, and music education program.

Table 1: *Participant Demographic Data* (N = 83)¹⁰

Gender

Male	<i>n</i> = 27 (32.5%)
Female	<i>n</i> = 56 (67.5%)

Race

Caucasian	<i>n</i> = 81 (97.6%)
Caucasian/Asian	<i>n</i> = 1 (1.2%)
Latino	<i>n</i> = 1 (1.2%)

Ethnicity

American	<i>n</i> = 10 (12.1%)
Caucasian	<i>n</i> = 36 (43.4%)
Italian/English/Irish/German/Swiss/Austrian/ Dutch/Native American	<i>n</i> = 1 (1.2%)
Eastern European	<i>n</i> = 1 (1.2%)
European Mutt	<i>n</i> = 1 (1.2%)
European descent	<i>n</i> = 1 (1.2%)
Greek/Italian	<i>n</i> = 1 (1.2%)
Irish	<i>n</i> = 2 (2.4%)
Irish and Polish	<i>n</i> = 1 (1.2%)
Mexican	<i>n</i> = 1 (1.2%)

¹⁰ Participants self-identified in categories of gender, race, and ethnicity; hence the variation.

Table 1 (cont'd)

Polish/Scottish	<i>n</i> = 1 (1.2%)
Prefer not to answer	<i>n</i> = 27 (32.5%)
<hr/>	
Years in attendance	
Year in the University	
First	<i>n</i> = 14 (16.9%)
Second	<i>n</i> = 15 (18.1%)
Third	<i>n</i> = 17 (20.5%)
Fourth	<i>n</i> = 14 (16.9%)
Fifth	<i>n</i> = 19 (22.9%)
Sixth and above	<i>n</i> = 4 (4.7%)
Year in the School of Music	
First	<i>n</i> = 17 (20.5%)
Second	<i>n</i> = 20 (24.1%)
Third	<i>n</i> = 13 (15.7%)
Fourth	<i>n</i> = 18 (21.7%)
Fifth	<i>n</i> = 15 (18.0%)
Sixth and above	<i>n</i> = 0 (0.0%)
Year in the Music Education program	
First	<i>n</i> = 17 (20.5%)
Second	<i>n</i> = 20 (24.1%)
Third	<i>n</i> = 13 (15.7%)
Fourth	<i>n</i> = 18 (21.7%)

Table 1 (cont'd)

Fifth	$n = 15$ (18.0%)
Sixth and above	$n = 0$ (0.0%)
<hr/>	
Instrument Family	
Woodwinds	$n = 27$ (32.6%)
Brass	$n = 14$ (16.8%)
Percussion	$n = 6$ (7.2%)
Strings	$n = 6$ (7.2%)
Voice	$n = 25$ (30.2%)
Piano	$n = 1$ (1.2%)
Prefer not to answer	$n = 4$ (4.8%)

Membership and Involvement in Collegiate Music Education Associations

Questions 8 and 9 asked students to list their membership in collegiate music education association chapters (e.g., Collegiate National Association for Music Education, American Choral Directors Association, and American String Teachers Association) and their level of involvement in the chapters. Table 2 lists statistics for both sets of data.

Table 2: *Membership and Involvement in Collegiate Music Education Association Chapters* (N = 83)

National Association for Music Education	$n = 40$ (48.4%)
American Choral Directors Association	$n = 30$ (35.9%)
American String Teachers Association	$n = 8$ (9.38%)
None of the Above	$n = 5$ (6.4%)

Table 2 (cont'd)

No participation in organization	<i>n</i> = 11 (14.1%)
Attends meetings of organization	<i>n</i> = 16 (20.5%)
Participation in meetings and association in-service conferences	<i>n</i> = 8 (10.2%)
Executive Board member	<i>n</i> = 18 (23%)
No answer	<i>n</i> = 25 (32%)

Self-Identification

Using language modified from Isbell's (2006) survey, questions 10 and 11 assessed changes in occupational identities from matriculation into the music teacher preparation program to the present according to musician/performer and teacher identities (L'Roy, 1983; Roberts, 1990, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c, 1993, 2000, 2003) and Carper's (1970) Occupational Title:

Question 12: "*When I first started participating* in the music education program, I saw *myself* as a _____ at that point in time." (give the best rating for each label)

Question 13: "*I now see myself* as a _____." (give the best rating for each label)

Results are show in Table 3.

Table 3: *Changes in Occupational Identities (Questions 12 & 13)*

		Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Somewhat Agree (3)	Somewhat Disagree (4)	Disagree (5)	Strongly Disagree (6)
Musician	Entering	50.0% (<i>n</i> = 41)	30.5% (<i>n</i> = 25)	17.1% (<i>n</i> = 14)	1.2% (<i>n</i> = 1)	1.2% (<i>n</i> = 1)	0.0% (<i>n</i> = 0)
	Current	67.1% (<i>n</i> = 55)	24.4% (<i>n</i> = 20)	6.1% (<i>n</i> = 5)	1.2% (<i>n</i> = 1)	1.2% (<i>n</i> = 1)	0.0% (<i>n</i> = 0)

Table 3 (cont'd)

		Strongly Agree (1)	Agree (2)	Somewhat Agree (3)	Somewhat Disagree (4)	Disagree (5)	Strongly Disagree (6)
Music Educator	Entering	26.5% (n = 22)	21.7% (n = 18)	38.6% (n = 32)	7.2% (n = 6)	2.4% (n = 2)	3.6% (n = 3)
	Current	63.4% (n = 52)	26.8% (n = 22)	8.5% (n = 7)	1.2% (n = 1)	0.0% (n = 0)	0.0% (n = 0)
Educator	Entering	12.2% (n = 10)	29.3% (n = 24)	36.6% (n = 30)	13.4% (n = 11)	6.1% (n = 5)	2.4% (n = 2)
	Current	55.4% (n = 46)	36.1% (n = 30)	6.0% (n = 5)	2.4% (n = 2)	0.0% (n = 0)	0.0% (n = 0)
Director	Entering	8.5% (n = 7)	18.3% (n = 15)	24.4% (n = 20)	25.6% (n = 21)	15.9% (n = 13)	7.3% (n = 6)
	Current	18.3% (n = 15)	29.3% (n = 24)	29.3% (n = 24)	13.4% (n = 11)	8.5% (n = 7)	1.2% (n = 1)
Conductor	Entering	13.6% (n = 11)	9.9% (n = 8)	13.6% (n = 11)	21.0% (n = 17)	22.2% (n = 18)	19.8% (n = 16)
	Current	18.3% (n = 15)	29.3% (n = 24)	29.3% (n = 24)	13.4% (n = 11)	8.5% (n = 7)	1.2% (n = 1)
Performer	Entering	28.4% (n = 23)	29.6% (n = 24)	25.9% (n = 21)	6.2% (n = 5)	6.2% (n = 5)	3.7% (n = 3)
	Current	39.0% (n = 32)	25.6% (n = 21)	17.1% (n = 14)	13.4% (n = 11)	2.4% (n = 2)	2.4% (n = 2)

Table 3 (cont'd)

		Total number of respondents	Observed Mean	Change in Observed Mean	Observed Standard Deviation	Change in Observed Standard Deviation
Musician	Entering	82	1.73	-0.28	0.87	-0.10
	Current	82	1.45		0.77	
Music Educator	Entering	83	2.48	-1.00	1.23	-0.53
	Current	82	1.48		0.70	
Educator	Entering	82	2.79	-1.24	1.16	-0.44
	Current	83	1.55		0.72	
Director	Entering	82	3.44	-0.76	1.37	-0.14
	Current	82	2.68		1.23	
Conductor	Entering	81	3.88	-1.22	1.66	-0.25
	Current	82	2.66		1.41	
Performer	Entering	81	2.43	-0.21	1.32	-0.03
	Current	82	2.22		1.29	

Results suggest that, upon matriculation into the undergraduate music education program, the Musician identity category was the “strongest” identity within music education undergraduates (1.73 & 1.45, respectively), followed by the Performer identity category. However, results also suggest a change in student identities from matriculation into the music education program to the time they took the survey. The greatest change in observed mean took place in the Educator identity category (-1.24), followed closely by the Conductor identity category (-1.22). Students may have identified more as a Conductor over time due to participation in conducting classes at the junior and senior levels. Students also viewed themselves more strongly as music educators and directors since matriculation into the pre-service music teacher education program.

While the Musician and Performer identity categories had the highest and second highest mean of all identity categories upon matriculation into the music teacher education program, respectively, all other identity categories had a greater *change* in observed mean, suggesting that, for survey participants, the Musician and Performer identities did not intensify to the extent of

other categories.

Influential Classes

Questions 12 through 17 focused on interactions that take place within communities of practice—courses within the music teacher education program, as well as influential persons and social interactions situated within the culture of a School of Music. In particular, questions 12 and 15 asked students to indicate the classes that most influenced them to change their beliefs about music education and change their identities as music educators, respectively. To provide a context within which to situate results, I determined results for these questions based on dividing the number of those who stated that a class was influential by the total number of students who took the class (asked in question 18). Simply taking raw numbers and percentages would have led to misleading results, especially for courses that are inherently high in student enrollment, such as ensembles and required freshman/sophomore theory and musicology classes. Results for question 12—“Which of the following music education, School of Music, College of Education, and University classes influenced you to change your beliefs or conceptions about music education (if any)?” (check those classes that apply)—are shown in Table 4.

Table 4: *Classes that Changed Beliefs about Music Education (Question 12)*

Class	Change in beliefs or conceptions about music education - 83 respondents (number of participants citing class/number of participants who participated in the class)
MUS 177 – Introduction to Music Education	100% (57/57)
MUS 277 – Principles of Music Education	100% (49/49)
MUS 465 – Teaching Early Childhood Music	100% (19/19)
MUS 469 – Teaching Secondary General Music	100% (19/19)

Table 4 (cont'd)

Class	Change in beliefs or conceptions about music education - 83 respondents (number of participants citing class/number of participants who participated in the class)
MUS 467 – Teaching Elementary General Music	100% (16/16)
MUS 336B – Ensemble Conducting II: Choral	100% (11/11)
MUS 495 – Student Teaching	100% (10/10)
MUS 455 – Teaching Instrumental Music	100% (9/9)
MUS 468 – Teaching Choral Music	100% (8/8)
MUS 210 – Songwriting	100% (3/3)
MUS 125B - Women's Chamber Ensemble	84% (11/13)
MUS 171 – Class Strings I	83% (25/30)
MUS 456 – Teaching Stringed Instruments	80% (4/5)
MUS 125A – Women's/Men's Glee Club	75% (15/20)
MUS 335 – Ensemble Conducting I	73% (22/30)
MUS 126 – State Singers	69% (16/23)
MUS 114 – Marching Band	67% (12/18)
MUS 172 – Class Strings II	66% (20/30)
TE 496 – Becoming a School Music Teacher	66% (6/9)
MUS 117 – Concert Band	63% (19/30)
TE 302 – Learners and Learning in Context – Secondary	57% (13/23)
MUS 173 – Class Percussion I	50% (15/30)
TE 250 – Human Diversity, Power, and Opportunity in Social Institutions	44% (15/34)

Table 4 (cont'd)

Class	Change in beliefs or conceptions about music education - 83 respondents (number of participants citing class/number of participants who participated in the class)
MUS 461 – Marching Band Methods	38% (3/8)
MUS 281 – Musicianship III	32% (12/37)
MUS 280 – Musicianship II	30% (17/57)
TE 150 – Reflections on Learning	20% (11/55)

Question 13 asked survey respondents to give an example from a class that was identified in question 12. Several participants spoke to how these classes and their instructors influenced a change in their conceptions about music education:

MUS 177 showed me different types of music teaching. I had always thought there was only one way. However, there are many ways to include vernacular music into your teaching and different styles so students learn a variety of things and have at least something they enjoy available to them. (Female second-year student)

MUS 177 helped me to see the different places that people had come from and the different experiences that others have had. This allowed me to open up my view of what it could mean to teach music and how that might look. (Female third-year student)

MUS 177 made me realize all of the extra things that need to be done for students. It isn't all just waving your arms and sounds come out. Dr. Lee taught us to think deeper about the lives of our students and how our choices as educators and musicians affect them. (Male fifth-year student)

In MUS 177, I really felt like I was going “behind the scenes” of music education. As a high school student, you get to see all the teaching and the impact, but you don't really get to see all the turmoil and administrative side of teaching. Being able to learn about that and study the controversies of music education was something I had no idea that existed before taking this class. It really changed how I valued music education and what I considered a music education. Music education was no longer band and orchestra, but also general music, composition and theory classes, ukulele classes, choirs, etc. Bringing up controversial topics such as gender inequality on the podium and sexual orientation in the classroom were aspects of music education that never really seemed like part of the job until we were presented with case studies and examples. (Female second-year student)

MUS 177 made me realize that I will be teaching a TON of different kinds of students. I will maybe be teaching some special education kids and very advanced kids in the same class! I have to have more patience. (Female second-year student)

In MUS 177 and MUS 277, I have really been challenged to think about aspects of education that may have otherwise go unnoticed. I remember coming into 177 and not even realizing that I would have to deal with aspects such as special education, sexual orientation, and classroom management. When we discussed these topics, I realized that not only would I be teaching music in the classroom, but also about life lessons and how to face the real world. (Female second-year student)

I took MUS 277 the fall of my sophomore year with Dr. Matthews and it really changed how I thought about music education. This class really challenged my idea of what the PURPOSE of music education is. For instance, before this class, I thought that a program that emphasizes performance was ideal and that when defending a music program it was important to relate how music helps other content areas. However, after MUS 277 I was enlightened a lot more and my viewpoints shifted on a variety issues, including the ones I previously mentioned. (Female third-year student)

Dr. Cunningham helped shape my philosophies for teaching young children in Elementary Methods (MUS 467). I had opportunities to observe classrooms and test my skills as a young teacher. She has a wonderful personality that I want to mirror in my future classroom. She is one of the main reasons why I chose to be an elementary music educator. (Female fifth-year student)

When I entered the music education program as a freshman, I assumed that I would only enjoy teaching high school music because otherwise “real music-making” or “high-caliber music making” wouldn’t really be happening. Early Childhood and Elementary methods completely opened my eyes to how incredibly musical children can be, and to the importance of the development of the brain in relation to learning language and music. Secondary methods (MUS 469) redefined my picture of a music class to include a wide range of non-large-ensemble, non-traditional music classes. It also solidified some thoughts I’d been having about what is truly the goal of a music class in K-12 settings, those being that music is much more than black notes on a white page, and that the traditional classes that many ensemble directors are accustomed to may not be serving enough of their respective schools’ populations. (Female fourth-year student)

The biggest influence on my perception of music education has been Dr. Emerson’s Secondary General Class (MUS 469). It taught me the value of “amateur” musicianship and songwriting in school and led me to want a secondary general/composition class in my school. (Male fifth-year student)

Teaching Secondary General Music (MUS 469) made me understand that music education can be extremely valuable in ways other than the large ensemble setting. It was the first class that really got me excited to be a teacher and try new things. (Male fourth-

year student)

Dr. Westen in Secondary General Methods (MUS 469) has helped me be very aware that social justice needs to be addressed even in music classrooms, and this is something I have not really been very aware of in the past. (Male fourth-year student)

An analysis of responses to question 14 (individuals and/or groups of people who have influenced students to change their beliefs and conceptions about music education) revealed that the music education faculty was the most identified group of persons for “disrupting” students’ beliefs and conceptions of music education. However, several survey participants also recognized the influences of other types of communities—music education graduate assistants and peers—as influential in “disrupting” their beliefs and conceptions about music education:

Dr. Lee has made me believe strongly that women are an important and powerful asset to the music education community. Dr. Matthews has, thus far, often made me question my beliefs on music education and how I will perform as an educator. (Female second-year student)

Dr. Cunningham played a pivotal role in my experience with music education here. She helped me understand Music Learning Theory, which makes so much more sense to me compared to whatever my general music teacher was doing. I am enthralled with the idea of providing students with a readiness for music learning; giving them the basics to pursue and experience music in a more enriched way. Taking Dr. Cunningham’s Early Childhood and Elementary General Music classes helped my decision in pursuing a teaching position at an elementary school. Also, the best part of my week is going to the Community Music School and teaching early childhood music. It is amazing experiencing what such young children can do. (Female fifth-year student)

The most influential people in my beliefs about music education have been the faculty and my peers. Through observing my professors in class, I have been able to better develop an understanding of why music education is the way it is. I find that their philosophies and teaching techniques (whether I agree or disagree) have all contributed to my conception about music education today. In addition, interacting with my peers has also helped me develop my understanding of music education. We have all experienced vastly different musical journeys, which creates a more diverse set of opinions and ideas. (Male second-year student)

Mostly my peers are the ones that have helped me to shape my views on music education. I am around these people the most, and they all are willing to dig deep and are truly passionate about learning. Faculty is always willing to listen and assist with any questions on subject areas, but, at the end of the day, my peers are the only ones that are in the

situation that I am in and which whom I feel truly comfortable around. I think more than anyone my peers are the ones that have a desire to learn and crave digging for information and to go deeper about subjects that professors sometimes don't want to go to. In hearing all of my peers' stories of their high school programs or about an experience at a camp or job, I really truly feel like we are the ones that are fueling our own education and are looking to answer the big, fundamental music education questions. Once hearing about their experiences, I am able to be better informed about the different approaches of music education around the world and use their knowledge to formulate my philosophies and beliefs of music education. (Female second-year student)

I think my peers have definitely influenced my thoughts on music education. Just the fact that we all grew up in different music programs that have different values and experiences allowed me to realize that the way that I know and value music education is not the same as every other person. (Male third-year student)

The music education graduate students definitely have influenced me to change my beliefs about education. Their insights and their experiences really have gave me a different perspective about music and music teaching, especially thinking about schools opposite to mine and how to teach within them. (Male fourth-year student)

Results for question 15—"Which of the following music education, School of Music, College of Education, and University classes influenced you to think differently about yourself as a music educator, if at all?" (check those classes that apply)—are shown in Table 5. As with question 12, to provide a context within which to situate results, I determined results for this question based on dividing the number of those who stated that a class was influential by the total number of students who took the class.

Table 5: *Classes that Changed Identities as Music Educators (Question 15)*

Class	Change in identity as music educator - 83 respondents (number of participants citing class/number of participants who participated in the class)
MUS 467 – Teaching Elementary General Music	100% (16/16)
MUS 465 – Teaching Early Childhood Music	89% (17/19)
MUS 468 – Teaching Choral Music	88% (7/8)

Table 5 (cont'd)

Class	Change in identity as music educator - 83 respondents (number of participants citing class/number of participants who participated in the class)
MUS 125B - Women's Chamber Ensemble	84% (11/13)
MUS 469 – Teaching Secondary General Music	74% (14/19)
MUS 277 – Principles of Music Education	73% (36/49)
MUS 177 – Introduction to Music Education	67% (38/57)
MUS 455 – Teaching Instrumental Music	66% (6/9)
MUS 210 – Songwriting	66% (2/3)
MUS 336B – Ensemble Conducting II: Choral	64% (7/11)
MUS 495 – Student Teaching	60% (6/10)
MUS 171 – Class Strings I	60% (19/30)
MUS 456 – Teaching Stringed Instruments	60% (3/5)
MUS 335 – Ensemble Conducting I	53% (16/30)
MUS 172 – Class Strings II	60% (16/30)
MUS 114 – Marching Band	50% (9/18)
MUS 461 – Marching Band Methods	50% (4/8)
TE 302 – Learners and Learning in Context – Secondary	48% (11/23)
MUS 117 – Concert Band	43% (13/30)
MUS 126 – State Singers	43% (10/23)
MUS 125A – Women's/Men's Glee Club	40% (8/20)
MUS 496 – Becoming a School Music Teacher	33% (3/9)
MUS 173 – Class Percussion I	33% (12/36)
TE 250 – Human Diversity, Power, and Opportunity in Social Institutions	32% (11/34)
MUS 281 – Musicianship III	16% (6/37)
MUS 280 – Musicianship II	16% (9/57)
TE 150 – Reflections on Learning	15% (8/55)

Question 16 asked survey respondents for an example from a class that was identified in question 15. As with question 14, several participants spoke to how those classes and the

instructors who taught them influenced a change in their identities as music educators:

MUS 465 and 467 made me realize I might be a good fit for early childhood and elementary. I had never thought of these areas as my strength, but now I am very passionate about both of them! I saw myself in these roles for the first time and was excited about it. Especially elementary! (Female fifth-year student)

Dr. Lee is an amazing teacher in Women's Chamber Ensemble. Her gestures are very clear and she engages us in a lot of philosophical discussions about the music that we sing as well as the context in which it fits. She gives every little detail incredible attention-pulls even the subtlest of inflections out of the music. She talks about being a great female educator in a world dominated by stereotypes-very empowering. Dr. Lee is wonderful at saying, "this is a teachable moment" or "future educators always remember to..." I love that she is more focused on improvement than perfection-maybe that comes from leading an auditioned ensemble...I'm not sure. Still, it feels as though the focus of Women's Chamber Ensemble is more about becoming an effective communicator/sensitive musician/confident individual than it is about learning all of the notes and rhythms perfectly (though we obviously do address these concerns as they arise). I have seriously thought about my teaching methods and how I could become a more effective teacher as a result of being in this ensemble. It is one of my most powerful POSITIVE motivators to become the best teacher that I can be. Dr. Lee has helped me change the way I feel about vocal music education most specifically. (Female fifth-year student)

Women's Chamber Ensemble helps me to relate everything I see in a choral context and see ways to be a teacher/conductor that I don't get in the band world. This allows me to relate teaching techniques and ideas for teaching across disciplines. (Female third-year student)

Secondary Classroom music (MUS 469) made me think of myself as an educator more broadly. It showed me how many roles I'll have to take on as a teacher potentially and how much more opportunity and creativity there can be. (Female fourth-year student)

Both MUS 177 and 277 have made me think much more critically about not only what to teach, but what we want to value and how we want to act in the classroom. These two courses have made me think about many situations and how I would handle them as a general educator and also specific questions related to music education. These classes have made me view myself and feel much more like a music educator than I did entering college. (Female second-year student)

The most prominent example of how a class has changed my own identity of myself as a music educator would be MUS 177 where we did our first teaching at all in college and were asked to reflect on how we did and what we could do differently in the future. (Male second-year student)

MUS 336B (Choral Conducting): Previously, I had not thought a lot about conducting. I

knew that as a choral teacher, I would need to, but this class made me realize how much you can convey with your motions alone. Both MUS 456 and MUS 469 are making me feel more well rounded. I came in wanting to conduct high school band, and that was it. These classes are making me consider teaching strings or general music, and therefore I see myself more as an overall music educator rather than just an aspiring band director. (Female fourth-year student)

Student teaching has allowed me to educate myself on HOW I am a music educator (to put it shortly). I am constantly learning what I do well, what I don't do well, what I want to implement, what I don't want to implement, etc. Shaping who I am as a Music Educator in every class. (Female fifth-year student)

My string methods classes (MUS 171 & 172) help me think of myself not as a teacher but as a facilitator of learning. Students are more autonomous in their learning, discovering topics on their own. My role is to help guide them rather than instruct them. (Female first-year student)

MUS 456 (Teaching Stringed Instruments) provided me an opportunity to get in front of a middle school orchestra and conduct a rehearsal. I was able to essentially student teach for a class period and lead a group. It felt good to be in front of kids and I was thrilled that I could be successful in that environment. It showed me that I could make it in public school. (Female sixth-year student)

An analysis of responses to question 17 (individuals and/or groups of people who have influenced students to change their identities as music educators) again revealed that the music education faculty was the most often identified group of persons for "disrupting" students' beliefs and conceptions of music education. As with question 14, survey participants also identified music education graduate assistants and peers as influential in creating identity shifts within themselves:

I think those students who have been in my 177 and 277 courses, as well as those teaching these courses, have influenced me to think differently of myself as a music educator. (Female third-year student)

My interactions with my fellow students and understanding their diverse experiences with public school music programs has naturally shown me a lot of new perspective on the role of a music educator. (Male first-year student)

Experiences with my peers definitely got me thinking about what kind of music educator I want to be. In fact, they are more influential than many of the professors here. The discussions that we as students had/have outside of the classroom are just as influential as

the discussions in the classroom. (Male fifth-year student)

My daily interactions with my peers in the School of Music have shaped some of my ideas for what I think of myself as an educator. I truly believe that the community of students in the music education degree program here are all brilliant, talented people. I enjoy hearing so many variations in what “good teaching” is, and I enjoy being able to engage in discussions with those people and talk about a lot of issues that would be hard to discuss if the community wasn’t as open-minded as my peers at this school are. (Female second-year student)

The social circle I have here is amazing. My friends who also want to be music teachers have made me so very appreciative, knowing that we have made incredible, unique, lifelong friendships in and outside of music and that we will always be a phone call away. The conversations we have together when we're just hanging out are so frequently about music teaching. This is a unique support system that has helped me shape into a music teacher. Our influence on each other is great! (Female fifth-year student)

The faculty and my peers have challenged me to think of myself differently as a music educator. When I entered school, I believed that band was the only way to teach others about music. Since then, the interactions I’ve had with students like me have broken and rebuilt my concept. As I imagine myself as a music educator, I am able to see that it is a compilation of all of the things around me that have influenced me. (Male second-year student)

I think mostly the music education faculty and grad students have really helped me to think of myself as more of a music educator than anybody else. I can discuss with my peers about how “one day when I’m a teacher” all I want, but when faculty and grad students share their experiences and reality of the situation, it makes me think about how one day I could attempt to be in their shoes. Also, hearing about their experiences and getting their advice on different concepts and scenarios is really helpful and enlightening. (Female second-year student)

Dr. Matthews often makes me question whether or not I would be a good music educator. I feel as though I need to consider my beliefs thoroughly due to his influence. (Female third-year student)

Dr. Matthews makes me think about what it means to be a music educator and Dr. Lee makes me feel like I belong no matter where I am. (Female second-year student)

Well, the professors have influenced the way I think about music education have also deeply impacted how I feel about myself as a music educator. Also, Jean Fox, a recent graduate student and assistant, helped me crack open the “human” part of what was holding me back as a musician and as an effective educator. Because I had the opportunity to work with her, I am now able to look past myself and see that the needs of my students are far more important than the insecurities I have about myself. (Female third-year student)

The grad assistants that I am surrounded with have really inspired me and I have loved watching and learning from them. I am learning so much just by observation and I think, “Oh, I want to do that someday,” or “I think I would rather do this differently.” (Female first-year student)

Other Experiences

Question 19 asked respondents to describe experiences, if any, within the School of Music or the University, besides classes and persons, who “disrupted” students’ beliefs and conceptions of music education and their identities as music educators. Several students identified their involvement in collegiate music education organizations (e.g., American Choral Directors Association, Collegiate National Association for Music Education, American String Teachers Association), initiatives sponsored by those organizations, and in-service music teacher conferences as being “disruptive”:

Being a voluntary conductor in Reeds Landing Sings, a nursing home choir started through ACDA, was really influential for me with becoming an educator. This was my first leadership experience.

Working with the Reeds Landing Sings program and actually conducting for the first time has changed a lot of things. It's a lot harder to practice what you preach.

Participation in ACDA and attendance of the ACDA Regional and National conferences has influenced me. Getting to immerse myself in a music education environment and hear so many different ideas is always very exciting.

The student clubs and organizations have a very large impact on how I view myself. Also, the different programs are very beneficial as well. I think Running Start (the School of Music’s entrepreneurial and career services program) is a great resource and helps students learn how to market themselves and build professional networks. I am also a member of ACDA, which has info sessions that give you the opportunity to hear another professional's experiences and advice.

Being a member of NafME and having the opportunity to attend conferences, such as the state music teachers conference and NafME National, has helped me discover what teachers in the field right now are doing, and gave me ideas for how to progress and develop music education further.

Others identified their participation in off-campus events not affiliated with the

University or the School of Music:

I am just now starting my third year as the director of Rockford Congregational's Youth Choir. The kids have caused me to grow an insane amount as a music educator as many of them come from abnormal social and mental backgrounds.

My private students continue to inspire me and help me develop as a music educator. Also, teaching Suzuki group classes has really helped me develop as a music educator and think of myself differently because I had never done group classes before becoming a Suzuki teacher. I love both of these experiences and I treasure my students. They inspire me to be a better educator and performer.

Attending conferences, working as an Ensemble Manager at a music camp upstate, and attending clinics, specifically Bass Fest and Bass Bash, have helped me to grow. I feel like a representative of the University when I attend these events and like to share and learn about how others approach music education. It also has helped me learn different pedagogical strategies, especially in terms of the bass. Also, attending recitals, rehearsals, and performances of all kinds at the University has exposed me to other ways of learning and performing.

Two students specifically noted the Music Education "Rally," an event held once a year in early September. Attendance is mandatory for all music education majors. The "Rally" was started over twenty years ago by the then-department chairperson, Dr. Emerson, as a way to increase camaraderie and a sense of community among the undergraduate music education students. Events at the "Rally" include the opportunity to join the School of Music's collegiate music education organizations, recognizing scholarship recipients and recent student teachers' successful employment, and listening to an inspirational speech by an outstanding in-service educator or faculty member. One student said that, "The Music Education Rally this year made me think about music education differently. Marcia Holcomb was the guest speaker and the things she said still stick with me."

Past and Present Interest in Occupational Types of Music Teaching

Questions 20 and 21 asked respondents to rate their past and current interest in various occupational types of music teaching (e.g., early childhood music educator, high school

performance-based ensemble teacher, etc.):

Question 20: “To what extent were you interested in each of the following kinds of music teaching when you *first* entered the music education degree program?”

Question 21: “To what extent are you *currently* interested in pursuing the following kinds of music teaching?”

Results are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: *Past and Present Interest in Occupational Types of Music Teaching (Questions 20 & 21)*

		Very Interested (1)	Interested (2)	Somewhat Interested (3)	Somewhat Uninterested (4)	Uninterested (5)	Very Uninterested (6)
Early Childhood Music Teacher	Entering	3.08% (n = 2)	3.08% (n = 2)	23.08% (n = 15)	21.54% (n = 14)	18.46% (n = 12)	30.77% (n = 20)
	Current	26.98% (n = 17)	19.05% (n = 12)	19.05% (n = 12)	12.70% (n = 8)	11.11% (n = 7)	11.11% (n = 7)
Elementary General Music Teacher	Entering	9.23% (n = 6)	7.69% (n = 5)	16.92% (n = 11)	24.62% (n = 16)	18.46% (n = 12)	23.08% (n = 15)
	Current	29.69% (n = 19)	17.19% (n = 11)	21.88% (n = 14)	14.06% (n = 9)	9.38% (n = 6)	7.81% (n = 5)
Elementary traditional ensemble teacher	Entering	6.15% (n = 5)	7.69% (n = 5)	13.85% (n = 9)	23.08% (n = 15)	30.77% (n = 20)	18.46% (n = 12)
	Current	17.46% (n = 11)	20.63% (n = 13)	25.40% (n = 16)	17.46% (n = 11)	12.70% (n = 8)	6.35% (n = 4)
Middle school traditional ensemble teacher	Entering	12.31% (n = 8)	20% (n = 13)	26.15% (n = 17)	16.92% (n = 11)	12.31% (n = 8)	12.31% (n = 8)
	Current	32.81% (n = 21)	23.44% (n = 15)	20.31% (n = 13)	14.06% (n = 9)	6.25% (n = 4)	3.13% (n = 2)

Table 6 (cont'd)

		Very Interested (1)	Interested (2)	Somewhat Interested (3)	Somewhat Uninterested (4)	Uninterested (5)	Very Uninterested (6)
Middle school general music teacher ¹¹	Entering	3.08% (n = 2)	9.23% (n = 6)	16.92% (n = 11)	27.69% (n = 18)	18.46% (n = 12)	24.62% (n = 16)
	Current	21.88% (n = 14)	26.56% (n = 17)	25% (n = 16)	14.06% (n = 9)	9.38% (n = 6)	3.13% (n = 2)
High school traditional ensemble teacher	Entering	73.85% (n = 48)	15.38% (n = 10)	4.62% (n = 3)	3.08% (n = 2)	1.54% (n = 1)	1.54% (n = 1)
	Current	56.25% (n = 36)	23.44% (n = 15)	10.94% (n = 7)	4.69% (n = 3)	3.13% (n = 2)	1.56% (n = 1)
High school general music teacher ¹²	Entering	15.38% (n = 10)	24.62% (n = 16)	21.54% (n = 14)	10.77% (n = 7)	20% (n = 13)	7.69% (n = 5)
	Current	32.81% (n = 21)	39.06% (n = 25)	18.75% (n = 12)	4.69% (n = 3)	4.69% (n = 3)	0% (n = 0)
College ensemble conductor	Entering	15.38% (n = 10)	24.62% (n = 16)	16.92% (n = 11)	13.85% (n = 9)	12.31% (n = 8)	16.92% (n = 11)
	Current	28.13% (n = 18)	28.13% (n = 18)	10.94% (n = 7)	6.25% (n = 4)	9.38% (n = 6)	17.19% (n = 11)
Collegiate music education professor	Entering	9.23% (n = 6)	13.85% (n = 9)	21.54% (n = 14)	21.54% (n = 14)	12.31% (n = 8)	21.54% (n = 14)
	Current	28.13% (n = 18)	26.56% (n = 17)	20.31% (n = 13)	9.38% (n = 6)	1.56% (n = 1)	14.06% (n = 9)

¹¹ e.g., music technology, songwriting, music theory, popular music class, etc.

¹² Ibid.

Table 6 (cont'd)

		Very Interested (1)	Interested (2)	Somewhat Interested (3)	Somewhat Uninterested (4)	Uninterested (5)	Very Uninterested (6)
University studio teacher	Entering	4.62% (n = 3)	12.31% (n = 8)	7.69% (n = 5)	20% (n = 13)	20% (n = 13)	35.38% (n = 23)
	Current	14.06% (n = 9)	17.19% (n = 11)	12.50% (n = 8)	15.63% (n = 10)	9.38% (n = 6)	31.25% (n = 20)

		Total number of respondents	Observed Mean	Change in Observed Mean	Observed Standard Deviation	Change in Observed Standard Deviation
Early Childhood Music Teacher	Entering	65	4.42	-1.47	1.37	0.31
	Current	63	2.95		1.68	
Elementary General Music Teacher	Entering	65	4.05	-1.25	1.55	0.04
	Current	64	2.80		1.59	
Elementary ensemble teacher	Entering	65	4.20	-1.14	1.42	0.05
	Current	63	3.06		1.47	
Middle school ensemble teacher	Entering	65	3.34	-0.87	1.53	-0.14
	Current	63	2.47		1.39	
Middle school general music teacher	Entering	65	4.23	-1.51	1.39	-0.03
	Current	63	2.72		1.36	
High school ensemble teacher	Entering	65	1.48	0.32	1.01	0.15
	Current	63	1.80		1.16	

Table 6 (cont'd)

		Total number of respondents	Observed Mean	Change in Observed Mean	Observed Standard Deviation	Change in Observed Standard Deviation
High school general music teacher	Current	65	3.18	-1.09	1.56	-0.5
	Entering	63	2.09		1.06	
Collegiate ensemble conductor	Current	65	3.34	-0.42	1.70	0.14
	Entering	63	2.92		1.84	
Collegiate music education professor	Current	65	3.78	-1.06	1.59	0.06
	Entering	63	2.72		1.65	
University studio teacher	Current	65	4.45	-0.62	1.55	0.29
	Entering	63	3.83		1.84	

Results suggest a change of interest in occupational types of music teaching from matriculation into the music education program to the time they took the survey. While the High School performance-based ensemble teacher category's observed mean scores for both questions were consistently the strongest within music education undergraduates (1.48 & 1.80, respectively), the change in observed mean (0.32) indicates a slight decrease in interest in teaching music through that medium. Additionally, this is the only category that exhibited an *increase* in the change of observed mean, suggesting that students became slightly less interested in this type of music teaching and that their interest in other occupational types of music teaching became more pronounced during their time in residence. The most prominent changes in interest of occupational types of music teaching were in the middle school general music category (-1.51), followed by early childhood music teacher (-1.47) and elementary general music teacher (-1.25).

Past and Present Interest in Means of Music Teaching

Subsequently, questions 22 and 23 asked respondents to rate their past and current interest in different means of teaching music: both traditional means of music teaching (i.e., performance-based ensembles, teaching elementary general music, etc.) and emerging modalities of music teaching (i.e., music technology, popular music, etc.):

Question 24: “To what extent were you interested in each of the following when you *first* entered the music education degree program?”

Question 25: “To what extent are you *currently* interested in the following?”

Results are shown in Table 7.

Table 7

Past and Present Interest in Means of Music Teaching (Questions 22 & 23)

		Very Interested (1)	Interested (2)	Somewhat Interested (3)	Somewhat Uninterested (4)	Uninterested (5)	Very Uninterested (6)
Teaching musical concepts using technology ¹³	Entering	4.62% (n = 3)	9.23% (n = 6)	18.46% (n = 12)	30.77% (n = 20)	27.69% (n = 18)	9.23% (n = 6)
	Current	26.56% (n = 17)	26.56% (n = 17)	15.63% (n = 10)	23.44% (n = 15)	4.69% (n = 3)	3.13% (n = 2)
Teaching musical concepts using popular music	Entering	9.38% (n = 6)	20.31% (n = 13)	32.81% (n = 21)	20.31% (n = 13)	10.94% (n = 7)	6.25% (n = 4)
	Current	43.75% (n = 28)	17.19% (n = 11)	31.25% (n = 20)	7.81% (n = 5)	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)
Teaching early childhood music	Entering	3.08% (n = 2)	15.38% (n = 10)	21.54% (n = 14)	16.92% (n = 11)	23.08% (n = 15)	20% (n = 13)
	Current	29.69% (n = 19)	21.88% (n = 14)	17.19% (n = 11)	12.50% (n = 8)	9.38% (n = 8)	9.38% (n = 6)

¹³ i.e., GarageBand, music production tools, tablet/smartphone applications, etc.

Table 7 (cont'd)

		Very Interested (1)	Interested (2)	Somewhat Interested (3)	Somewhat Uninterested (4)	Uninterested (5)	Very Uninterested (6)
Teaching early childhood music	Entering	3.08% (n = 2)	15.38% (n = 10)	21.54% (n = 14)	16.92% (n = 11)	23.08% (n = 15)	20% (n = 13)
	Current	29.69% (n = 19)	21.88% (n = 14)	17.19% (n = 11)	12.50% (n = 8)	9.38% (n = 8)	9.38% (n = 6)
Teaching composition	Entering	0% (n = 0)	9.68% (n = 6)	20.97% (n = 13)	17.74% (n = 11)	30.65% (n = 19)	20.97% (n = 13)
	Current	17.19% (n = 11)	23.44% (n = 15)	21.88% (n = 14)	12.50% (n = 8)	12.50% (n = 8)	12.50% (n = 8)
Teaching elementary general music	Entering	6.25% (n = 4)	15.63% (n = 10)	14.06% (n = 9)	26.56% (n = 17)	21.88% (n = 14)	15.63% (n = 10)
	Current	32.81% (n = 21)	17.19% (n = 11)	26.56% (n = 17)	7.81% (n = 5)	10.94% (n = 7)	4.69% (n = 3)
Teaching secondary ¹⁴ general music	Entering	10.77% (n = 7)	23.08% (n = 15)	32.31% (n = 21)	13.85% (n = 9)	12.31% (n = 8)	7.69% (n = 5)
	Current	51.56% (n = 33)	23.44% (n = 15)	9.38% (n = 6)	9.38% (n = 6)	3.13% (n = 2)	3.13% (n = 2)
Teaching arranging	Entering	0% (n = 0)	16.92% (n = 11)	23.08% (n = 15)	18.46% (n = 12)	21.54% (n = 14)	20% (n = 13)
	Current	25% (n = 16)	18.75% (n = 12)	14.06% (n = 9)	26.56% (n = 17)	9.38% (n = 6)	6.25% (n = 4)
Teaching & conducting a traditional ensemble(s) ¹⁵	Entering	73.85% (n = 48)	18.46% (n = 12)	1.54% (n = 1)	1.54% (n = 1)	3.08% (n = 2)	1.54% (n = 1)
	Current	76.59% (n = 49)	17.19% (n = 11)	1.56% (n = 1)	4.69% (n = 3)	0% (n = 0)	0% (n = 0)

¹⁴ Middle and/or High School¹⁵ Band, Chorus, Orchestra

Table 7 (cont'd)

		Very Interested (1)	Interested (2)	Somewhat Interested (3)	Somewhat Uninterested (4)	Uninterested (5)	Very Uninterested (6)
Teaching & conducting a non-traditional ensemble(s) ¹⁶	Entering	6.15% (n = 4)	23.08% (n = 15)	24.62% (n = 16)	18.46% (n = 12)	13.85% (n = 9)	13.85% (n = 9)
	Current	34.92% (n = 22)	34.92% (n = 22)	17.46% (n = 11)	7.94% (n = 5)	4.76% (n = 3)	0% (n = 0)
Teaching & conducting a collegiate ensemble(s)	Entering	20% (n = 13)	21.54% (n = 14)	23.08% (n = 15)	13.85% (n = 9)	9.23% (n = 6)	12.31% (n = 8)
	Current	26.56% (n = 17)	28.13% (n = 18)	15.63% (n = 10)	9.38% (n = 6)	9.38% (n = 6)	10.94% (n = 7)
Teaching improvisation	Entering	3.13% (n = 2)	12.50% (n = 8)	17.19% (n = 11)	21.88% (n = 14)	20.31% (n = 13)	25% (n = 16)
	Current	26.98% (n = 17)	22.22% (n = 14)	14.29% (n = 9)	22.22% (n = 14)	12.70% (n = 8)	1.59% (n = 1)
Teaching collegiate applied lessons	Entering	7.69% (n = 5)	13.85% (n = 9)	12.31% (n = 8)	23.08% (n = 15)	20% (n = 13)	23.08% (n = 15)
	Current	14.06% (n = 9)	23.44% (n = 15)	7.81% (n = 5)	21.88% (n = 14)	9.38% (n = 6)	23.44% (n = 15)
Teaching music education at the college level	Entering	10.77% (n = 7)	12.31% (n = 8)	20% (n = 13)	26.15% (n = 17)	16.92% (n = 11)	13.85% (n = 9)
	Current	34.38% (n = 22)	21.88% (n = 14)	20.31% (n = 13)	4.69% (n = 3)	6.25% (n = 4)	12.50% (n = 8)

		Total number of respondents	Observed Mean	Change in Observed Mean	Observed Standard Deviation	Change in Observed Standard Deviation
Teaching musical concepts using technology	Entering	65	3.95	-1.32	1.27	0.11

¹⁶ e.g., steel pan ensemble, mariachi ensemble, iPad ensemble

Table 7 (cont'd)

		Total number of respondents	Observed Mean	Change in Observed Mean	Observed Standard Deviation	Change in Observed Standard Deviation
Teaching musical concepts using technology	Current	64	2.63		1.38	
Teaching musical concepts using popular music	Entering	64	3.22	-1.19	1.32	-0.29
	Current	64	2.03		1.03	
Teaching early childhood music	Entering	65	4.02	-1.24	1.46	0.18
	Current	64	2.78		1.64	
Teaching composition	Entering	62	4.32	-1.15	1.28	0.35
	Current	64	3.17		1.63	
Teaching elementary general music	Entering	64	3.89	-1.28	1.47	0.04
	Current	64	2.61		1.51	
Teaching secondary general music	Entering	65	3.17	-1.19	1.40	-0.07
	Current	64	1.98		1.33	
Teaching arranging	Entering	65	4.05	-1.10	1.39	0.16
	Current	64	2.95		1.55	
Teaching & conducting a traditional ensemble(s)	Entering	65	1.46	-0.12	1.02	-0.29
	Current	64	1.34		0.73	
Teaching & conducting a non-traditional ensemble(s)	Entering	65	3.52	-1.39	1.48	-0.36
	Current	63	2.13		1.12	
Teaching & conducting a collegiate ensemble(s)	Entering	65	3.08	-0.28	1.62	0.04
	Current	64	2.80		1.66	
Teaching improvisation	Entering	64	4.19	-1.43	1.46	0
	Current	63	2.76		1.46	

Table 7 (cont'd)

		Total number of respondents	Observed Mean	Change in Observed Mean	Observed Standard Deviation	Change in Observed Standard Deviation
Teaching collegiate applied lessons	Entering	65	4.03	-0.44	1.58	0.19
	Current	64	3.59		1.77	
Teaching music education at the college level	Entering	65	3.68	-1.04	1.51	0.19
	Current	64	2.64		1.70	

Consistent with results from previous questions, findings suggest a change in students' interest in means of music teaching from matriculation into the music education program to the time they took the survey. The Teaching & Conducting a Traditional Ensemble category's observed mean scores for both questions were consistently the strongest within survey respondents (1.46 & 1.34, respectively), suggesting that those students are still very interested in teaching music through the performance-based ensemble. However, the change in observed mean (-0.12) is the smallest change in observed mean in all categories, meaning that students' interest in teaching music through a traditional performance-based ensemble did not intensify to the extent of other types of music teaching, particularly improvisation, teaching and conducting a non-traditional ensemble, teaching musical concepts using technology, and elementary general music (change in observed mean is -1.43, -1.39, -1.32, and -1.28, respectively).

Interpretation

Not all results from the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey can be interpreted and compared through the lens of prior research due to the unique context of the setting that is being studied and the lack of disseminated research for constructs that some of the survey questions address. However, several findings regarding pre-service music educator identity can be compared to findings from previous research.

Survey results demonstrated that the musician identity category was the “strongest” identity within music education undergraduates, which is consistent with findings that suggest that pre-service music educators are socialized as musicians during K-12 schooling (Cox, 1997; Frink, 1997; L’Roy, 1983; Roberts, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c), with that identity deepening due to additional time within the performance-centric School of Music (Aróstegui, 2004; Kingsbury, 1984, 1988; Nettl, 1995). Additionally, the Performer identity was the second “strongest” identity category for respondents upon matriculation into the undergraduate music education program, which is consistent with what researchers have found (Aróstegui, 2004; Bernard, 2005; Beynon, 1998; Bouij, 1998, 2004; Froehlich & L’Roy, 1985; L’Roy, 1985; Mark, 1998; Pellegrino, 2009; Roberts, 1991c; Scheib, 2006; Woodford, 2002). These findings suggest that students strongly identify both as “musicians” and “performers” upon entry into the music teacher education program, demonstrating the influence of performance-based ensemble experiences and high school directors during the primary socialization experience, with particular emphasis on students’ secondary school years (Bergee, 1992; Bergee et al., 2001; Cox, 1997; Fredrickson & Williams, 2009; Hellman, 2008; Jones & Parkes, 2010; Kelly, 2010; Madsen & Kelly, 2002; Rickels et al., 2010; Schonauer, 2002; Thornton & Bergee, 2008). Also, survey respondents’ strong interest in teaching high school performance-based ensembles is consistent with findings of several researchers (Bergee et al., 2001; Fredrickson & Williams, 2009; Hellman, 2008).

Students also noted that peer interactions within and outside of classes, as well as participation in various collegiate music education association (e.g., ACDA and NAFME) were “disruptive” influences on their occupational identities, supporting several researchers’ findings that the socialization and peer interactions that take place within communities of practice can

influence students' college development (Chickering, 1974) and identity development (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999; Conkling, 2003; Haston & Russell, 2012; Isbell, 2008; Wenger, 1998).

Some results contradict previous research findings. Cox (1997) believed that pre-service students could not begin to develop a teacher identity until they had started to teach on a regular basis as a professional. Additionally, Roberts (1991b) found that pre-service educators lacked any sense of teacher identity. Results from the present survey revealed that students' identities as educators and music educators did indeed develop during the music teacher education program, which is grounded in discussion-based learning, observations, peer teachings, and microteachings in public school settings. These findings suggest that educator and music educator identities can be developed in a pre-service music teacher education program and that identity formation and development does not necessarily require employment as a music teacher.

Moving Forward: Implications of Quantitative Results for Qualitative Procedures

Survey results suggest that multiple influences within the School of Music helped to “disrupt” students' occupational identities, career trajectories, and preconceptions of music education. Findings from questions 12 through 17 support the notion that the following classes were particularly “disruptive” for students' occupational identities and changed their preconceptions of music education, thus meriting additional investigation¹⁷:

MUS 125B – Women's Chamber Ensemble

MUS 171 – Class Strings I

MUS 177 – Introduction to Music Education

¹⁷ I created focus cohort groups only from classes for which 80% or more of the students who had taken the class indicated that the class changed their beliefs about music and/or for which 60% of the students who had taken the class indicated that the class had changed their identities on the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey.

MUS 210 – Songwriting

MUS 277 – Principles of Music Education

MUS 336B – Ensemble Conducting II: Choral

MUS 455 – Teaching Instrumental Music

MUS 456 – Teaching Stringed Instruments

MUS 465 – Teaching Early Childhood Music

MUS 467 – Teaching Elementary General Music

MUS 468 – Teaching Choral Music

MUS 469 – Teaching Secondary General Music

MUS 495 – Student Teaching

Findings from these questions also suggested that the following individuals were particularly “disruptive” influences on students’ occupational identities and preconceptions of music education:

Music Education peers

Music Education faculty

Music Education graduate assistants

Collegiate Music Education Organizations: NAFME, ACDA, ASTA

University-sponsored events and organizations, such as the Music Education “Rally” and collegiate music education organizations, and non-university-sponsored activities, such as teaching private lessons and church choirs also were cited by several participants as being influential towards “disrupting” students’ occupational identities and preconceptions of music education.

Student Cohort Focus Groups Questions

The next phase of the study included the creation of student cohort focus groups of the above classes, as well as individual interviews with music education faculty, to inform the results of the survey, illuminate the phenomenon of interest, and answer the research questions of the qualitative portion of this study:

1. How do structural components of the music teacher education program (e.g., course curricula, university/school of education/School of Music/music education program requirements, music education program sequence) assist with “disrupting” pre-service music educators’ occupational identities?
2. Why are certain communities, interactions, and persons within the cultural cohort and the culture the most significant “disruptive” influences on pre-service music educators’ occupational identities? How are those “disruptions” created?
3. How do these “disruptions” manifest themselves in pre-service music educators’ occupational identities? How do these “disruptions” manifest themselves in pre-service music educators’ conceptions of and beliefs and attitudes about music education?

In an explanatory sequential study (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011), the data gleaned from the quantitative-based survey drive the qualitative research part of the study, which, in turn, informs the quantitative results (Morgan, 1998). To this end, I formulated student cohort focus group discussion questions (see Appendix C) based on analysis of survey results with the intent of having the qualitative data informing the results of the quantitative survey and illuminate the phenomena of interest. I conducted all focus group discussions and interviews using a semi-structured interview approach (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003), which includes the use of formal,

prepared questions as well as open-ended questions in response to answers given to the formal questions.

Questions one through three are broad, open-ended questions that were constructed to assist me with understanding how students self-identified and what their conceptions of music education were before they matriculated in the School of Music and before they took the class that the focus group addressed. Results from the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey indicated change in students' occupational identity between matriculation and administration of the survey. Therefore, I sought to understand how students were self-identifying and what their conceptions of music education were prior to matriculation and participation in a class to comprehend the magnitude of their transformation in occupational identity and changes in preconceptions of music education. I also sought to understand the origins of these phenomena to compare and contrast with previously published research and determine if any variances existed to what researchers had found.

I convened a cohort focus group for every class within the School of Music that was deemed particularly “disruptive” by survey participants, both through quantitative-based questions and qualitative-based open-response questions. I asked focus group participants directly through question 4 for their reasons why the class may or may not have been a “disruptive” influence for them. I made sure to include the possibility of “non-disruption” for some students, as I sought disconfirming evidence that would run counter to primary themes to assist with efforts to achieve rigor (Erickson, 1986). I then used question 5 to elicit specific information that would allow me to understand types of mechanisms that allowed the “disruption” within and outside of the class to occur and how the mechanisms functioned to provide a “disruptive” experience. I provided several examples in the question, including class units,

teacher/peer actions, and readings, to facilitate this discussion. These activities could have proven to be “critical incidents,” defined by Schutz et al. (2001) as “a self-environmental transaction that results in changes in the direction of a person’s life” (p. 305) that affected, and continue to affect, their occupational identities and career paths. The nature of the focus group discussion allowed students to build upon each other’s responses, creating a rich dialogue full of detail that would not have been possible to create through an individual online survey.

The Pre-Service Music Educator Survey revealed that faculty, peers, and graduate student assistants were “disruptive” influences on students’ occupational identities and conceptions of music education. Thus, I created question 6 to extract information as to why these populations are particularly “disruptive.” Finally, responses to question 7 assisted me with understanding if there are any other influences throughout the School of Music that may be perceived by pre-service educators as being particularly “disruptive” beyond those noted on the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey.

Faculty Focus Group Questions

I then devised faculty focus group discussion questions (see Appendix D) following data analysis of responses from students in the cohort focus group discussions and responses from the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey. Based on my conversations with students in the focus group discussions and the reoccurrences of themes that emerged throughout the discussions, for question 1, I wished to determine if the music education faculty held a unified philosophy of music teacher education and its underpinnings and, if so, how the philosophy was developed. Along with a possible development in program philosophy, I created question 2 to determine if the program was restructured in any way and, if so, why and how.

Several student teachers participated in different focus group discussions. That cohort, in

particular, spoke passionately about their transformation in occupational identity from the perspective of their daily interactions with K-12 students and “distance” from the music teacher education program. Therefore, the purpose of question 3, and its related subquestions, was to help me understand the music education faculty’s perceptions of their student teacher population and how they perceive some students’ occupational identities to be transformed during their time in the undergraduate music education program. I also made sure to ask for the possibility of other influences on students’ occupational identities in order to provide the opportunity to find disconfirming evidence (Erickson, 1986).

Almost every focus group discussion included references to MUS 177 (Introduction to Music Education) and MUS 277 (Principles of Music Education) as influential in their transformations of occupational identity and conceptions of music education. Several students stated that one or both courses were highly influential in their development as pre-service music educators. Question 4 provided me the opportunity to elicit more information on these two courses, including purpose of the courses, course content, and methods of teaching content. Similarly, focus group participants found that observations, peer teachings, and microteachings at the local community music school and area public schools were particularly “disruptive” experiences. I constructed question 5 to gain more insight into the music education faculty’s philosophy on observations and microteachings for music education classes, including benefits of these activities for students, structure and sequence for these activities throughout the course of the program, and benefits and possible pitfalls of these experiences.

Several student focus group discussions included articulations of the perception of a caring faculty as part of a larger “music education community.” I sought via Question 6 to determine if this was intentional on the part of the faculty and, if so, what purpose it served and

if they believed that it influenced students' occupational identities. Conversely, some focus group participants voiced frustrations with certain aspects of the music teacher education program, including sequence of courses, topics within courses, and lack of microteachings early in the degree program, and how those aspects may have negatively impacted the ongoing construction of their occupational identity. I constructed question 7 to allow faculty to provide their own perceptions of both the strengths and weaknesses of the music teacher education program in regards to occupational identity development. Finally, I created question 8 to allow faculty to provide any other information that they felt might be pertinent for this study.

Individual Faculty Interview Questions

I then undertook another series of data analysis and created individual faculty interview questions (see Appendix E) that were based on data derived from the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey and the student and faculty focus group discussions. I created questions that were addressed specifically towards the classes that each faculty member taught and other topics associated with the faculty member.

I requested that all faculty members provide the purpose and premise of their respective courses and how they contribute to a music education student's course of study within their time in the School of Music. I also requested a broad overview of the course to provide a context within which to situate the phenomena of interest and students' comments from the focus group discussions and the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey. Additionally, I asked faculty directly for their perceptions of why students stated that their class(es) were particularly "disruptive" for their occupational identities and conceptions of music education and allow them to list specific components of their classes that could be deemed "disruptive." For faculty whose classes include observation and microteaching components, I asked for their thoughts on how these activities can

act as “disruptive” influences. Finally, I encouraged faculty to state the goals of their respective classes and anything else that they deem is important for the present study. These questions constitute the extent of Dr. Emerson’s (instructor of record for Songwriting and Teaching Secondary General Music) and Dr. Woolfolk’s (instructor of record for Class String I and Teaching Stringed Instruments) interviews, but additional themes arose from some focus group discussions that had potential implications for the phenomenon of interest for this study. Therefore, I created additional questions for certain faculty.

Dr. Lee is the instructor of record for MUS 177 (Introduction to Music Education), MUS 468 (Teaching Choral Music), and Women’s Chamber Ensemble. Her ensemble students spoke passionately of her as a model of effective teaching within the performance-based ensemble context, often using the term “conductor-teacher” to describe the work of ensemble conductors. Dr. Lee’s students also credited her as being a model for how women can navigate higher education spaces. During rehearsal or class, she would sometimes share with them the challenges that women, including her, often face in the academy. These discussions were quite emotional and empowering for some focus group participants, crediting these experiences as being quite influential for their occupational identities and conceptions of music education. Also, students spoke about the themes of authenticity, confidence, and vulnerability that Dr. Lee constantly references in her classes, particularly in MUS 468 and Women’s Chamber Ensemble, the influence those themes had on how they envision themselves as educators working with children, and the notion of having her classes be “safe spaces” to discuss potentially controversial topics in the classroom, such as religion, sexual orientation, and race in music education.

Dr. Matthews is the instructor of record for MUS 277 (Principles of Music Education) and is the coordinator of student teachers for the music education department. In this capacity, he

leads the student teaching seminar which occurs once weekly for up to one and a half hours. Students for both of these classes spoke of Dr. Matthews' teaching methods, such as his use of a discussion-based class context, class units that include philosophical and sociological topics, and providing opposing viewpoints to students' opinions to force them to think more critically about their stances, as creating "disruptive" moments for them. Therefore, I wanted to hear directly from Dr. Matthews regarding his teaching techniques, why he employs them, and his perception of how his teaching practices and the class structure facilitate "disruptive" experiences for students. I also sought to understand how and why student teachers are placed with cooperating teachers, as the student teaching experience can influence pre-service music educators' occupational identities and conceptions of music education.

As with Dr. Lee, Dr. Sterling (instructor of record for MUS 336B: Choral Conducting) speaks throughout his class about the importance of teacher confidence, authenticity, and vulnerability, and the impact these conversations have on their occupational identity. In addition to asking him for his perceptions on this topic, I also asked Dr. Sterling why students thought his class was a particularly "disruptive" force for having students rethink their perceptions of choral conducting and teaching a choir, as several students in the focus group discussion noted that their conceptions of teaching choir was vastly different after taking his class. Finally, I elicited Dr. Sterling's perceptions on why students attributed several "disruptive" episodes to his engagement with K-12 teachers and students and how those experiences inform what and how he teaches in MUS 336B.

Dr. Cunningham is the instructor of record for MUS 465 (Teaching Early Childhood Music) and MUS 467 (Teaching Elementary General Music). I included a question regarding perceptions of students' experiences with peer teaching/observations/microteachings, as focus

group participants noted that peer teaching activities during class, as well as observing, assisting with, and teaching early childhood and elementary classes in the local community music school and area public schools were quite influential in “disrupting” students’ occupational identities and conceptions of teaching music to young children.

**CHAPTER V: “HELPING STUDENTS FIND THEIR VOICES”:
“DISRUPTION” VIA STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS OF THE MUSIC TEACHER
EDUCATION PROGRAM**

The qualitative phase of this mixed methods study was intended to inform the results of the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey and illuminate the phenomena of interest: the “disruption” of pre-service music educators’ occupational identities and preconceptions of music education. Following a review of the qualitative methodology employed for this study, I provide a brief background of each examined class and biographies of the faculty members who teach them, then discuss the influences of the structural components of the music teacher education program itself, as guided by the following research question:

How do structural components of the music teacher education program (e.g., course curricula, university/school of education/school of music/music education program requirements, music education program sequence) assist with “disrupting” pre-service music educators’ occupational identities?

Review of Qualitative Methodology

Following data collection and analysis of the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey, I created cohort groups of students for focus group discussions from classes that were identified by survey participants as being highly “disruptive.” I created cohort groups only from classes for which 80% or more of the students who had taken the class had identified it having changed their beliefs about music education and for which 60% or more of the students identified it as having changed their identities as music educators. Those classes are listed below:

MUS 125 – Women’s Chamber Ensemble

MUS 171 – Class Strings I

MUS 177 – Introduction to Music Education

MUS 210 – Songwriting

MUS 277 – Principles of Music Education

MUS 336B – Ensemble Conducting II: Choral

MUS 455 – Teaching Instrumental Music

MUS 456 – Teaching Stringed Instruments

MUS 465 – Teaching Early Childhood Music

MUS 467 – Teaching Elementary General Music

MUS 468 – Teaching Choral Music

MUS 469 – Teaching Secondary General Music

MUS 495 – Student Teaching in Music

Analysis of qualitative open-ended responses on the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey supported examination of these classes, including examination of interactions between peers and music education faculty and interactions between music education faculty and music education graduate students. Results of the survey also prompted me to examine the influences of collegiate music education associations (e.g., Collegiate National Association for Music Education, American Choral Directors Association).

Description of Classes

MUS 125 – Women’s Chamber Ensemble

Women’s Chamber Ensemble is an auditioned ensemble that was created in 2004. All students (undergraduate and graduate) campus-wide may audition. Repertoire is contemporary (often composed within the past decade) and includes several on- and off-campus performances

each semester. Dr. Lee has conducted the ensemble since her arrival in the School of Music in Fall 2004.

MUS 171 – Class Strings I

MUS 171, Class Strings I, is the first course of a two-course sequence (MUS 172 – Class Strings II is the second course in the sequence). It is offered every fall semester and most commonly taken during the freshman year, although that may vary due to scheduling, timing of acceptance to the School of Music, and time of declaration of major. Dr. Woolfolk, who has been on the faculty of the School of Music since Fall 1985, is the instructor of record. According to the course description in the University's Schedule of Courses, MUS 171 includes discussion of "techniques for playing and teaching stringed instruments at the elementary level." According to the syllabus of the course, goals of MUS 171 include developing students' string performance skills, helping students gain an appreciation for teaching and playing string instruments, building students' string pedagogy skills, and providing students with basic reference information to help them in the teaching field. Class activities include constructing and executing lesson plans, microteaching episodes with the entire class, and "adopting" a student who plays an unfamiliar instrument and teaching techniques specific to that instrument via songs from a method book.

MUS 177 – Introduction to Music Education

MUS 177, Introduction to Music Education, is the first music education course for all undergraduate music education students. It is offered twice yearly and most commonly taken during the freshman year, although that may vary due to scheduling, timing of acceptance to the School of Music, and time of declaration of major. It is a two-credit class that meets twice a week for 50 minutes and is the first course of a two-course sequence focusing on music teacher identity development, philosophy, and contemporary issues in music education. According to the

course description in the University's Schedule of Courses, MUS 177 includes discussion of "historical foundations, current trends, and teaching responsibilities in music education at all curricular levels." According to the syllabus of the course, objectives include student growth as individuals and "as a community of learners, educators, and musicians," exploration of teaching identities, foundational topics, and social issues in music education, and "challenging students' positions and dominant narratives affecting assumptions and beliefs about music teaching and learning." During the spring semester, Dr. Lee is the instructor of record. The graduate assistant who shadows her for that semester then becomes the instructor of record for the following fall semester.

For this class, students are required to observe three public school music classes in different settings and write an observation reflection for each. A graduate student coordinates the scheduling of the observations and transportation arrangements, but the music education faculty specifies which teachers may be observed. There are no microteachings in the public schools, although there is one 5-minute microteaching in class on a topic of the student's choice. Other assignments include online discussion of assigned articles, writing of a personal narrative that includes details of one's background with music education, interviewing a K-12 student and their experience with music education, and taking a "final exam" that includes the student articulation of perspectives about what they learned in the class.

Topics discussed in the class include developing meaningful student-teacher relationships, music teacher identity, philosophy of music education, competition in music education, social class, gender and gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, special education, popular/vernacular music, technology and music education, race and music education, and teacher vision. Most of the music education faculty are guest lecturers for a class and discuss

their areas of specialty. For example, Dr. Cunningham lectures on early childhood and elementary music education, Dr. Woolfolk lectures on musician wellness, and Dr. Weston lectures on critical race theory.

MUS 210 – Songwriting

MUS 210, formally known as Songwriting, is a two-credit class that meets twice a week for 110 minutes each time. The class is offered once yearly and is open to all students at the University. Dr. Emerson, who recently retired from the School of Music, was the instructor of record. Prior to his retirement, Dr. Emerson was on the faculty of the School of Music since Fall 1994. A graduate assistant now is the instructor of record. According to the course description in the University's Schedule of Courses, MUS 210 includes "developing and refining the ability to express oneself through songwriting." According to the syllabus of the course, objectives include understanding the artistic characteristics of existing songs through critical analysis of musical elements, developing compositional ability through writing and performing of songs, critiquing of songs written by class members, and reflecting on one's own personal journal as a songwriter through the use of a composer's journal.

The approach to this course is constructivist in nature. Students construct knowledge about songwriting in their own way via exposure to new ideas and songs, analysis of the process of songwriting, giving and receiving feedback, and engaging in the composition and revision process. The class is a learning community with members learning from each other's experiences and backgrounds. Class activities include in-class performances of new songs, revised songs, or a portion of a work in progress, analytical "mini-presentations" of admired songs accompanied by class discussion, and conversations about important songwriting concepts (e.g., word play, rhyme, imagery, form, beat production, recording technology, vocal technique).

MUS 277 – Principles of Music Education

MUS 277, Principles of Music Education, is offered twice yearly and most commonly is taken during the sophomore year, although that may vary due to scheduling, time of acceptance to the School of Music, and timing of declaration of major. It is a three-credit class that meets three times per week for 50 minutes and is the second in a two-course sequence grounded in music teacher identity development, philosophy, and contemporary issues in music education. Dr. Matthews, who has been teaching in the School of Music since Fall 2003, is the instructor of record during the fall semesters. Dr. Westin, who has been teaching in the School of Music since fall semester 2015, is the instructor of record during the spring semesters. Prior to that, Dr. Emerson taught it in Spring semesters.

According to the course description in the University's Schedule of Courses, MUS 277 includes discussion of "techniques for developing instructional and management skills for teaching music." According to its syllabus, the course is built around five broad units: philosophy of music education, student learning in music, curriculum, characteristics of appropriate learning environments, and measurement and evaluation. Goals of the course include preparation for upper level methods courses and further exploration of teaching identities, foundational topics, and social issues in music education. Students are required to observe six public school music classes in the same setting and write an observation reflection for each. Furthermore, in conjunction with the cooperating teacher, students must teach a brief lesson during two of those visits. Students also must interview the teacher each visit and ask instructor-generated questions that correspond with the course's units. As with MUS 177, a graduate student coordinates the scheduling of the observations and transportation arrangements, but the music education faculty specifies which teachers may be observed.

Assignments include reading assigned articles for every class, studying and presenting on a major curricular approach in music education (e.g., Kodaly, Music Learning Theory, Orff, Comprehensive Musicianship), pedagogically analyzing an ensemble work or musical activity to be taught to a class with embedded teaching strategies, and creating a classroom management plan to address the behavior of a student who exhibits attention-seeking behaviors.

MUS 336B: Ensemble Conducting II: Choral

MUS 336B, Ensemble Conducting II: Choral, is a two-credit course that meets four days a week for 50 minutes. It is offered every Spring semester and is most commonly taken during the junior year, although that may vary due to scheduling, timing of acceptance to the School of Music, and time of declaration of major. Dr. Sterling, the Associate Director of Choral Activities at the School of Music, is instructor of record for the class and has been teaching there since the Fall semester 1993.

According to the course description in the University's Schedule of Courses, MUS 336B includes discussion of "advanced conducting and rehearsal techniques as applied to music literature from each of the stylistic periods." Class activities consist of "mini-rehearsals" of choral works from the Renaissance through the 20th Century, discussion of concepts from these musical eras, analysis of famed conductors' techniques, and exploration of space, flow, and gesture to communicate clear and expressive musical interpretation. According to the syllabus of the course, goals include analyzing a score and creating a rehearsal plan based on that analysis, understanding of the rehearsal process, conducting in various simple, compound, and mixed meters, and developing use and independence of the left hand for cueing, phrasing, and dynamics.

MUS 455 – Teaching Instrumental Music

MUS 455, Teaching Instrumental Music, is a three-credit upper level methods course that meets twice a week for 110 minutes each time. It is offered every Spring semester and is taken either during the junior or senior year, although that may vary due to scheduling, timing of acceptance to the School of Music, and time of declaration of major. While the title may imply an examination of both band and orchestra/string methods, this course is focused specifically on methods for band. Although Dr. Matthews currently is the instructor of record for the course, Dr. Miles, the former Assistant Director of Bands, served as the instructor of record for the past two years. He since has taken a position at another university and was unable to be interviewed for this study.

According to the course description in the University's Schedule of Courses, MUS 455 includes discussion of "the development of skills necessary for teaching elementary and secondary band, the role of the instrumental music educator, and the purpose of instrumental music in the schools." According to the syllabus of the course, goals include understanding the scope of the instrumental music education program in K-12 education and the roles that instrumental music teachers play within their programs, as well as developing an awareness of "highest quality" curricular materials, understanding how to develop a sequential curriculum, and refining the techniques necessary to teach, rehearse, and perform the highest quality literature at the highest possible musical level. Class activities include discussions of the role of instrumental music educator as "musical leader, effective administrator, and compassionate role model," designing rehearsal plans, peer teaching of secondary instruments, student rehearsing of well-known band repertoire, planning for two to three "mini-concerts" (elementary, middle school, and high school band) with student conductors, analyzing of method books, and

observing and working with band students at a local public middle school.

MUS 456 – Teaching Stringed Instruments

MUS 456, Teaching Stringed Instruments, is a three-credit upper level methods course that meets twice a week for 110 minutes each time. It is offered every Fall semester and is taken either during the junior or senior year, although that may vary due to scheduling, timing of acceptance to the School of Music, and time of declaration of major. Dr. Woolfolk is the instructor of record. Rather than focusing strictly on preparing students to teach in an orchestral setting, the purpose of the class is to aid students in developing skills needed for teaching string instruments in schools with particular emphasis on the group setting. According to the course description in the University's Schedule of Courses, MUS 456 includes discussion of "the development of skills and knowledge for teaching string and orchestra programs in schools." It also includes discussion of "pedagogy, musicianship, curriculum, materials, and program administration." According to the syllabus of the course, objectives include composing and improvising with strings, selecting repertoire for strings, learning how to recruit and retain string players, designing/administering a successful strings program, planning and sequencing curricula, selecting and teaching with appropriate materials, learning assessment techniques for string players, learning teaching/rehearsal techniques for musics of a variety of styles, and shifting students' string paradigm to include musical ensembles of other styles (e.g., mariachi, fiddle).

Class activities include discussion of method books, effective scaffolding strategies for all students, assessment of student progress, how to choose repertoire, infusing creativity activities in string settings, and administration of a string program. Students also work with and observe string students at a local public middle school.

MUS 465 – Teaching Early Childhood Music

MUS 465, Teaching Early Childhood Music, is a two-credit, upper-level methods course that meets twice a week for 50 minutes each time. It is offered every Fall semester and typically is taken either during the junior or senior year. Dr. Cunningham, who has been teaching at the School of Music since Fall 1993, is the instructor of record. This class was created to coincide with the creation of the School of Music's Community Music School, which has an early childhood program. Dr. Cunningham also serves as director of that program and teaches early childhood classes weekly during the semesters in which she teaches MUS 465.

According to the course description in the University's Schedule of Courses, MUS 465 includes discussion of "music learning activities and teaching strategies for children ages three to six." According to the syllabus of the course, goals include developing an understanding of the musical development of young children (birth to age five) and how to provide instruction that meets their needs, as well as developing teaching skills that can be used to provide developmentally appropriate music instruction for young children. Class activities include teacher lectures and demonstrations that focus on the theoretical underpinnings of Music Learning Theory (Gordon, 2013) and how it is applied in early childhood classes, including those at the Community Music School. Peer teaching experiences during class constitute a major portion of the class. Peer teaching experiences are used as opportunities for students to gain experience teaching through Music Learning Theory and receive valuable feedback from peers and the instructor. Students then modify the activity and teach it in the Community Music School's early childhood program. MUS 465 students are required to assist one of the program's teachers and teach a short lesson in a class that meets once weekly over the course of 10 weeks. Students also develop lesson plans for students at various stages of early childhood music

development.

MUS 467 – Teaching Elementary General Music

MUS 467, Teaching Elementary General Music, is a three-credit, upper-level methods course that meets twice a week for 110 minutes each time. It is offered every spring semester and is taken either during the junior or senior year. Dr. Cunningham is the instructor of record. According to the course description in the University's Schedule of Courses, MUS 467 includes discussion of "techniques for teaching general music to students in grades K-6" with additional discussion of "curriculum, pedagogy, materials, and program administration." According to the syllabus of the course, goals include developing an understanding of and being able to successfully engage students in music activities that are appropriate for elementary students, applying understanding of individual differences between students to the preparation of elementary general music lessons, planning developmentally appropriate elementary general music curricula, evaluating student achievement through the use of appropriate tests and performance measures, and teaching elementary general music to all populations using appropriate methods and materials. The theoretical underpinnings of the class are based upon Edwin E. Gordon's Music Learning Theory (Gordon, 2013).

Similar to MUS 465, class activities include teacher lectures and demonstrations that focus on the theoretical underpinnings of Music Learning Theory (MLT) (Gordon, 2013) and how it is applied in elementary music classes. Also, as with MUS 465, students participate in peer teaching experiences throughout the semester. Students receive peer and instructor feedback, modify the activity accordingly, and teach it in a local elementary school that the students choose from a list provided to Dr. Cunningham. Students assist public school teachers and teach microlessons once weekly over the course of 10 weeks. In addition, students develop several

lesson plans for students in kindergarten, second grade, and fifth grade.

MUS 468 – Teaching Choral Music

MUS 468, Teaching Choral Music, is a three-credit, upper-level methods course that meets twice a week for 110 minutes each time. It is offered every Spring semester and is taken either during the junior or senior year. Dr. Lee is the instructor of record. According to the course description in the University's Schedule of Courses, MUS 468 includes discussion of "techniques for developing choral music programs," along with discussion of "curriculum, pedagogy, materials, and program administration." According to the syllabus for the course, goals include developing and exercising teaching skills for success in the secondary choral classroom, developing a philosophy of choral music education, as well as developing listening/diagnosis skills and a working knowledge of arranging/adaptation/re-voicing. Other course goals include selecting appropriate repertoire, discerning the implication of repertoire-as-curriculum, developing rehearsal plans/teaching webs, constructing appropriate choral warm-ups, teaching from the keyboard, and exploring concepts of choral tone, such as diction, vowels, and voice-building techniques. Class activities include teacher- and graduate student-led discussions centered on goals/objectives of the course and conducting experiences.

Students are required to participate in an 8-week internship at a local public middle or high school that includes observation and participating in microteaching episodes, such as tutoring students individually or in small groups, working with students in a sectional rehearsal, or leading the full choir in a warm-up or main rehearsal segment. Students are required to ask cooperating teachers instructor-generated questions in conjunction with the unit currently being studied (e.g., teaching and rehearsing techniques, operational procedures, and characteristics of students) and critically reflect on their experiences via a weekly blog post.

MUS 469 – Teaching Secondary General Music

MUS 469, Teaching Secondary General Music, is a three-credit, upper-level methods course that meets twice a week for 110 minutes each time. It is offered every Fall semester and is taken either during the junior or senior year. Dr. Emerson, who recently retired from the School of Music, was the instructor of record. Prior to his retirement, Dr. Emerson was on the faculty of the School of Music since Fall 1994.

According to the course description in the University's Schedule of Courses, MUS 469 includes discussion of "techniques for teaching general music and elective music classes in middle and high schools." According to the syllabus for the class, goals include becoming familiar with appropriate and creative music methods for teaching middle and high school general music, performing cover songs, arrangements, and student-composed songs, developing lesson plans and a long-term curriculum for a secondary general music class (e.g., music technology class, ukulele-based class, popular music class, songwriting, etc.), learning how to use song materials, published materials, and electronic media in secondary general music classes, developing sufficient technical and teaching skills for the ukulele, and developing vernacular musicianship skills such as learning by ear, arranging, and composing. Class activities included instructor lectures on course topics and contemporary issues in music education, peer taught listening lessons, student performances of cover songs, arrangements, and student-composed works, presentation of YouTube ukulele lessons, student presentations on current applications for technology (software and smartphone/tablet applications), curricular ideas for secondary general music classes, and how these class activities can be implemented into a traditional performance-based ensemble program.

MUS 495 – Student Teaching in Music

MUS 495, Student Teaching in Music, is a nine-credit semester-long seminar course that meets on campus once a week for 90 minutes in addition to the time spent every day in the schools. This seminar coincides with the formal semester-long practicum experience that takes place during an undergraduate music education student's last semester. Dr. Matthews is the coordinator of student teaching, the liaison to the College of Education's teacher preparation program for the School of Music, and the instructor of record for MUS 495. The seminar is meant to serve as a pre-service forum for issues and questions that may arise during the practicum. Seminar activities include creating a cover letter and resume, developing an online professional portfolio, reviewing lesson planning, critiquing peer lessons via video recording, practicing interviewing techniques, learning first aid and CPR, and participating in a certification workshop sponsored by the College of Education. According to the syllabus for the course, goals include developing attributes evident in successful professional music educators and deriving maximum benefit from the practicum experience.

Additionally, during the course of the semester, students prepare, design, implement, assess, and reflect upon a "creative project" that demonstrates their abilities to teach composition, improvisation, or arranging in their internship setting. This "Student Teaching Portfolio" (STP) contains two types of information: documentation (lesson descriptions, student work, recorded classroom activities) that provides evidence of the nature and quality of student learning and commentaries that serve as reflective responses to specific prompts. These STPs are shared during the STP Poster Fair, an event that is held during the last meeting of the semester and open to all students, faculty, and cooperating teachers.

Influential Structural Components of the Program

“De-Tracked” Program Sequence

Prior to the year 2000, the music education program had an instrumental and a vocal track. As a result, students could not explore areas of interest that were not included in their “track,” such as taking an elementary general music methods class if they were instrumentalists. During the 1990s, the music education faculty found the existing music teacher education program structure to be problematic in that it provided a narrow range of experiences dependent on pre-service music educators’ applied performance area, resulting in highly specialized music educators who were not prepared to teach a broad array of music classes as the University is located in a state that has K-12 music certification. Additionally, the lack of choice in course sequence forced pre-service students to adopt a career path that did not necessarily suit their occupational interests. As a result, the faculty de-tracked the curriculum. Dr. Emerson was chairperson of the music education area during the transition to a “de-tracked” sequence:

As teachers, it’s very easy for the music teacher to go off by himself or herself and become their own island. I’ve seen situations where the choral teacher doesn’t even talk with the instrumental teacher and so on because they’re in completely different worlds. I think that that has to change, that teachers need to, in a community, need to see each other as allies working towards similar goals with these groups of students. That can only happen if the students here see themselves as collaborators. I think it’s really important for students to learn to work with and learn with each other. One very powerful thing I think that emphasizes that is we did a dramatic change in the undergraduate program here in which we eliminated all tracking. The program had been highly tracked so that students who were vocal majors took very few courses in common with students whose main instrument was a cello or a trombone. My thought was that these people are going to have to work with each other as colleagues in the real world when they leave here. It’s foolish for us to think of people in these kinds of very narrow categories. In many colleges, students learn to become teachers by being a very narrow slice of what a music teacher is and that eliminates the possibility for there being crossover, to be able to take a technique from an instrumental methods class and work with your choir, or something from a vocal ensemble and work with an orchestra. We are not in the business of preparing a choir *director*, an orchestra *director*, a band *director*. You are music *teachers*. You teach in different settings, but you are all music *teachers*. I see nothing wrong with someone whose primary instrument is their voice, also working with the marching band. I

think that's the real world of being a music teacher. I think the program we have here enables students to see themselves in a completely different light. (interview, 11/19/15)

A "de-tracked" program sequence gives students more options to satisfy program requirements and allows them take classes that may be less directly related to their applied area (instrumental or vocal). In Dr. Emerson's opinion, the "de-tracked" program sequence placed pre-service educators in more classes with each other than the "tracked" program sequence, giving them shared learning opportunities, creating a sense of community among the pre-service educators, and facilitating "disruptive" experiences among *all* students. During several focus group discussions, several students noted the influence of this community on their learning:

Joseph (fifth-year male): Our common education classes caused us to form relationships with each other. We became grouped so closely is if you just looked at our freshman/sophomore year, we were all a pool together. Everybody.

Adele (fifth-year female): And then, gradually, as we filtered out into separate classes—some for education majors, others for performance majors, this group stayed together and it went education majors and performance majors. *But*, we didn't have an instrumental versus choral mindset. We had an *educator* mindset.

Valerie (fourth-year female): We all took these "mixed" instrumental and choral classes and we all kind of had these education experiences. I mean, some of the classes that really started shaping our educational beliefs...we were all in the same room having those life-changing moments at the same time.

Stacy (fourth-year female): Like 177 and 277 [Introduction to Music Education and Principles of Music Education].

Emma (third-year female): I would agree with that completely.

Caleb (fifth-year male): We had the classes that were opening up our education sides, and we needed people to converse with about that and that just happened to be ALL of the education people. Not necessarily the vocal people by themselves or the instrumental people by themselves. (MUS 336B focus group discussion, 12/8/15)

Carter (fourth-year male): I think we find performance to be a very important thing because we're in a large school. At a certain point, though, it kind of became you were either a performance major or an education major and so, I wasn't a performance major, so I kind of became a part of this education major group, which, thankfully, I think the culture here is that at least we're not vocal education majors and instrumental. We're all

just *education* majors – just one big community trying to help each other be the best that we can be. (MUS 468 focus group discussion, 12/8/15)

Jenna (third-year female): “I really like that the education classes bring us all together. It’s definitely helped me not only develop more insight, but also develop close friendships with people I probably wouldn’t have interacted with otherwise.” (Women’s Chamber Ensemble focus group discussion, 12/4/15)

For these students, the “de-tracked” program sequence facilitated the creation of relationships with each other and helped to foster a sense of “educator” identity within an environment that tends to bestow a higher social status upon the identity of “performers” (Aróstegui, 2004; Kingsbury, 1984, 1988; Nettle, 1995; Woodford, 2002). Additionally, the “de-tracked” program sequence fostered the creation of espoused values (Schein, 1985, 2004) and feelings of mutual support towards a common goal of being outstanding educators who are prepared to teach K-12 students, regardless of music teaching specialization (Conway, 2002, 2012).

A core value (Schein, 1985, 2004) shared amongst all music education faculty is to empower students and give them options and experiences that help them “find their voices”—provide agency—and prepare them as best as possible for their preferred teaching area. During the focus group interview with the faculty, Dr. Matthews and Dr. Cunningham referred to a recent discussion with a bassoonist who, rather than desiring to teach band or orchestra, wished to teach elementary general music or chorus:

Dr. Cunningham: This student came in and said, “You know, I don’t really see myself as a band director. I might see myself as an elementary general music teacher, or if I’m going to teach secondary, it’s probably going to be as a choral conductor.” I called in Dr. Matthews [coordinator of student teachers] just so that was on his radar screen. I wanted you to be aware of what she is thinking so that we can mentor this person. We both said to her to make sure to talk with Dr. Lee [choral music educator] so that she knows that this is in your head because I think that if we know what’s in your head, we can make sure that we’re providing you the support and the growth and the development in the areas that you’re going to need in order to be successful. Again, just a single example of

empowering students and helping them “find their voices” as teachers. Find what they feel called to do...

Dr. Matthews: That’s just one example. If you want to be a choral teacher, take Dr. Lee’s class. But, I don’t care if you play the bassoon. If you want to teach chorus, great. We’ll figure out a way for you to do that. So, again, a way for students to figure out what their own voice is as a teacher. That’s not a defection. That’s not a loss. That’s not a bad change. They’re being *music teachers*. That’s a plus for everybody. They’re going to be the kind of music teacher they want to be and maybe stay in the profession longer because of that and do different things. We’re all for it. Of course, students can build their own mini-tracks if they know exactly what they want to do. For example, there are students who come in and they know that they want to teach orchestra from seventh grade onwards. I think the distinction is that we’re not forcing them into those things and that, in this constructivist attitude about it, we want to know from them what they want to teach. We’re not telling them through the accident of playing the trumpet in fourth grade that you have to be a band teacher. (faculty focus group discussion, 1/12/16)

Observation/Fieldwork Requirements

Starting with MUS 177 (Introduction to Music Education), students are required to observe K-12 music educators in surrounding communities. As researchers have suggested that the secondary school’s director’s influence on the decision to become a music teacher is so strong that pre-service music education students typically desire to resemble their concert band, choir, or orchestra director (Fredrickson & Williams, 2009), as well as adopt a similar occupational identity and teach as they were taught (Campbell, 1999), the music education faculty have required observations immediately following matriculation into the music teacher education program to “disrupt” students’ conceptions of music education and see contexts of music teaching that are different from those to which they are accustomed. However, observation settings are controlled by the faculty. The music education faculty periodically updates a list of area music teachers that exemplify outstanding music teaching and value systems that are discussed in music education classes. Each semester, a music education graduate assistant then contacts the K-12 teachers on the list for their availability for collegiate observations and then coordinates carpools to area schools based on students’ schedules and available transportation

options, including students' cars and public transportation.

Almost all music education classes have an observation and fieldwork component, accompanied by written reflections. MUS 177 (Introduction to Music Education) requires only three observations, each in different teaching contexts including but not limited to elementary/middle school/high school general, middle school instrumental and choral, high school instrumental and choral, and high school songwriting. MUS 277 (Principles of Music Education) requires six site visits to a public school, two of which must include a microteaching component, such as working with students in a sectional setting, warming up an ensemble, or leading a short segment of a rehearsal or class. Students in MUS 455 (Teaching Instrumental Music) and MUS 456 (Teaching Stringed Instruments) participate in fieldwork experiences in the latter half of the semester. MUS 465 (Teaching Early Childhood Music) includes a 10-week placement at the local community music school where students assist early childhood class teachers and teach short lessons. Students in MUS 467 (Teaching Elementary General Music) perform similar tasks over the course of ten weeks at a local public elementary school. Students also observe in a public elementary school as a class three times during the semester and respond in email to a list of questions provided by Dr. Cunningham. Students in Dr. Lee's MUS 468 (Teaching Choral Music) class must participate in an eight-week internship in an area public school. Once weekly, students observe choral classes and work with the cooperating teacher to arrange four microteaching lessons. Some classes, such as MUS 277 and MUS 468, have instructor-generated observation and fieldwork guiding questions that correspond to each unit covered within the courses. Students need to reflect on their experiences by using these guiding questions as lenses through which to write their reflection papers.

During focus group sessions, students spoke to the influence these fieldwork experiences

had on their philosophies and mental models (Schein, 1985) of music education:

Jonah (second-year male): Observing the orchestra class out in Farmington during 177 [Introduction to Music Education] was really mind blowing for me. At first, I thought the students were doing *whatever* and totally walking all over the teacher. It just seemed like they were talking and being off task. Then, I started to realize that the students weren't doing whatever, but they were helping each other with musical issues that they were having. The teacher walked around and helped out, but the students really took care of their own problems. That was, like, *mind blowing* for me. I've always been used to the teacher being in the front and telling everyone what to do. *That* person was in charge. These observations really helped me figure out that there are *other* ways of teaching music that are effective. (MUS 277 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

James (third-year male): I think the observations...it's cool to see the entire 10 weeks of a class. "This is what a classroom is like." When you get to see all 10 weeks and see where kids were at the start, it's really interesting. You can see that this class is actually having an effect on the kids and I think they also enjoy the class more now than they did at the beginning of the 10 weeks. You can see them engaging more and it's just cool to see. Like, we read about how all this is super important and has a big effect on kids. I should go back and read my original early childhood rationale because I'm sure I would change stuff now. I'm thinking about it now in a very different way. By experiencing it, I think I could write about why it's important better. The discussions and the readings make us think, "Oh, that's interesting." Discussing it makes it come to life a bit more, then observing it is the final step in understanding stuff that we're doing. (MUS 465 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Liam (fourth-year male): The Community Music School is one of the most fantastic resources that we have as a university because I've assisted with a bunch of early childhood classes and I feel able to teach. I'm not going to be able to teach any of those, I think, but I think I could. I could have a plan and teach an entire class, because I've subbed a few times and I taught one class at a time. I haven't done a whole semester of them. I think that experience is one of the best things that we have thanks to the Community Music School and those early childhood classes. (MUS 465 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Stacy (fourth-year female): I mean, a lot of us have summer jobs at marching band camps and stuff like that. But, for some of us, this is our very first music teaching "job" [being an assistant at the local community music school] and for some of us, it's our first music teaching "job" that's not related to marching band. That's a really scary thing because you're singing and you've never done that for people before, but you have to go and you have to have an appropriate activity. Then, these are actual kids and their parents, so the parents are judging you on how well your activity goes. Then, for all the kids, you have to make sure that they learn and are engaged. It made me think that there's so much more to teaching than just teaching and that teaching really little kids can be challenging and complicated. I think that's part of the appeal. I love it! (MUS 467 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Jennifer (fifth-year female): I think another one of the coolest things we did, which, always seemed like a hassle when we have such hugely busy schedules, was to go to Carlson Middle School and see the classes because we really saw good teaching, but we also saw growth in the students over the semester. I learned a TON from teaching. I realized that I needed to adapt my teaching technique for this population because they had very different backgrounds and needs from what I grew up with and was accustomed to. I also liked how the teacher facilitated...she didn't just dictate from the podium. She let students help each other. It's *so* different from what I'm used to and I think it's really effective. (MUS 455 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Chad (fourth-year male): It's one thing to talk about what to teach and how to teach in choral methods [MUS 468], but I think I got more out of applying that stuff from the classroom. I had to go out every Friday to the high school chorus down in Houlton. At first, we just observed to see what was going on and ask the teacher questions. After a couple of weeks, we had to teach the chorus. I did some sectional rehearsals and led a couple of warm-ups. Like, those experiences really helped me to understand that teaching isn't something out of a book. It's messy and can change from day to day, minute to minute. Elwell has a smaller choral program, too, but the teacher does AMAZING things and that was really good for me to see...so different from my high school program. (MUS 468 focus group discussion, 12/8/15)

For these students, fieldwork and microteachings in a broad range of levels, socioeconomic contexts, and teaching styles “disrupted” their occupational identities and conceptions of music education, as they were different from their own experiences in music education. Also, observing and working with the same class over a period of time gave the pre-service educators opportunities to view growth in children, some of which they helped to facilitate. These were powerful learning opportunities that helped to deepen their occupational identities as educators and gave them valuable teaching experiences within contexts that challenged their notions of music education.

Dr. Matthews stated that the cooperating teachers have played a major role in the transformation of pre-service educators' occupational identities and that refinement of their cooperating teacher list has assisted towards that end:

Every year that I do this job, I'm more and more grateful and I recognize more and more, the huge influence that the cooperating teachers have on occupational identity of student

teachers. Just as we all say, “We learn more about teaching the first six weeks that we’re actually teaching,” I think that they learn just as much from those teachers out in the schools in ways that we like, who help form the voices of those people as they become our colleagues out in schools. So, I just want to make sure that we recognize that it’s definitely not just us. There are profound contributions from everyone who volunteers to be a supervisor of placement for any of our classes at any level, and of course, the people that take student teachers. We have such a great group of supervising teachers and it’s gotten better every year. We’re really intentional about that. Dr. Lee will say that “I saw so-and-so and I don’t think we should put them on the [approved supervising teacher] list anymore” and Dr. Cunningham will see so-and-so and she’ll say that “we need to put that person on our list.” We constantly refine the list of whom our teaching partners are out in the schools. They’re teaching us as faculty and they’re sure a huge influence on the pre-service teachers. Our kids aren’t learning how to teach in Room 165 of our music building. They’re learning how to teach in real classrooms and colleagues in the schools are mentoring them in that. That doesn’t happen in all programs. I think it’s getting more common, but I think we’ve really had a commitment to do that and it’s messy and it’s hard. We’ve had a commitment to do that in virtually all of our music education classes. (faculty focus group discussion, 1/12/16)

Some of the music education faculty had varying perspectives on observing public school teachers whose practices may differ from those recommended in methods classes. Dr. Matthews believes that there is value in observing faculty who may use teaching strategies that run counter to what may have been stressed in methods classes:

This semester in 455 [Instrumental Methods], we will go to Lucy Sonato’s school. There are things, if we’re being brutally honest, there are things that Lucy does that I would not do. I want students to see different models and different kinds of teaching and the only thing that I make a decision about is I’m not going to contradict what she does. If we’re going to have all this challenging stuff in 177 [Introduction to Music Education] and 277 [Principles of Music Education], then I’m not going to paint them a sitcom version of instrumental teaching in 455 where there’s only one way to do it and we’re going to wrap it up with a bow at the end. There are different ways to get to the same kinds of goals. There are other matters to consider. Is this a good teacher and can I work with them? Lucy and I get along great. There are no issues there. But, she has different goals and I think that makes the experience richer. It will certainly create some discussions this semester. You said “Do this” and she did this other thing. Yup. Sometimes we don’t have an easy answer for those things, but that’s the real world. We’re sending them out to teach in the real world. I think that gets back to the occupational identity, too. (interview, 1/25/16)

Dr. Cunningham, however, has her students observe teachers whose practices are similar to those studied in her MUS 465 (Teaching Early Childhood Music) and MUS 467 (Teaching

Elementary General Music) methods classes:

I actually would like them to see what I'm doing with kids. The students have just come from secondary ensemble settings. They're engaged in ensembles here. They know what ensembles are like. They know what being in a band is like and what having a band director or a band teacher or a music educator, whatever the person views their self as. But, when I ask my students in the college here to tell me what they remember from their elementary general music experiences, they don't remember very much. I think they are coming with a less rich understanding of the context, so actually I think the sameness and the supporting and the building, rather than the conflicting, helps them be more successful and helps them have a better sense of how to move forward as an elementary music teacher. (interview, 1/20/16)

MUS 469, Teaching Secondary General Music, does not have an observation/fieldwork component due to the lack of secondary general music classes in the area and the paucity of teachers that actually carry out activities similar to those in the methods class. The lack of observing the application of course units and activities, such as composing original songs, arranging songs, utilizing electronic media means of music learning, and developing vernacular musicianship skills in learning by ear, did not provide students with a real-life context within which to situate these activities. As a result, students felt that these activities were unrealistic to execute in a secondary setting:

Cara (fourth-year female): After being in a real classroom during my student teaching in a band program where we have four concert bands and only six periods in a day, it seems more and more unrealistic to implement those kinds of activities into our daily classroom with the amount of things that our band actually has to do on a daily basis just to fulfill the requirements put forth by the district or by the school. I guess the one thing that I would have liked to see more out of 469 was we never got to see any of this stuff implemented into a real classroom setting. I still to this day haven't seen any of this stuff implemented into a real classroom setting. It makes the whole class just a little bit idealistic and not necessarily realistic.

Jonathan (fourth-year male): That's exactly what I was going to say. It was almost like a radical view of the subject.

Jessi: Maybe the activities that we talk about in secondary general may be better as after school activities or clubs than implemented into an actual classroom setting. I would say the elementary level people are so gung-ho about implementing popular music and popular culture into music classes, but I feel that it's a little bit easier for them than it is

for a band, choir, or orchestra person to do at the secondary level, just because band, choir, and orchestra is so much of what society is used to and I think it would need a pretty flexible and pretty well funded school district to bring forward any new ideas, which is really rare nowadays to find that.

Jonathan: We don't know how to teach it.

Cara: Exactly.

Jonathan: So much of our degree and all the classes are about pointing us in the direction of ensembles.

Cara: We always had to be in an ensemble.

Jonathan: We had an ensemble. But all of our education classes, it's like, "Oh no, you should actually be doing this."

Cara: Conflicting.

Jonathan: Very conflicting ideologies. (MUS 469 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

The lack of observations led to a lack of credibility for the course content, thus making students doubt the viability of these methods within a secondary school music program with performance-based ensembles. This dialogue also captured the tension that students perceived within their School of Music. As with many schools of music, the secondary school curriculum is centered largely on performance-based experiences, particularly through the large ensemble medium. However, these students perceived the music education faculty and course curriculum as contradicting powerful cultural aspects of the School of Music, creating a sense of role stress and tension within students as to what is "best."

Music education students are required to participate in College of Education classes (TE classes) as part of the educator licensure curriculum. Many of these classes contain an observation/fieldwork component, similar in scope to the music education methods classes. Due to academic freedom principles, however, the School of Music and music education faculty has no input in curriculum or in educators who are observed; the College of Education alone

coordinates observations. Two students, Suzanne and Stuart, provided powerful examples of the negative influence observations could have on occupational identities when the contexts are poor models of music education:

Suzanne (third-year female): My TE observations were never really that great. For TE 302, my observations...they were the epitome of what *not* to do. I didn't get *anything* out of those. In fact, in some ways, they made me NOT want to be a teacher. (MUS 455 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Stuart (fourth-year male): My teacher education classes were a joke. The instructors had no idea about music classes and how to teach them...what we need to do to handle 80 kids with noisemakers. The observations were really demoralizing to me. There were moments that made me second-guess my career choice to be an educator. (MUS 468 focus group discussion, 12/8/15)

Rather than providing transformative and uplifting experiences that inspire students to embrace teaching and an educator identity, these students actually considered dropping out of the music education program entirely as a result of their field experiences. This suggests that care needs to be made in selecting which area educators should be involved in a music teacher education program.

Student Teaching

The capstone event for pre-service music educators is the student teaching experience. Several student teachers at the time of data collection spoke to the influence that student teaching had on their occupational identities:

Jeanne (fifth-year female): I really think student teaching shapes your identity as a music educator, for me, because, before this, you weren't an educator. [laughing] I mean, in our college classes, you're teaching your peers in small groups, but you're not being an *educator*. I think student teaching solidifies all those ideas in those sort of big, grasping concepts that we talk about in our classes and puts them in practice and says, "This is who you are." Now, I'm an educator.

Jessica (fifth-year female): What's changed for me was specifically that idea when I became a *teacher* instead of a *student*. Even though I would have those internships when I would go once a week to a placement or I would be peer teaching, there wasn't really that sensation of being a *teacher* until I was student teaching. And so, with all those

lessons that we had done with our instructors and Dr. Lee and Dr. Cunningham, it seemed more real once you got to student teaching because all of sudden, there was a need for ownership of that kind of skill, and the demand for actually being always on top of your game. Student teaching allows you to apply those skills so much more realistically. (MUS 495 focus group discussion, 11/18/15)

Joseph (fifth-year male): I feel that college has taught us how to be educators, but this internship experience teaches us how to be *teachers*. For me, a teacher is applying all of the education. The education is the substance, it's the stuff you're learning, but then the teacher is the way you do it. Every kid who learns all the stuff in high school, they can't instantly become a teacher. They don't have all of the little "moves," like how do you get the class to be quiet, or how do you plan this transition so that it works better, or the baseball coach really *really* expects his students to be here for this one banquet thing that may have a conflict with this. How do you work with that? How do you work with other faculty in the building? How do you work with the vice principal? The stupid little things you can't learn in college. (MUS 495 focus group discussion, 11/18/15)

Peggy (fifth-year female): I came in as an education major and I was interested in teaching, but I really wanted to be a performance major. But, the more people I talked to, the more they said, "You should get an education degree." I had this "You can perform with a teaching degree, but you can't teach with a performance degree" type of mentality. I didn't, even until last year, know that I wanted to be a teacher. I was still thinking, "Maybe I'll get a master's in performance because I still love playing my instrument." It's taken me until student teaching to realize how much I love it and actually spending every day with these kids. I'm having so much fun and I'm exhausted and I'm sick and I love it! It just took me until this semester to really want to pursue teaching still, I guess. The student teaching is the most important experience you have from the music education standpoint. I have an AMAZING cooperating teacher. She's phenomenal. The way she works with them is something I really want to take away from this experience. (MUS 455 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Samuel (fifth-year male): I didn't really like my band programs in high school and middle school. I had a really awesome beginning band director and my 7th grade teacher was super awesome, but they never really made me *want* to be a teacher. I just liked playing my instrument. My high school director, who I feel is probably the one who influenced me the most because I had him the longest, he wasn't that great. He was just like, this guy that stood in front of us. My student teaching has really shown me a good way to direct a high school band, even though I'm not there all the time because I spend most of the day at the middle school. The high school band teacher does a really good job. It's different to see an effective high school program or middle school program. The middle school program here is so much different than the one I was in. It's made me look at my identity as an educator differently than when I was going through undergrad. It's given me something that I can identify with...use as a practical model. This whole *experience* has given me a different way of looking at band and music education. Like, there's *so* much more that you can do! (MUS 455 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Jeremy (fifth-year male): I spent all four years marching in our college's marching band drum line. I taught a lot of them last year during sectionals. You realize in student teaching that those kids are also not even close to the majority of the kids that you'll be teaching in high school. That's the minority of the minority of kids who you'll be teaching. Like, the ones who do something like that in college, and even they're not music majors, the ones who are that good. So, you think like, "Wow." This is something that I noticed more in student teaching. You can tell that most of these kids aren't going to be music majors and maybe like two of these high schoolers in this senior class will audition for the marching band, let alone be in it. So, what about everyone else?" Like, that has certainly affected my identity a lot. Who am I really teaching here? What kind of people am I teaching here, because most of the people are not the ones like me. It's totally not. It's everyone else who I really need to teach to. (MUS 177 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

In contrast to the opinions provided by students through qualitative portions of the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey describing their occupational identity shifts during their time in the music teacher education program, these student teachers' occupational identities shifted more fully or shifted again during the student teaching experience. Peggy, even throughout her coursework, observations, and fieldwork, was uncertain about her occupational choice to become a music educator. She did not truly identify as a teacher until her student teaching experience when she had an outstanding cooperating teacher who influenced her identity. Samuel found his cooperating teachers to be highly influential in that they provided excellent models of secondary school ensemble instruction. He also found their programs to provide a different conception of music education for middle and high school ensembles. For these pre-service educators, student teaching is when their occupational identities began to assume the role of teachers. This suggests that pre-service music education students may have varying interpretations of the "teacher" occupational identity, what it means to be a teacher, or the work that it entails. For some music teacher education students, the feeling of still being "in school" and having the label as "students" may inhibit occupational identity development. It may not be until these students cease participating in daily college classes and work in a school context daily, interact with in-service

educators, administrators, and parents, and grapple with the realities of teaching, that they can more fully develop their occupational identities.

Dr. Matthews spoke of the development of occupational identity within the context of the “realities” of music teaching that are observed during student teaching and the conflict that arises between these “realities” and a student’s developing teacher vision. In his opinions, these conflicts are essential for developing and informing students’ occupational identity:

One of the things that happens during student teaching is that they come out of Dr. Lee’s and Dr. Cunningham’s and Dr. Woolfolk’s classes with kind of a vision of what they want to be as a teacher, and *then*, there’s this rude awakening of what it’s really like. We hear this all the time, like Judy, the violinist from Wright. She was in one of the first weeks of student teaching seminar and said, “Hey, Dr. Matthews, this is the real world out there.” [all faculty laugh] All of a sudden, there’s festival. We don’t have festival here at MSU. There’s attendance, there’s classroom management. There are a lot of things that they bump their heads on in student teaching and those help to form that occupational identity, too. We can’t control that and we shouldn’t try. (faculty focus group interview, 1/12/16)

Additionally, Joseph noted the difference between the terms “educator” and “teacher.” For him, an “educator” is one who is learning education theory in preparation of becoming the “teacher” who successfully applies the theory in a school context. For him, there is a clear difference between those who understand the mechanics of teaching in a classroom and those who can successfully apply that knowledge to create meaningful educational experiences for students. Joseph also believes that part of the student teaching experiences includes learning non-education based concepts that are essential for a creating a successful music education program, such as building relationships with colleagues, athletic staff, and administrators.

The music education faculty considers the placement process of student teachers with cooperating teachers to be a particularly important part of the overall music teacher education program. Dr. Matthews and Dr. Cunningham provided the faculty’s philosophy on student teacher placement:

Dr. Matthews: Each one of us is the “chief worrier” for the area that we’re “camped out” in. I don’t place a student teacher in choral without Dr. Lee being in charge of that. Each person for their area decides where those placements should be. I just do the paperwork.

Dr. Cunningham: We send the students out into the schools to go observe and tell them to not see who they think is best, but think about who is the best fit for them. Different people fit others better. It’s *very* person dependent. One person may be a terrific fit for a cooperating teacher for one student and not a great fit for a cooperating teacher for another student, depending on career goals, sensitivity, and worldview. We look at the big picture of who the student is beyond “Are they an elementary person or a choral person?” We look at who they are as human beings and what human beings are there in that same general specialization area that will be best in terms of their nurturing growth and development of occupational identity. (faculty focus group discussion, 1/12/16)

Student teachers are not placed merely by preferred area of specialization, i.e. band, chorus, and orchestra. Rather, as part of the formal philosophy (Schein, 1985) of the music education area, students are advised to look beyond specialization and find a cooperating teacher whose philosophy of music education and worldview “fits” those of the student teacher and would make for a best “match.” In Dr. Cunningham’s opinion, this “match” is helpful for development of teacher skills and occupational identity. The faculty who specializes in the student’s applied area of student teaching, i.e., band, strings, general music, choral, is the “point person” who facilitates the pairing of student with cooperating teacher. Dr. Matthews, in his role as coordinator of student teacher, creates and signs the necessary forms to be sent to the College of Education.

One student, Rachel, spoke about the importance of similar philosophies between cooperating and student teacher for a successful student teaching experience. However, she believes that exact alignment of philosophies is not necessarily the best situation for a student teacher:

It’s really important with whom you student teach. I understand why Dr. Matthews talks about worldview, but I think about it more in terms of philosophy—challenging philosophy or changing philosophy. If you are solid in your philosophy and you’re finding a person to student teach with and mentor to student teach with that’s the

complete opposite of the spectrum, you need to know that going in. My cooperating teacher and I don't agree on everything, which is good. I don't think you want to student teach with somebody that agrees on everything with you, but we're also not opposites in everything, either. So, we're both challenging each other with our different philosophies and growing as a result of our conversations, but I'm not in direct conflict with his views because the overall philosophies that he has, I hold, too. (MUS 495 focus group discussion, 11/18/15)

Rachel and her cooperating teacher did have opposing philosophies on some topics of music education, but the conversations based in those divergent philosophies led to increased understanding of different viewpoints and a broadening of perspectives, resulting in new conceptions and ideas about music education for both parties.

Challenges to Occupational Identity Formation

Tensions Between Performance and Education Aspects

While a number of students identified components of the music teacher education program as being particularly “disruptive” for students’ occupational identities, some students spoke at length about the perceived tensions that exist between the performance and education aspects of the School of Music and how those tensions, as well as learning in an environment with those tensions, affected development of their occupational identities. Two students, Joseph and Adele, discussed their perceptions of tension between vocal performance and education majors:

Joseph (fifth-year male): At some point, there started to form small animosities between some of the vocal performance majors and some of the vocal education majors and I saw that in the instrumental world, too. Animosity between the performance and education majors. We've all heard about the stories about competition and stuff...

Adele (fifth-year female): Nodding loudly. [all laughing] And I straddled this line because I'm a double major. I'm also a vocal performance major. So, it's been really interesting for me, trying to *prove* myself as a performance major. Trying to exist in that world while being an education major, too. I need to be careful to not make performance majors mad by what I say about education or not be offended by things they would say about education in general and about music in general and about musicians in general. It's *really* been a conflict for me. But, hearing both groups talk about what makes a good

musician or what makes music worth performing or worth listening to or whatever has been really interesting because I've been so close to the performance majors and the education majors. I've gotten a real sense of the way my ideology has shifted as I've taken my education classes and continued listening to performance majors' opinions about education. (MUS 336B focus group discussion, 12/8/15)

Adele's statement suggests that there is a "divide" in her studio between the vocal performance and the vocal education majors. Her perception of having to "prove" that, due to her dual major and identity as an educator, she is of the same quality as the other performance majors in her studio suggests an institutional value (Schein, 1985, 2004) that performance majors are valued more within the culture of the School of Music. Additionally, her perception of having to "walk a line" between not offending performance majors with potentially oft-putting remarks about education and her need to not get offended by performance majors' remarks regarding education have led to self-described inner conflict. Other authors have discussed these feelings of conflict and tension within pre-service music educators due to the higher value placed on performance majors within the culture of the School of Music (Aróstegui, 2004; Kingsbury, 1984, 1988; Nettle, 1995; Woodford, 2002).

Stigmatization of Education Students

Two other students, Michael and Hope, discussed the unequal privileges between performance and education students and the stigmatization of education students:

Michael (fifth-year male): There is definitely a stigma of education majors in the School of Music. As far as the studios, a lot of it comes from the philosophy of the individual applied professor. Education majors in certain studios really get the short stick. Like, significantly. They get less lesson time, they get lesson time with grad students and not the applied professor, and their general playing isn't really cared about. You can tell and it's just weird. It's a strange environment. When I think of my experience in my studio, it's very much *not* like that. We get an hour a week, education or performance. We're placed in chamber ensembles not based on our major. I'm an education major and I was in an ensemble with other grad students. They weren't like, "He's not a performance major, so why would we put him with grad student performance majors?" They just don't think that way. I think it really does depend on your studio. And so, for any of those problems to be fixed, there's no other way to address it, other than the applied professor

or changing the requirements in the schedule. If you're an education or performance major, you will be get X amount of time each week, this same amount of time each week with this professor. That'll be it. That's the only way to change that culture. Otherwise, you're just going to continue to have this stigma of performance majors' time is more important and it's more valuable for me [the applied professor] to spend an hour with a performance major than an hour with an education major, which, to me, makes no sense at all. (MUS 495 focus group discussion, 11/18/15)

Hope (fifth-year female): In my studio, I wasn't known as a performer. I really identified as an educator – really strongly. But, to my professor and my performance peers, I was *just* the educator and I was treated like I was *less than*. And I grew to actually hate my instrument. I hated practicing. I didn't think it was worth it. This kind of sucks to say, but I don't think, except for playing some “boom chicks boom chicks” for my classroom, I haven't sat down and played it. How long has it been since I *had* to do that? I feel like I was the runt of the studio. I felt that, during my lesson times, my time wasn't really valuable. I felt like I was just forgotten about and that sucks. I got through it because I really wanted to *teach* and I was super strong willed about it. What would be really cool, and this would be a complete change for the School of Music and I doubt that it would happen, but if I could do anything, it would be to not have four years of lessons on the same instrument. Maybe have a year of two, and then allow those other two years to learn other instruments. For me personally, for elementary, I wish I could play guitar more. Yeah, there's a class guitar, but it's a semester. Why couldn't I have some more ukulele? I know that requires a professor to do those things and I get all of that. But, so much time was invested in practicing and, for me, personally, I get for other people that it's important to be good on your instrument and that makes you a musician, but that didn't do anything for me. It made me bitter towards music and not teaching. When I got into a classroom is when I started to feel happy. And I sing in the classroom, so why couldn't I do more singing opportunities? Make me more well-rounded instead of focusing five hours a day on one instrument. Why couldn't I stop that after my second year and pick up more teaching opportunities and things like that? That's what I think would have been better and maybe, for me, for my instrument, that would stop some of the competitive things and me feeling like I don't belong. (MUS 495 focus group discussion, 11/18/15)

Michael has an applied professor who believes that *all* students are entitled to the same amount of resources and opportunities, regardless of major. While he has had experiences that are comparable to his performance major peers, his education peers in other studios have not fared nearly as well and are subjected to unequal amounts of lesson time and lower expectations of achievement. Similar to Adele, performance majors in certain studios are valued more than education majors and reap benefits that may assist them with achieving higher levels of progress in musicianship development than their education peers, leading to a more pronounced

difference that is based on musicianship rather than teaching expertise (Roberts, 1991b). Both students offered suggestions grounded in their own perceptions and experiences for improving equity among students and preparing pre-service music educators for the variety of proficiencies required for their future classrooms.

Researchers have found that music education majors may feel stigmatized by being labeled as educators (Austin, Isbell, & Russell, 2012; Conway et al., 2010; Dolloff, 2006; L’Roy, 1983; Prescesky, 1997; Roberts, 1991c; Woodford, 2002). Hope’s labeling as such by her applied professors and educators led to a perception of being marginalized and, ultimately, a feeling of hatred for her instrument and practicing. Despite her negative experiences within her studio, Hope’s strong identity as and desire to be an educator, as well as her perseverance, led her through particularly trying moments. This mirrors L’Roy’s (1983) finding in that a strong sense of professional identity helped her to experience professional achievement and success. Other pre-service educators with a less developed sense of teacher identity, however, may experience confusion and be unable to endure a similar situation, leading to negative consequences that can include dropping the music education major or leaving the School of Music entirely.

Focus on Performance Aspects

Another student, Christopher, discussed his frustration with the espoused values (Schein, 1985, 2004) of the School of Music, as manifested via performance-centric requirements, and how they prevent him from exploring more areas within music education, as well as the conflict students observe in teaching methods between applied faculty and music education faculty:

There’s some major disconnect in the School of Music between what the music education faculty are teaching you and what your performance faculty are teaching you. There’s not any creative kind of learning at all going on in lessons and I think there should be a place for that. I think that, in our lessons, there’s no creative anything. It’s even more

frustrating because I have an issue with the fact that our applied lessons have so much weight over everything we do here in the School of Music. SO much emphasis is put on your lessons and how good you are at your instrument. And that's fine if you're a performance major. That makes sense. I would be perfectly fine taking lessons here and learning how to be better at the trombone because that's what that teacher is supposed to do for me. But, also, why am I spending an hour a week with this teacher whose teaching is important, and I think is worthwhile and beneficial, but why are they my *main* professor as a music education student? I'm not an instrument major. I'm a *music education* major. Why don't I get to spend an hour every week with Dr. Cunningham or Dr. Emerson? Why don't I get to spend an hour a week having music education lessons? I think that would be SO much more worthwhile for me and every other music education student, then taking these lessons that most of us don't really care about. It just gets monotonous and we play the same exercises for our teacher over and over and it's like, "What's the point?" I'm not here to do this. Why does this have so much weight for my grades and for my schooling? And, I'm willing to accept the fact that I'm young and I might not really understand the impact that trombone playing will have on my education, because even the graduate students who I've talked to, the people who are older who I've talked to about this are kind of like, "Well, it really is important. You really do have to do it." I'm like, "Okay." I understand that it's important and necessary, but that's not what I'm here for. Why am I spending so much time on this thing when I want to be learning more about teaching kids and developing myself to be a teacher? (MUS 469 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Christopher noted a dichotomy between the perceived non-creative methods used in his lessons and what he experiences in his music education contexts, creating a sense of anger within him. Additionally, he recognizes and appreciates the importance of applied lessons in the music major curriculum, but disagrees with how much time is devoted to applied lessons over the course of one's academic career. He feels that music education majors should concentrate their efforts on topics that will directly impact their future work as educators. Perhaps rather than having the same amount of time in applied lessons as performance majors, some applied lesson time could be diverted towards music education experiences that strengthen students' identities as educators.

Lack of String "Community"

One student, Rachel, spoke to the difficulty in identity change that she has experienced due to the low number of string players enrolled in the music teacher education program:

Rachel (fifth-year female): The lack of opportunities here as a string person has been particularly difficult for me. Because there are so few of us, most of what we have to do is categorize under something else. It's categorized by whether we're instrumental, which, instrumental conducting was fantastic if you want to be a band person, but that's not what I do. I've been learning through student teaching that that type of style doesn't work in orchestra. It was very, very frustrating for me because I felt like I had to relearn everything because there was nothing here tailored towards my experience as a string educator. Bows move very differently than air through an instrument and being able to connect to that, to what kids need or being able to move my arms freely, I struggled with this for the first two months of student teaching. It's finally getting to the point where I'm comfortable being big and using my hands to mirror bow movements. I was never shown that here. I know there's not very many of us, but part of why there might not be very many of us is because those opportunities aren't here. I think that's a really big thing that's lacking in this program, because, as a string person, I'm constantly feeling left out because everyone around me is band, or choir, or general music. I feel kind of off in my own little island half the time and I feel all this conflict and confusion surrounding my identity. *Who am I?* I felt like student teaching was a lot of completely new stuff, which is what all teaching is, but I wished I had more stuff to draw on from my college classes that because that's something I never got. (MUS 495 focus group discussion, 11/18/15)

Rachel is one of the few string music education majors in the School of Music. Her perception is that, due to the low number of string students in the music education program, concepts in "instrumental" conducting and other "instrumental" courses are biased towards the idiosyncrasies of the concert band and preparing students for that context. As a result of not having educative experiences designed for string-specific contexts, Rachel felt a sense of frustration at having to disregard habits during student teaching that were learned in her pre-service classes. The "instrumental" courses experiences, as well as the lack of a string "community" within her education program, contributed to a less developed sense of teacher identity within Rachel and led to feelings of confusion, similar to students in L'Roy's (1983) study.

Music Education Admissions Policies

Also, School of Music policies may restrict the development and “disruption” of pre-service music educators’ identities. The music education faculty noted that the applied faculty control admission to the School of Music:

Dr. Lee: I think there’s a systemic built-in challenge that we have not been able to get over. The gateway to be a music education major is through the studio; the audition. So, for the guitarist and the songwriter, there is not a path unless you can successfully audition in the studio. It’s a challenge not only for us, but for the profession and I don’t know what the answer is. It does mean, in a way, that we do track because we track for people who are highly, technically proficient on their instrument.

Dr. Cunningham: It’s even more subtle sometimes than that. It’s not even just the admission into a studio, but it’s the funding support to enable them to come because that’s given not on the basis of how good they will be in their potential chosen career path, which is being a music teacher, but the funding is distributed based upon how well they sing or play. That’s challenging.

Dr. Matthews: We also don’t have enough diversity. That’s tied to this issue. There are financial and socioeconomic barriers for certain populations of students that we are locked into, that if we had more financial resources, we had a different policy set, we could recruit and maintain and support and nurture a much more diverse population. I think that’s a real problem for us. And not just us. System wide. Profession wide, it’s a problem. This is a problem for us and we need to do something about it and getting the rest of our colleagues in this unit to do something is going to be a big struggle. (faculty focus group discussion, 1/12/16)

Current admission practices present challenges to “disrupting” students’ occupational identities and preconceptions of music education in several ways. Students may be admitted to a School of Music for their performance and musicianship skills, but not have the proper dispositions and personal skills to be an effective music teacher. Also, as researchers have found, auditioning students may identify more as a performer than an educator because that is what is valued and expected in the admissions process (Aróstegui, 2004; Bernard, 2005; Beynon, 1998; Bouij, 1998, 2004; Froehlich & L’Roy, 1985; L’Roy, 1985; Mark, 1998; Pellegrino, 2009; Roberts, 1991c; Scheib, 2006; Woodford, 2002). The potential of “disrupting” occupational

identities may be limited by the lack of teacher identity. Furthermore, students' occupational identities may be "disrupted," but the absence of necessary teaching dispositions limits their effectiveness in the classroom. Also, Koza (2008) discussed how schools of music "listen for Whiteness" and practice social funding of race by "othering" those who may be outstanding musicians but do not play "traditional" Western-based instruments or are not educated to sing in a bel canto style, eliminating an entire population of potentially excellent educators and perpetuating Western-based classical music to be taught in public schools. Finally, systemic factors that have influenced participation in formal music education experiences, such as race, class, and socioeconomic status, act as additional barriers for potentially outstanding music educators to gain admission into a School of Music (Koza, 2008).

The music education faculty devised a method towards addressing what they described as "flawed policy": a short interview that assesses students' interests in and dispositions towards teaching, as well as an aural skills test that includes the echoing of rhythm and tonal patterns, singing a familiar song, and sight-reading a line of music. These activities take place on the same day as the audition with the applied faculty:

Dr. Cunningham: When I got here, we didn't have interviews and we didn't have aural skills tests. Now, we interview every single person who auditions to get a sense of their disposition in terms of being a music teacher. What's motivating them? Do they seem to have the personal skills to be success in this? We know that matters. Yet, even though we have this information and we know personal skills and disposition, combined with the aural skills test, are fairly predictive of success in teaching, they only serve in an advisory role. They can be especially helpful for people who might be on the bubble. It doesn't have any real power in the decision making process.

Dr. Matthews: The interview and the aural skills tests open up ways for us to talk to applied faculty about students that we couldn't do if we weren't them and having some part in the audition process. So, when Dr. Lee interviews a killer kid, she can immediately reach out to the voice faculty. If this kid can sing well enough to get into a studio, this is somebody that we *really* want in our education program. I think it's a game changer. It is, however, a significant amount of time. There are Fridays we all look at each other and go, "I'm not sure that was worth four hours of my time." The only thing

worse would be if we didn't do it. If we didn't do it, it would send a pretty loud message to the applied faculty that we're not worried about who we get in here. So, it opens up conversations and relationships. Dr. Woolfolk has a better relationship with the string faculty because she has sat in on auditions then if she had never done that. She's showing them that she values what they're doing and what they're hearing.

Dr. Woolfolk: The string faculty have even said to me, "How did this person do on their interview and aural skills test?" If it's somebody on the bubble and they're not so enthusiastic, but I say, "Oh, this person seems to be a natural born teacher and has great aural skills," they'll take that person. I think that's true of several faculty now. I've had faculty run into my office and say, "How did this person interview because I'd sure like her to be in music ed."

Dr. Matthews: And I'm not trying to paint a rosy picture because Dr. Lee's point is the one that should matter. We don't have much of a voice on who gets here to help them have a voice as teachers.

Dr. Cunningham: When you look at the policy, it is flawed policy.

Dr. Matthews: We're doing the best we can with the flawed policy.

Dr. Cunningham: But, we have built relationships that have enabled us to do end-runs around the policy sometimes. (faculty focus group interview, 1/12/16)

The interview and aural skills test has given music teacher educators the means to assess students' depth of teacher disposition and musicianship skills, but also has created dialogue between them and applied faculty and a sense of presence on audition days. These assessments and music teacher education faculty's visibility demonstrate that they have an interest in who is admitted. Their "voice" on these important days has, in the faculty's opinion, been beneficial for the program and helped admit students who have proper dispositions towards teaching, even through the policy remains "flawed" in that the interview and aural skills results do not play a formal role in the admissions process. Additionally, the dialogue and relationships built between music teacher education and applied faculty through the assessments has benefitted occasional students who may have had outstanding potential as an educator, but may not have been able to matriculate into the School of Music through the audition process alone.

Summary

Several structural components of the music teacher education program have resulted in “disruption” of students’ occupational identities and preconceptions of music education. A “de-tracked” program sequence allows students to take classes that may be outside of students’ primary means of music making production (vocal or instrumental) and gives them additional options to satisfy program requirements. Students identified the “de-tracked” program sequence as helping to create a music teacher education curriculum for all pre-service educators to learn within, regardless of applied instrument. Students also noted that the absence of “tracks” and resulting curricular course structure facilitated the creation of relationships, helped to foster a sense of educator identity with espoused values (Schein, 1985, 2004) of being outstanding K-12 educators, and allowed for all educators to experience “disruptive” moments in their education. Additionally, the “de-tracked” program sequence fostered a feeling of mutual support towards the common goal of being outstanding K-12 music educators.

Observations and microteachings across multiple grade levels, socioeconomic contexts, and teaching styles that were components of music teacher education classes, when planned carefully, “disrupted” students’ occupational identities and conceptions of music education as these experiences were, most likely, different from their own elementary and secondary school experiences and provided additional perspectives of what music education can be. Observing and working with the same class over a period of time gave pre-service educators opportunities to view growth in children over time and provided them with valuable teaching experiences within contexts that challenged their notions of music education. Students in MUS 469 (Teaching Secondary General Music), which did not have a fieldwork component, spoke of a lack of credibility for concepts discussed in the course as they could not observe course content and

theory put into practice. As a result, students doubted the viability of the course's methods within a school music program, particularly within secondary schools with performance-based ensembles or few teachers on staff. Music teacher educators also should be judicious with who pre-service educators observe. Two students, Suzanne and Stuart, provided powerful examples of the negative influence observations can have on occupational identities when the contexts are poor models of music education.

Some focus group participants identified student teaching as the period of time when their occupational identities shifted dramatically to assume the role of teachers, whereas other students may have had "microshifts" in occupational identities throughout their time in the music teacher education program. The feeling of being "students" and taking classes on a regular basis may inhibit occupational identity development. For some students, student teaching and working in a school context daily may be the only way to develop and "disrupt" occupational identities.

Students and faculty also noted aspects of the School of Music that can interfere with occupational identity development and identity "disruption." Students perceived performance majors as being valued more within the culture of the School of Music, with performance majors of some studios receiving additional amounts of lesson time and being held to a higher musical standard than education majors. These factors, along with the stigmatization of being labeled as an "educator" rather than a "performer," led to tension and inner conflict within students. Music education students with a less developed sense of teacher identity may be unable to endure these types of situations, which may lead to negative consequences that can include dropping the music education major or leaving the School of Music entirely.

Additionally, School of Music admissions policies favor students with excellent performance skills and musicality, but not necessarily the possession of a teacher identity, nor

the possession of dispositions and skills required to be an effective music teacher, the lack of which may limit students' effectiveness in the classroom. Additional barriers to entry include societal factors that have influenced participation in formal music education experiences, such as race, class, and socioeconomic status, and School of Music audition requirements that are restricted to traditional western-European based repertoire and performance practices.

CHAPTER VI: “I HAVEN’T CHANGED THE ‘WHAT’ I WANT TO DO. I CHANGED THE ‘HOW’ I WANT TO DO IT”: “DISRUPTIVE” INFLUENCES WITHIN THE MUSIC TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAM AND THEIR MANIFESTATIONS WITHIN OCCUPATIONAL IDENTITIES

Throughout this chapter, I will discuss the phenomena of pre-service music educator occupational identity “disruption” as guided by the remaining two research questions of the qualitative phase of this study:

4. Why are certain communities, interactions, and persons within the cultural cohort and the culture the most significant “disruptive” influences on pre-service music educators’ occupational identities? How are those “disruptions” created?
5. How do these “disruptions” manifest themselves in pre-service music educators’ occupational identities? How do these “disruptions” manifest themselves in pre-service music educators’ conceptions of and beliefs and attitudes about music education?

MUS 177 & MUS 277: The Foundation of the Program

MUS 177 (Introduction to Music Education) and MUS 277 (Principles of Music Education) are two courses taken during the first and second year, respectively, of participation in the music teacher education program. These classes serve as a two-course sequence grounded in music teacher identity development, philosophy, and contemporary issues in music education. Even though these are two discrete courses, students and faculty almost always spoke of these classes as one unit. Thus, for purposes of this discussion, they will be treated as such, with differentiations noted as appropriate. Additionally, Dr. Lee has been an instructor of record for MUS 177, Women’s Chamber Ensemble, MUS 336B (Ensemble Conducting: Choral), and MUS

468 (Teaching Choral Music). Students referred to Dr. Lee throughout conversations in relation to these four classes. Thus, these four classes are presented sequentially.

During the faculty focus group discussion, the faculty explained that these courses have not always existed in their present state and discussed the purpose of the two courses:

Dr. Woolfolk: When I came [in the fall of 1985], we...used to have a more silo-focused, ensemble-focused curriculum, one that's focused on smaller issues for the most part, such as technique and how you recruit and keep your uniforms clean. We later transitioned to a less structured degree program, meaning that there are less "siloed" paths for the students to follow. Initially, we had one class to cover what we now do in two classes. You had to accomplish everything that we now do in 277 and 177 in one class. That was only two credits, which is why it wound up getting all the philosophical, historical, psychological stuff in that beginning class. Students just weren't ready to handle that yet. So, breaking it up into one two-credit class and one three-credit class enabled us to put more of that teacher content material in 277 and to focus more on identity in 177: how you begin to shift your view to the "other side" of the desk into your teacher role. With that class being so much more about teacher identity, it is so much richer than trying to teach them things that they aren't ready to learn about or are unnecessary, like certain parts of history of music education and that sort of thing.

Dr. Cunningham: It was our hope that our students would start viewing themselves as music teachers and educators earlier in their degree program and really start developing a strong identity that they can use as an orientating lens for the rest of their experiences here.

Dr. Woolfolk: We can start earlier with that identity progression by having the introduction class in the freshman year, rather than later in the degree program as many schools do, if they have an introductory class at all.

Dr. Cunningham: And I actually heard some comments from studio teachers or one of the composers about how annoyed they are that our students think of themselves first as teachers, rather than as musicians first. (faculty focus group discussion, 1/12/16)

Dr. Matthews: 177 and 277 are not about how to teach specific music classes. They're about being a music teacher and what that means...what our profession is like. We back up a little bit in those foundations courses to look at the profession from a landscape view down at ground level. Speaking as an instructor of 277, I look at it like a philosophy class, which is also sometimes challenging for undergraduates. The research on this is that fewer than 1% of undergraduate music education students have a stand-alone music education philosophy class in their curriculum. My guess is that there's not a huge amount higher than that that have a philosophy unit in a class. Philosophy is often something that is held off until graduate school and I think that's a big mistake. I like to get it early, plant the seeds, and then refer to them throughout the course. I think what

you're doing is giving this kind of introductory experience with that philosophical content, with the curricular content that we touch on in the course, with the assessment content that we touch on as well, that hopefully we will spiral ahead in a 400 level class, touch back on it, and, then again, put a finishing touch on it in student teacher seminar in the fourth or fifth year. I think that's the only way we have a chance at affecting some kind of change in students' habits of mind and dispositions over a four or five year curriculum. I have no problem with touching this multiple times, which means, as they're accruing field experience along the way, maybe their understandings become deeper along the way. (interview, 1/25/16)

Before the present curricular structure, one introductory class contained all of the concepts discussed in the current two-class sequence. Furthermore, the amount of material discussed in the previous introductory class proved to be overwhelming and inappropriate for students at the time of their development as pre-service music educators. Realizing this, the faculty decided to create a two-course foundational sequence. The purpose of the first class, now known as Introduction to Music Education, is to develop pre-service music education students' identities at the beginning of their music teacher education experience. It is the faculty's hope that the discussions that take place in MUS 177 regarding topics such as the development of meaningful student-teacher relationships, music teacher identity, philosophy of music education, social class, gender and gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, special education, technology, and teacher vision, help to create, in Dr. Cunningham's words, an "orientating lens" through which students view their instructional experiences within the School of Music, the university at large, and out in the schools. As students proceed through the music teacher education program, they can build and reflect upon shared meanings (Schein, 1985) created through class discussions, creating their identity as educators as they continue to progress through music education and non-music education courses, as well as observe in area schools and teach in microteaching experiences. The faculty then created an additional three-credit

semester-long class, now known as Foundations of Music Education, which includes more discussion of philosophy, as well as history, assessment, and classroom management.

Students across focus group discussions gave examples of the influence the two classes had on their occupational identities and preconceptions of music education:

Erin (second-year female): I think it's really cool in 177 and 277 that we talk about finding ways to teach a guitar class and other kinds of things to try and get as many people involved and engaged in music as possible, instead of just focusing on 10% of students, or whatever it is, who are interested in being in one of the more classical classes. Even then, not just playing the classical Western music that we focus on in the profession and that we focused on in high school. Finding different cultures and stuff. I think that's really cool because that's something that's never occurred to me before because that's not something that we did at my high school. (MUS 277 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

Katie (second-year female): I think the 177 and 277 classes teach you to be a lot more open-minded about possibilities in education. I came from a very "traditional" music program at my high school and thought that there was only *one* way to teach. Both 177 and 277 have us in the public school classroom, which is really cool. The observations were really helpful for me to see different teachers, what they teach, and how they teach. I found in 177 and 277 that education itself is an art and that there are so many different ways to teach. There's not a "right" way to instruct. Two people can teach something completely differently, but both can be effective for different students. This is especially true with the technology discussions that we had in 177. In 277, my mind was a lot more open to different kinds of instruments and making music with iPads and how that can be really useful. I think I would have been used to it before coming here and maybe not thought it was as valid. Sometime after the 177 technology discussion, I met a student who was playing oboe and he was telling me how they had been having an iPad ensemble in their school. I was really excited about that because it makes me think, as a teacher, as being creative and trying to do things. I'm a lot more open to that. (MUS 177 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

Rich (second-year male): My upbringing was very centered on competition. So, I kind of grew up thinking that you need to play an instrument as well as you can. No matter what pieces comes in front of you, you need to make sure that you play all of them perfectly. I was always very competitive in that all that I cared about was that I wanted to have students who were robots. I wanted them to destroy all mankind with their instruments. I wanted them to be *so* good and dominate at competition. I always knew that I wanted to teach high school or collegiate and I wanted to have high performing ensembles. But, going through 177 and 277, I haven't changed the "what" I want to do. I changed the "how" I want to do it. I don't think that what I had—people that are so good at their instruments—that's not really music. It's learning the language, understanding the bigger picture...the story behind music and the feeling and the emotion. That's what I think can really connect with students. I've also kind of been a little more relaxed with my

competitiveness. I really don't care if my future students are prodigies or don't know the fingerings. I really don't care. All I care about is if they love music or not. I want to be able to provide opportunities for them so that they can find what they love about music. Everybody does love music. It's just finding what they love about it... I'm just not so centered on being good on your instrument. I think there's more to it than that. I've changed my focus and 177 and 277 have really helped with that. (MUS 177 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

Bobby (fourth-year male): When I was in high school, I had a ton of great experiences. The ones that I remember don't have anything to do with being on stage and performing music. It was all the community aspect of that: the relationship that I had with my teachers and my best friends. All of my best friends I met through band. That's what's important to me. When I came here, I figured that since I had done so much music in high school, it had to have been music...the cause of all my great experiences had to have been music. But, going through 177 and 277, I started to realize that it wasn't music. It was just education, really, that brought all those experiences. I just happened to do music because pretty much all that I did [laughing] in high school was music classes. I didn't have anything else to go back on. Now, with how I view education, partly from 177 and 277, I'm going to be a music teacher, but I personally think I would be just as happy and successful teaching *any* subject just because I know that what I will bring to my students will be the same no matter what it is that I'm teaching. 177 and 277 were kind of in my developing stage. They kind of helped me figure out where I was going with my identity as a teacher. (MUS 277 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

Fletcher (fourth-year male): When I first started here, I was all about high school choral music...so gung-ho about it. I was going to be God's gift to choral music education. But, my thinking first started to change in 177 and then solidified in 277. My identity changed not to one of a high school choir director, but really a secondary music *teacher*. So, starting to question whether or not having a good choir is the most important thing, or what I thought a valuable musical experience was. I still would love to have a really good choir and I *love* choir. But, I think there are other options that I didn't realize before, and there are a lot of options. I thought I was going to be a high school choir director, but, now, as I go through these classes, early childhood and stuff, it just changes the way I was thinking about music education. The philosophy classes—177 and 277—started to make that change happen for me. I decided early on that I was going to take early childhood because I was trying to keep an open mind to other things and, like, not just focus on teaching high school choir. And, I think part of the reason for that was my 177 and 277 classes, where we talked about issues like that all of the time. All the different ways that we can be teaching music. (MUS 177 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

MUS 177 and 277 were pivotal courses in these students' development as pre-service music teacher educators. Erin and Katie, both of whom participated in traditional, performance-based ensemble programs in high school, had their preconceptions of music education "disrupted"

by discussions that addressed additional means of teaching music, such as the use of technology and the implementation of a guitar class. Erin remarked that an educator could still use the traditional ensemble as a teaching medium, but incorporate a variety of repertoire that is representative of world cultures, rather than standard Western-based classical repertoire that tends to dominate school music programs (Heuser, 2011) and may be considered irrelevant by students (Williams, 2011a). Rich had a somewhat similar experience with “disruption” of his belief regarding competition in music education. His experiences in MUS 177 and 277 allowed him to transcend a teacher-centered, competition-based philosophy to one that is student-centered and is more concerned with providing learners with opportunities that allow them to develop a love of music.

Bobby and Fletcher experienced “disruption” of their occupational identities. Through his work in MUS 177 and 277, Bobby realized that, even though he was learning how to teach music, his identity was not necessarily exclusively that of being a “*music* educator.” Bobby’s identity is one of being an “educator” who would derive pleasure from and be successful teaching *any* subject, not exclusively music. Fletcher started in the School of Music strongly identifying as a choral ensemble director. His MUS 177/277 experience, however, made him question the centrality of the choral ensemble in a music education program and what a “quality” music education is. He began to embrace the identity of a secondary music teacher who is interested in teaching music through means in addition to the performance-based ensemble. Additionally, his “open mind” and interest in taking the Teaching Early Childhood Music class (MUS 465) may be indicative of further occupational identity “disruption” in that his identity is shifting to something that is not exclusively secondary school related, nor ensemble-based. Dr. Cunningham,

the instructor of record for MUS 465, spoke more about the implications of MUS 177 and 277 for her class:

There certainly are students who have experiences with young children through the early childhood methods class [MUS 465] and through the elementary general methods class [MUS 467], who had never really considered that as a possibility before...I think it starts in 177 and in 277, because they discuss important topics and go out into the schools and they see people doing this who are pretty magical at what they do. All of a sudden, their eyes are open to that as a possibility. So, the pump has already been primed, to a large extent, by the time they get to me. (interview, 1/20/16)

The requirements for MUS 177 and 277 require three and six public school music class observations, respectively. These observations, combined with the discussions, create a “readiness” for students’ occupational identities to become further “disrupted” during the Teaching Early Childhood and Teaching Elementary Music methods classes.

Dr. Lee, the instructor of record for MUS 177 during the spring semesters, provided her perspective as to why her class may be influential for her students:

I think we start to help our students find their voices right from the beginning in 177. Having that freshman level course is a game changer because they develop a sense of identity with one another. They see themselves as emerging teachers. Many, many programs, they don’t get anything until sophomore year, if at all. I think the way that we’ve designed that course with the “bigger questions” is key. We’re talking about the bigger ideas in the profession right away when they arrive. “Here are the topics that are out there right now that you need to be thinking of.” We’ve moved away from, “Here’s what elementary general music is...here’s what choral music is.” They have no context for that. That’s material that they didn’t even have any context yet to really be able to wrap their heads around because they haven’t done anything yet. They just got to campus. So, I was just much more interested in them trying to connect up their views of themselves; to be able to articulate something about themselves in relationship to the possibility of being a teacher, with the idea in mind that the most important thing about making the choice to be a teacher is whether or not you can make relationships with your students. I think that has to have a foundational effect throughout the curriculum. 177 is really about opening dialogue and for them to begin to see themselves into what it might be like to be a teacher. At the beginning of the semester, they’re still speaking from their high school experience. Almost all of their references go back to, “Well, when I was in high school” or “My band director.” And that’s completely normal and natural. Some of the early disruption is simply making it evident that their choice to be a music teacher involves more than the setting that they were just in, and that’s hard for some of them to see. So, even to consider the possibility that being a music teacher’s not being a band

director is a stretch for some of them. Presenting lots of pictures of teaching, which we do in various ways, whether it's through the media or YouTube or bringing someone into the classroom...giving students permission to think about being a different music teacher than they thought they were going to be when they came here. (interview, 1/20/16)

As expected (Bergee, 1992; Bergee et al., 2001; Campbell, 1999; Cox, 1997; Dolloff, 1999; Draves, 2012; Ferguson, 2003; Fredrickson & Williams, 2009; Isbell, 2008; Kelly, 2000; Madsen & Kelly, 2002; Mark, 1998; Rickels et al., 2010; Roberts, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c; Schmidt, 1998; Thompson, 2000; Thompson & Campbell, 2003), students' opinions are grounded in their secondary school music experiences. Dr. Lee attributes the "disruption" of students' preconceptions and occupational identities to the different perspectives that she brings to the classroom through discussion of unit topics and the use of ancillary materials. Dr. Lee also believes that the structure of her class—discussion-based—and how discussion is facilitated is important towards the goal of "disruption":

We begin to enlarge their world a little bit by engaging students in the classroom at a fundamental level. I want them to think deeply into issues and I want them to feel comfortable and free to have opinions that are different from mine. I also want them to feel comfortable expressing themselves in an environment that feels safe—a "safe" classroom" or a "safe space." If you're disrupting something, it's actually not always comfortable. But, there has to be this trust that's built in before we can feel comfortable to take on those sorts of complex issues. And, the climate from class to class shifts from one semester to another. The feel of a class shifts. Sometimes I worry about the comfort level of some people because I know that for some, this is the most diverse place they've ever been. Simply moving here and coming to this School of Music. We still have so many segregated areas in our state. Not only have they not seen people or interacted with people of color, but they've never had to consider outside what their homogenous hometown looks like. The trickiest subject for me is religion...more than any of the other topics, because at least, in the other topics, generally speaking, they're looking at situations of "othering." So, something that's outside of their experience. But, for the ones that come with very deeply held religious beliefs...that, for me, is trickier because that's very much a part of their identity. To suggest that there are other ways of engaging the world, other people have different ways of doing that, can be super challenging. (interview, 1/20/16)

Dr. Lee endeavors to develop a climate (Schein, 1985) that influences how students interact with each other. More specifically, she creates a space in which students can express

their views fully on potentially controversial topics and develop a sense of trust with one another. This type of classroom environment, which she described as a “safe classroom” (Carter, 2011) or a “safe space” (Holley & Steiner, 2005), is important in order for students to have discussions that can “disrupt” their occupational identities. However, Dr. Lee admits that certain topics that are particularly close to one’s identity, such as religion, have the potential to create potentially uncomfortable discussions. She admitted that “disruption” is not necessarily a comfortable sensation. Dr. Matthews, the instructor of record for MUS 277 during the fall semesters, elaborated further:

There is a difference between having a safe environment and recognizing that being safe isn’t always the best environment in which to learn; that, sometimes, you have to feel a little bit uncomfortable in order to *really* learn. You have to get moved out of your comfort zone. It’s not just about always feeling safe. Sometimes you have to set up an environment in your classes where students feel uncomfortable and are approaching ideas that are new to them. That’s not a bad thing. (interview, 1/25/16)

In Dr. Matthews’ opinion, there is a fine line between being “safe” and being “comfortable.” Feeling safe can lead one to stay within a “comfort zone” that encourages complacency. Discomfort, however, motivates one to step outside that “comfort zone” and explore potentially provocative topics and accompanying viewpoints. Classes can operate as “safe spaces” and, perhaps, facilitate moments of feeling uncomfortable. These “uncomfortable” moments may be the ones that truly generate learning opportunities.

The “Weed Out” Classes

According to some students, discussions in MUS 177 and 277 have influenced some of their peers to choose a different major within the School of Music or drop out of the School of Music entirely:

Kevin (fourth-year male): 177 and 277 are “weed out classes.” Just so you know. [all in attendance are laughing] I’m just saying. The people who switched out? Those classes were the reason. Education wasn’t for them after those classes. It was probably a good

switch for them, but those classes kind of felt like the music ed weed out classes. I don't know why. "You better decide right now if you want to be a teacher." That's what I kind of felt like, especially 277. It was very like, "I'm going to tell you everything that is wrong with this and how difficult your life is going to be." A lot of times, it was like, "Oh my God!" One student who I know dropped out of the School of Music entirely. He cited 277 as the reason why.

Ana (third-year female): Right! 177 is the class that's like, "This is what music ed is like. Are you SURE that you're in for this ride?"

Elliott (fourth-year male): 277's like, "Are you REALLY sure?"

Eve (third-year female): A lot of my friends dropped their education majors because of 177 and 277...because they realized that's not what they wanted. They're happy they took them because they're like, "I wouldn't have been good at it. I wouldn't have liked it and I figured it out so much earlier than I would have anytime else." Those people tend to be like, "I will teach band, I will teach high school band, and they will be the best band and I don't care about anything else." Then, I'm like, "Well, I want to work with babies and choir and everyone [all in attendance laugh]." (MUS 455 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

For some students, the discussions, observations, and overall "presentation" of music education in MUS 177 and 277 may be so incompatible with some pre-service music educators' existing understanding of music education that accommodation and expansion of that understanding cannot be made. The stress between conceptions of music education grounded in secondary school experiences, career goal within music education, and "disruptive" moments occurring throughout the courses cannot be reconciled, leading to students leaving the music education program, or, as Kevin stated, the School of Music. Those students who tended to have occupational identities and schemas that were more "malleable" and "flexible," such as Eve, continued with the music education program. Eve's allusion to some of her peers suggests that students with rigid career goals and occupational identities resistant to transformation were most susceptible to dropping the major or leaving the School of Music.

Timing of Philosophical Development in the Context of Lack of Experience

Several students voiced disagreement with creating a philosophy of music education during these two classes, only not to revisit their philosophy statements later in the music teacher education program:

Wayne (fifth-year male): Now I'm student teaching and philosophy and advocacy are big topics, both in my placement and in our College of Education seminar. I'm sure that Dr. Matthews and Dr. Lee communicated about philosophy and advocacy, but it's been so long since we've really even come close to talking about those things...basically, three years.

Jen: (fifth-year female): We haven't really gone back and talked about those topics since 177 and 277. Not in student teaching seminar, either.

Wayne: Plus, I don't think you really can talk about philosophy that much until you've had experience teaching, taking methods classes, teaching some lessons to a class, go and observe classes. I think once you've done those things, then you can start to think about it. I think that, just in this past semester during my student teaching, in this past two weeks, I've developed more thoughts on my philosophy than I did my entire first two years here. Because, seriously, you have more context in your student teaching. I feel that the music student teaching seminar, [MUS] 495, I feel that's where a lot of the philosophy can be, because you're like, "I'm in a class. I'm seeing a class. I see the administration of this class. I see how the administrator directs the teacher who directs the class. I see how teachers are evaluated. I see how testing affects the kids." You're seeing everything and *then* you can start talking about your philosophy. When I was sitting there in 177 and 277, I was like, I'm coming straight out of high school, a high school senior, and I'm like [looking around like a deer in headlights], and Dr. Lee asked us to write our philosophy of music education, which was a great thing to do, but I can tell you right now that, if I read now what I wrote, I would be like, "Whoa! Clearly, I was clearly BSing this thing."

Tom (fifth-year male): It's based on a very narrow experience because all we know in high school is performance.

Wayne: While it probably was good to put those ideas together, that assignment would be so much more relevant now. It would probably be a lot more meaningful to me to have to do it now when I'm student teaching and about to get a job. I'm not sure it really meant much to me at the time.

Tom: Honestly, I would rather see the philosophy aspect bookend the degrees, because they try to get it all first in two or three semesters, and they're like "What's your philosophy?" I'm like, "I don't know! I don't have a philosophy!" It was so much to wade through, mentally. Classes like 455 (Teaching Instrumental Music) were refreshing. It's like, "Okay, let's teach some trumpet."

Wayne: How do you pick rep?

Stephanie (fourth-year female): The upper-level methods classes were like “Finally...this is actually what I’ll be doing.”

Tom: Whereas we’re doing philosophy first and they’re holding us back. We just want to teach. It should be a hand-in-hand approach throughout the entire degree.

Wayne: Dive into the fire, fail a little bit, talk about the philosophy, and then dive into the fire again with a firesuit. (MUS 455 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

As Tom paraphrased, when students first matriculate into a music teacher education program, they bring with them existing perceptions and beliefs about music teaching based on previous experiences in school music programs and ensembles that influence their values and identities as teachers (Bergee, 1992; Bergee, et al., 2001; Campbell, 1999; Cox, 1997; Dolloff, 1999; Draves, 2012; Ferguson, 2003; Fredrickson & Williams, 2009; Isbell, 2008; Kelly, 2000; Madsen & Kelly, 2002; Mark, 1998; Rickels et al., 2010; Roberts, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c; Schmidt, 1998; Thompson, 2000; Thompson & Campbell, 2003). Hence, when students arrive to the institution in their first year, their philosophies of music education are informed largely by their secondary school experiences. For students in the focus group, the failure to reference students’ philosophies of music education later in the program, particularly during student teaching, is a missed opportunity for discussion and refinement of their philosophies, actions that will benefit them during student teaching and the first years of in-service teaching.

However, some students in upper-level classes did have opportunities to either write or revise a philosophy statement from early in the music teacher education program. Two participants, Lyla and Jim, thought that subsequent revision and/or discussion of a philosophy statement at a later point in the program could be informative for both themselves and music teacher educators:

Lyla (fourth-year female): My applied instrument is violin, but I also did band in middle school and I had a really bad experience there. Since we didn't have orchestra at my school, it was always outside of the school day at outside programs for me. And so, it was always upsetting to me that not only did they not have orchestra, but there was a high dropout rate or low retention in the band program. It made me frustrated that I had to pay money to have good teachers. I had orchestra on the weekends and these great conductors, but everything I was doing were positive experiences *outside* of school. And, I always knew that I wanted to play the violin and do something with violin, and I auditioned here on performance, but then, the summer before coming here, thinking more about it, I decided to do the interview for music education because of those things. I just didn't think like having to pay money and being exclusive with music. It shouldn't be that way and I think that's what led me to music education. I wanted to make a difference. But, I had to do a philosophy statement for a class I'm in right now. So, I took the one that I had written freshman year for 177 and revised it. It was really funny because it was about me being a violinist and how violin impacted my life and it was way more about me being a musician than me being a teacher. I think in that way I used to identify more as a violinist and now I would say that I'm identifying more as a teacher, an educator. (MUS 455 focus group discussion, 12/15/15)

Jim (fourth-year male): I think, though, it was good because, like I said, for 456 and for 469 that I'm taking right now, we spent probably the first quarter of the course talking about philosophy and reading a bunch of great articles and that allowed me to reflect on what I wrote for 177 and see how I changed. (MUS 455 focus group discussion, 12/15/15)

Writing the philosophy statement during MUS 177 and then contrasting that statement with present philosophy allowed these students to understand the occupational identity change that took place over the course of their four years in the program.

Dean, a fourth-year male instrumental music education major, cited his frustration with the lack of teaching experiences during the initial portion of the music teacher education program and made the following comment based on his experiences and observations progressing through the music teacher education program:

This building, this School of Music...we're product-based. That's what we're used to. That's what we're used to expecting in trying to achieve...this product over an experience...a process. I think that's something that, when we get so absorbed in that, and then we go out to a middle school as part of our music education classes and teach, all of a sudden, it's "Whoa! This is different. This is so challenging for me." We're not working towards the same thing as we are in our college ensembles. We're not trying to clean and get everything precise and musical as possible in the same realm as what we do

in ensembles or applied study. Looking back, I kind of wish we'd do more of the getting out of the comfort zone in terms of teaching earlier. I understand why we don't and why most of our classes, for the first two, three years, are just thinking and observing. That's a philosophy, but I think it leads to a lot of burnout and a lot of jarring whiplash when we get into those scenarios. It causes a lot of anxiety and stress. I don't think any one of us are saying: "No music philosophy, ever." Just, implementation of more actual teaching to reflect on and that helps hone other things, even if it's just occasional...For some of us, I think it was great to have those teaching experiences. We should have them earlier, if at all possible. (MUS 469 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

While Dean understands the purpose of philosophical discussions and observations early in the program, he has observed his peers experiencing role conflict (Kahn et al., 1964; Scheib, 2003) between their roles as performers in the School of Music and future music educators, as well as conflict between their expectations of fieldwork experiences, including microteachings, and the realities of those incidents. By the third year of the music teacher education program, students are, most likely, socialized to a school of music's norms and accustomed to the expectations of a school of music, which tends to value performance-based activities and performance prowess. The concentration of performance-based experiences and the behaviors students exhibit to produce a "quality" music *product* can be at direct odds with the purpose of music education-based microteaching experiences—observing and/or facilitating the learning *process*—which utilize a different skill set from performing on an instrument and which may be contradictory to how students are taught in the School of Music. The conflict that is created within students by occupying these two disparate spaces may, for some individuals, lead to role conflict and, as Dean stated, anxiety and stress. Dean surmises that microteaching episodes early in the pre-service music teacher education program may avoid or alleviate the tension with the product-centric School of Music environment.

Dr. Matthews, however, voiced reservations on having recently matriculated pre-service music educators teaching K-12 students as part of coursework:

I really think, and I think my colleagues feel this way, too...it's inappropriate, bordering on unethical, to send a freshman, whether they're music education, music performance, music anything, out into a public school to teach children. At the very least, we should be able to put our stamp of approval on somebody who's going out and teaching from a music education area in a public school setting. They've passed Advanced Standing admission into the junior and senior year methods classes. If they're teaching a band class, they've passed 455 [Teaching Instrumental Music], or they're in the class at the time. If they're student teaching in chorus, that they've taken Dr. Lee's Teaching Choral Music methods class. We are not going to send a kid out there who happens to play the trombone and is in a music education class as a freshman to teach anyone anything. We're trying to learn how to teach. We're going to go out and see really good teaching and file that away. We're learning through *observation*. But, our place is not to provide teachers for public schools from inexperienced undergraduate students. I don't think any program should be doing that. (interview, 1/25/16)

Dr. Matthews believes that only observing K-12 educators, rather than serving in the educator role almost immediately upon entry into the music teacher education program, would better serve students in introductory music education courses. In his opinion, music education students should only work with K-12 students after they have participated in methods classes specific for a setting (e.g., Teaching Instrumental Music for working with band students) and have passed the music education area's Advanced Standing process, a process that includes a review of students' coursework and an interview with a faculty member to determine if a student possesses the necessary dispositions to be successful in upper-level methods courses and student teaching.

“Cloning”

Rather than experiencing disruption during MUS 177 and 277, some students may cling to their past experiences with the intent of replicating them. For example, Harry, a second-year male, spoke about the influence of the culture in the music education program and his concern about the possible implications. Although he was still early in the degree program, rather than embracing the values of the music education program that were espoused in MUS 177 and 277, he wanted his experiences in the School of Music to prepare him to provide the types of

experiences that he had had in high school to his own students. He fought against possible “disruptive” influences:

I feel like we’re influenced so much by the culture here and I feel like we’re sometimes going to go out and be clones of the School of Music’s education system. For instance, I’ve marched drum corps, winter guard, and indoor percussion. I know that those are subjects that we’re never going to touch in a music education class. They’ve never been brought up, but I know that it’s a big deal in a lot of places. It’s not really in this culture, but I feel like we should be informed as to what it is. There’re certain things that we just don’t talk about. We talk about expanding our horizons and everything, but for me, I know that there are more things that I wish that we would dive into. There are more opportunities that are out there for students. I just wish that I knew them as a student. I feel like I’m trying to go out and get some of them myself, without the help of the program. I wish they were more available here in some ways. I feel like we’re going to run our ensembles like we were taught in college. We’re going to run our ear training and theory stuff like we were taught in college. There are more ways to do those things, though. There are more things to be learned and desired. So, I feel like I’m going to miss a little bit of that unless I seek it out. (MUS 277 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

Harry believes that he and his peers are influenced by the culture of the music education program that may be limited and limiting in its perspective. He feels that the music education program does not include discussion of topics that he deems to be important for music teachers, such as drum corps-based activities. The lack of exposure to these topics, combined with the influence of the culture, is, in Harry’s opinion, problematic, as he believes that his peers will become “clones” of the music education program who will only “teach as they were taught” to teach during their time within the School of Music. Harry fears that his peers’ opinions as to what constitutes “effective” teaching will be influenced only by what is taught in the music teacher education program and how it is taught. As has been demonstrated in previous literature, his K-12 music learning experiences informed his secondary students’ emerging definitions of effective teaching (Brewer, 2009; Miranda, Robbins, & Stauffer, 2007; Schmidt, 1998). As a result, Harry felt that he needed to seek out knowledge himself to complement what he learned in

the music teacher education program to diversify his repertoire of teaching techniques and to create a teacher identity that is unique to himself and his experiences.

Summary

Participants found MUS 177 and 277 to be “disruptive” classes that influenced them to reconsider their preconceptions of music education and occupational identities. “Disruptive” influences within the classes included discussions that addressed additional means of teaching music besides the performance-based ensemble, discussions on the purposes of competition in music education, and observations in public schools in teaching settings that were, most likely, dissimilar to the music education contexts most students had experienced prior to matriculation into the music teacher education program. According to the instructors of the courses, some discussions, particularly those that are close to students’ identities, have created “discomfort” within students, motivating them to step outside a “comfort zone” of complacency and inaction and explore potentially provocative topics. Classes should operate as “safe spaces” but still allow for moments of “discomfort,” which may lead to influential learning opportunities for students.

While some participants thought revising their philosophies of music education in upper-level methods classes was important towards understanding their changes in occupational identities, others voiced frustration with not undertaking the same exercise in their own upper-level classes, believing it to be a missed opportunity that will benefit them during student teaching and the first years of in-service teaching. Participants also discussed their desire to teach early in the music teacher education program and to “fight” against “disruptive” influences and replicate their secondary school experiences.

MUS 125B: Empowerment

MUS 125B, Women's Chamber Ensemble, is open to all female students across the University and is conducted by Dr. Lee. During the focus group discussion, students lauded how her teaching processes, capacity to empower the members of the ensemble, and the nature of the ensemble and were able to "disrupt" their occupational identities and preconceptions of music education.

Empowerment through Ownership and Community as Ensemble Members

Several students spoke to how Dr. Lee and the processes she undertakes as a "conductor-educator" (Dr. Lee's term) as Women's Chamber Ensemble provides students with a sense of shared ownership and empowerment within a community of musicians:

Eve (third-year female): "I think the biggest thing about her and her teaching is that she makes it not about herself. It's about the group. She shares a lot of power with the ensemble. When she's voicing a group, she'll walk us through her process. [several go "mmmhmm"]. She'll be like, "Oh, do you hear how this is different when I switch these two people around?" Or when we're picking a soloist, she would always explain, "We're not picking the best *person*. We're picking who we think is *best* for the piece." And then, we would have a discussion about that. "What are you looking for with this piece right now?" We voted on who we thought, just like, captured that idea the best. I just think that that open environment, anyone can say anything at anytime in that ensemble that's valid. There's a genuine connection between everyone. She tries to get to know all the people in the ensemble, which is really cool." (Women's Chamber Ensemble focus group discussion, 12/4/15)

Brenda (second-year female): She approaches the ensemble not only as a conductor, but as an educator. So, even throughout the process, she's still, "Well, I know that a lot of you are going to be educators and this is an opportunity that you could use to teach to your classroom this thing." A lot of the time she addresses the classroom as future educators and you never ever feel that you're *not* intelligent. I feel that I've learned so much, not only musically, but from an educational standpoint. (Women's Chamber Ensemble focus group discussion, 12/4/15)

Meredith (fourth-year female): "I came into this school and I was like, "I'm going to be at the best music education program and I'm going to go out and make my own amazing program and compete and it's going to be awesome." That's where my mind was. Then I started taking all these classes and I was like, "But, really? Is that important?" [laughing] My philosophy is so different than that now. Dr. Lee has been a really big influence in

that. “What does making music mean to you?” is something she says often. I think that’s important to think about. If it isn’t anything besides winning to your kids, then you’re not going to have a successful ensemble, really, because there’s no personal connection there, which is something that’s really demonstrated in Women’s Chamber. Yeah, we do sound amazing but there’s a rehearsal process and each song has something deeper to it than just, “we’re going to sing the pitches and the notes accurately and we’re going to sound good with our vocal quality” or whatever. That kind of philosophy is brought into question by a lot of the music education professors here. That kind of questioning is *definitely* demonstrated in Women’s Chamber. (Women’s Chamber Ensemble focus group discussion, 12/4/15)

Jen (third-year female): I have a distinct memory of 277 when Dr. Matthews was like, “Oh yeah, there are lots of high schools that don’t go to competitions,” and I didn’t know that. [laughing with others] That was so ingrained in me from high school, coming up to here. I was like, “What do you mean that people don’t go to choral festival? Are you allowed to not do that?” I was so blown away by that. I just remember that conversation being taken aback by that whole concept that your choir could be about something *else* and still do really well by the standards of judges. Women’s Chamber has really helped me see that and see what I, as a music educator, want to do with my students in the future.” (Women’s Chamber Ensemble focus group discussion, 12/4/15)

Brenna (second-year female): “I feel like, because of Dr. Lee and this group, I care so much more about education instead of *just* making music, because I thought I was going to come in and my goal was to conduct *good* music. *Hard* music. I wanted to do SSAATTBB stuff. It was going to be cool. But now, there so much more than I thought there was. I really came in not knowing what I was doing, and now I have a basic idea of what I’m doing.” (Women’s Chamber Ensemble focus group discussion, 12/4/15)

Students perceive Women’s Chamber Ensemble as being an empowering student-centered ensemble built on the importance of relationships and exemplifying a feelingful community for its participants. Dr. Lee encourages students to provide their opinions and to assist with making musical decisions that are based in shared meanings (Schein, 1985), thus creating a sense of ownership and agency within the ensemble and helping to facilitate group norms (Schein, 1985), such as the creation of a welcoming atmosphere within the ensemble that further encourages student participation. Eve and Brenda both noted how Dr. Lee creates “teachable moments” for music education students, making the ensemble experience an educative one for future teachers. Dr. Lee also asks philosophical questions during rehearsal that,

combined with the student-centered community/relationship-centered nature of the ensemble, influence students to question their conception of the performance-based ensemble and traditional ensemble practices, such as competition at ensemble festivals.

During her interview, Dr. Lee spoke to how she creates a sense of ownership and community within the ensemble:

In Women's Chamber Ensemble, I think we get at a lot of creating a sense of trust and relationships through the exploration of the poetry that make up these pieces. It's not a huge step to take to invite them to consider what their interpretation might be *and* to connect that to stories in their lives. It's really about opening a space for them to do that. As a conductor-educator, I think taking rehearsal time and devoting it towards that pays off in the end in spades. It's a different thing to say, "I'm going to read this poem and here's what I think it means," and then to really have them try to grapple with what the poetry means. They often come up with things that I would never have thought of, but I think are equally interesting or more interesting than maybe what even I had. So, I guess just finding the little sites inside a rehearsal where you can have them participate is important to me. The other thing that they see me do in Women's Chamber specifically is to not always have the answer. I don't always have the answer. I'm not sure. I have looked at the music. I have looked at the music and I have a lot of ideas about how it could go, but I'm not married necessarily to it being one way. So, I often will try it several different ways and we'll talk about what was most satisfying, which one was most satisfying. Usually, we come to a consensus and sometimes I say, "Okay, given all those options, I think we're going to do it this way for these reasons." It's not an authoritarian approach but I made a decision about it. Other times, we can feel free to experiment with multiple possibilities. In the current educational environment, that's the challenge that, as a teacher-educator, that faces me most directly. Students are not always comfortable with multiple possible responses to any kind of a prompt. They're really concerned about the right answer. What's the right answer or the answer, instead of "an" answer. (interview, 1/20/16)

Empowerment as Women

Students also spoke to how Dr. Lee "disrupts" stereotypes of females in higher education and music, serves as a role model for women, and addresses issues of social justice through the ensemble:

Alyssa (second-year female): When we learned that Dr. Westin was going to be our new faculty member and how she was into teaching social justice through music, I'm not going to lie, the first thought I had was "How can you incorporate that with music? I don't understand how you could bring in gender equality with music." Since I joined

Women's Chamber with Dr. Lee, since I've worked with more music education professors, I've found that there are so many ways to talk about equality and social justice issues because music is something that's really personal and affects everyone. I've realized that we focus a lot on female composers here. I feel that there are so many ways that a lot of people don't really realize issues about inequity that are out there. So, it's really easy to incorporate more female composers and talk about why female composers weren't really allowed to compose and learn about Fannie Mendelssohn and why she was oppressed. (Women's Chamber Ensemble focus group discussion, 12/4/15)

May (second-year female): We're doing a concert this spring to raise awareness on human trafficking. I think it's so incredible that something like a university ensemble would take an interest in this because I think it just kind of shows that music is greater than yourself and you can do it for more things than just getting a Superior at choir festival. The whole reason why we're doing that is because it's an important issue and music just speaks to people...showing that message. I think it's really cool to work with someone who thinks of music in that way and sort of using it as a force for good in things. (Women's Chamber Ensemble focus group discussion, 12/4/15)

Heather (fourth-year female): I think the way Dr. Lee conducts her rehearsals and the repertoire that gets chosen is really unapologetic. I never sung anything as hard as I do in Women's Chamber. [others say "Yeah"] It's kind of hard sometimes to find women's repertoire that doesn't make you sound like you're 12. I'm really tired of being in women's groups that sing about fields and shepherds [someone says "and love"]. Don't waste my time with that! I think it's a bunch of *crap*. I don't want to sing about that. The things that we sing in Women's [Chamber Ensemble] are women's music. It's not "girl's music." It's for women and we're women and we're together. (Women's Chamber Ensemble focus group discussion, 12/4/15)

Leah (second-year female): Dr. Lee, I think, gives a really good example, especially to young women in a society that kind of systemically devalues women, of how to assert power and how to be a powerful figure without being a bitch. So, I think she gives a really positive example of you can do anything you want. She talks to us about situations she's had to face as a female in higher education and the mistreatment that she sometimes endures. Like, there was this one time when she told us about this background misogyny kind of thing. Someone kept calling her "Mrs. Lee" instead of "Dr. Lee" in a meeting when he called everyone else "Dr." She talked about how she dealt with it in a way that was very professional. I just think that's something that really influences me, too. (Women's Chamber Ensemble focus group discussion, 12/4/15)

Jenna (third-year female): She asserts herself in such a positive manner and such a strong manner. She's a force to be reckoned with, but she doesn't do it in a way that's, like, "I'm oppressed, I'm not going to be anymore! Hear me roar!", kind of a way. It's awesome because I'm all for female empowerment and she embodies that, especially as a woman in music and academia, which is so hard, I think. (Women's Chamber Ensemble focus group discussion, 12/4/15)

Dr. Lee serves as a powerful role model for females, an underrepresented population within higher education (College Music Society, 2013; Fiske, 1997; Gould, 2009; Music Educators National Conference, 2001) whose presentation in music education periodicals is subjected to inequity and sex stereotyping of females in “traditional” teaching roles with less visibility in the conducting field (Digón Regueiro, 2000; Humphreys, 1997; Kruse, Giebelhausen, Shoudice, & Ramsey, 2015; McWilliams, 2003). Her interactions with her students and colleagues (as illustrated by Leah) and the repertoire she chooses for the ensemble “disrupt” stereotypical tropes that have been associated with women and women in music for centuries, providing students with a sense of empowerment that strengthens the sense of community between conductor and students and offers a model for interactions with future students and administration of future ensembles. Dr. Lee’s model also provides students with examples of how to deal with potentially sexist situations in a professional but assertive manner as well as how to address issues of social justice through music and activism.

Dr. Lee acknowledged her power as a role model for the women in the ensemble during her interview:

I’ve becoming increasingly aware, and I’ve accepted more responsibility, with regard to being a role model for women. To think of yourself as a model requires you to take some responsibility. I’ve struggled with that over time. I feel a lot more comfortable with it than I used to. For women, to see someone being successful in a largely still male dominated profession, which conducting is, is really critical for them. At the same time, I don’t like to think of myself as speaking for the experience of all women, but I’m aware that it has an impact on them. I think one of the ways that I’ve really noticed that is they’re just so excited when they see me being fully vulnerable in music making and not, for lack of a better term, conducting like a “girl.” So, I’ve heard that expression in my own background. I used to think, “Well, what does that mean, even?” But, in a pejorative way, it means being *careful*. It means not drawing attention to you. It definitely means wearing clothing that diminishes any femininity. So, I’ve made some intentional choices about those things. On the spectrum of femininity, I’m pretty far over on the feminine side and I like being a woman and I don’t want to feel like I have to hide who I am. That sometimes is difficult in this academic environment, you know. The women in the ensemble see someone who’s older than they are, who’s had a measure of success, and

they see that I do it and I still am true to who I am. I think, probably, at the base of it, that's what's most compelling for them. I don't have to sell myself out. I make the kind of music that I want to make and I do it in a way that feels good to me, which is to be in a community of thinkers, not in a role of someone who tells them how it should be.
(interview, 1/20/16)

For Dr. Lee, being authentic and allowing oneself to be vulnerable during the music-making process gives her strength as a conductor and as a role model for women in her ensemble. She is also, as Heather stated, unapologetic about presenting herself as a feminine women and conducting music in a way that is authentic to her.

MUS 336B & MUS 468: Ownership/Authenticity and Vulnerability

MUS 336B (Ensemble Conducting II: Choral) and MUS 468 (Teaching Choral Music) are two upper level classes in the music teacher education program. As with MUS 177 and MUS 277, students and faculty almost always spoke of these classes as one unit. Thus, for purposes of this discussion, they will be treated as such, with differentiations noted as appropriate. The two themes that both courses had in common included ownership of the ensemble, being authentic to oneself, and letting oneself be vulnerable in front of others to grow as an educator.

Ownership and Authenticity

During the focus group discussion, MUS 336B and MUS 468 students referenced concepts that Women's Chamber Ensemble students discussed—empowerment and ownership—within a context of authenticity and how these concepts influenced their identities as pre-service music educators:

Jill (fourth-year female): In our classes with Dr. Lee, a big idea for her is ownership. You see it in how she conducts and runs rehearsal in a way that gives her choir ownership over the music while, and it's not being like, "Hmm, should we take a rest here or there. Should we emphasize this word [winking]?" She gives that to her choirs and she also gives that to her students, who are then hoping to go teach anyone, choirs or whoever.

Caleb (fifth-year male): The big thing about why these classes were so important for our identity...is that it wasn't about *someone else's* method. They were self-discovery courses.

I think just being encouraged to not limit yourself to, “Okay, *this* is the choral sound.” We were taught, “Okay, this is how you teach ways to teach tone: through analogy, through score study, through all that stuff, but not exactly what you should *hear*.”

Jill: They didn’t give us “This is what good tone sounds like, this is what bad tone sounds like.”

Michael (fifth-year male): They know we have different ideas...different concepts about tone.

Caleb: She said a lot, “If you don’t hear it, have them do this”. [laughing] You know? I think that was fostered a lot in both the choral conducting and the choral methods. Trying to figure out what works best for you...what’s *authentic* to you.

Michael: It’s about how you work with your ensemble because you can get your group to sound however you want if you’re being authentic. That’s what Dr. Lee and Dr. Sterling have prioritized in their methods of teaching. The most important thing is to develop a teacher identity...

Ana (fourth-year female): and teacher confidence...

Michael: ...and teacher confidence. Confidence in yourself so you can go in there and do whatever you want. (MUS 336B focus group discussion, 12/8/15)

Drs. Lee and Sterling also spoke more on her thoughts of authenticity and the importance of it when working with students in an ensemble setting:

Dr. Lee: We have this playground between us and the gesture is there to shape the play, if that makes sense. All that needs to be couched within authenticity. If you’re not authentic with your students, they sense it in about a heartbeat and they shut down. It doesn’t matter what amount of knowledge you have. We can all learn skill. We can know our subject area better. We can learn more effective ways of teaching. We can take contemporary research and we can learn from that. If they’re in a shut-down place, they’re not going to learn. So, that’s the challenge. That’s where music education programs can do a lot, but you can’t really teach authenticity. You can model it. You can value it, but it’s not something that you pull out of a handbook or a textbook. (interview, 1/20/16)

Dr. Sterling: Teaching is part of being human. I would much rather have our students here be who they are and inspire students that way, then being something they’re not with trying to be like us, or like some choral conductor “superstar.” [laughs] Our music education students are great and have worked with some wonderful conductors. That’s awesome. But, there’s a danger of students wanting to be like those conductors so badly that they take on their identity and philosophies, rather than making it more organic and having it come from within. By working with authenticity—getting past those barriers

and being vulnerable—it's much healthier and sustainable for students. They can create conceptions of conducting and music education that are *really* meaningful to them. (interview, 1/21/16)

Focus group participants echoed Drs. Lee's and Sterling's thoughts on the importance of being authentic to students when working with them. They perceive that Drs. Lee and Sterling would prefer for them to create their own unique choral ensemble tone with their students, which would be a reflection of their identity and true to their conception of choral music. Replicating a famed conductor's "recognized" and "celebrated" choral ensemble tone would lack the grounding of the unique individuality of the educator, diminishing the potential for effective student-educator relationships that lead to meaningful musical and learning experiences. Furthermore, creating an ensemble tone that reflects one's teacher identity provides confidence within the educator, thus strengthening the potential for student relationships to be created and fostered.

Vulnerability

One participant spoke specifically to the importance of showing vulnerability in teaching and how her work in MUS 336B and 468 led her to believe that exhibiting vulnerability is a critical trait for music educators:

Jill: I think it's a lot about the ownership and the responsibility of that ownership, being able to catch yourself and know when you need to ask for help, know that it's okay to ask for help, know that it's okay to fail, as long as you are constantly thinking about what your students need and how you can get them there with your set of tools that you're learning here in choral methods and elsewhere. I would say that teacher confidence *and* teacher vulnerability are both incredibly important. It's both okay and encouraged to question yourself as you go on. I feel like she [Dr. Lee] really fosters the confidence, but, on the other end, too, the vulnerability aspect where like, "All right, I have to ask because I don't know what to do." Being vulnerable is how we create relationships with our students. Those relationships are so important for helping us, as teachers, develop our identities as educators. (MUS 336B focus group discussion, 12/8/15)

For Jill, Dr. Lee works to help her students realize that making mistakes as a teacher is normal and part of the learning process and that asking for suggestions is appropriate and should even be encouraged. These actions display humanity and vulnerability, both of which are essential for creating relationships with students and creating an effective learning environment.

Drs. Lee and Sterling stress that the vulnerability of “opening” oneself to students and “inviting” them to create a sound represented through gesture encourages them to participate and learn.

Showing that we, as conductor-teachers, are vulnerable is so important. Same with being authentic with who you are, on and off that podium. I think one of the most potent tools that we have is gesture first, then modeling second...trying to create an embodiment, literally embodied, in what we would expect to hear, and trying to keep a physical posture that looks like an invitation, which is an open body, which is what we’re hoping to get back from them. So, an expression of vulnerability so that students can fill that space. (interview, 1/20/16)

However, the process of showing vulnerability needs to be situated within a context of authenticity—of being true to oneself. Otherwise, students will sense the “dissonance” between the message conveyed by the gesture and the lack of authenticity from the educator, diminishing the potential for meaningful music making and educational moments. Drs. Lee and Sterling attempt to “disrupt” students’ preconceptions of choral music education and conducting that may have been learned during secondary school experiences by teaching concepts that, while not directly musical, aid in the music making and education processes.

MUS 465 & MUS 467: Music for All, Dismantling Gender Barriers, and New Possibilities

Students conceived of MUS 465 (Teaching Early Childhood Music) and MUS 467 (Teaching Elementary General Music) as one “unit” with similar processes and outcomes during their focus group discussions. Therefore, for purposes of this discussion, these two classes are grouped together. The themes common to both classes include the desire to provide musical

experiences for all students, overcome gender stereotypes, and facilitating new types of music education experiences.

Music for All

Not all students have access to music education programs in public schools. Reasons include funding cuts for elementary music programs (Shaw, 2015), schools not offering electives in addition to the performance-based ensemble, and students not having the financial means to acquire an instrument to participate in an ensemble (DeLorenzo, 2012), to name a few. Stephanie and Erin discussed how MUS 465 and MUS 467 made them realize that all students should have access to music education experiences and that all forms of music are valid:

Stephanie (fourth-year female): I came from a really successful band program. It was a very competitive band program. It's a wonderful band program, but it was the very typical band program. I did the whole section leader thing, but I definitely saw it as "we're here to be the best, and we're going to be the best that we possibly can, and make the best possible band music, and if you're not trying for the top ensemble, it's not the best that you could possibly be." And so, I definitely wanted to be the best at this. I loved music, so I wanted to keep doing it and I had that section leader mentality when I came here to the School of Music: "I'm going to make you the best that you could possibly be and we're going to play the best band music." And then, I don't know, it changed to be a lot more accepting after taking Dr. Cunningham's classes. I'm not going to lie. I love band music but I don't go to the gym and put on Sousa and run. [all laugh] I like listening to pop music. It's what I like. It was nice to be in a class that was like, "Oh, you listen to pop music. That's *real* music. That's *valid* music. Even if it's not like the most technically difficult and harmonically interesting, that's valid. Through her classes, I came to realize that kids have valid opinions and listen to all kinds of valid musics. That was eye-opening. It was nice to hear. Also, when we did our first listening lesson in elementary general, she said, "It doesn't matter if they get it right or wrong because they're like, 8. It just matters that they've listened to it and that they were interested in it. You just piqued their interest. I was like, "Oh, my God. It doesn't matter if they can't sing in key and if they can't do the dance. At least they're there and music has interested them and they made a connection with it. Then I was like, "What if every kid had that connection? Not just with music, but with everything?" That's when I decided that I wanted to teach elementary. What if every kid could make that connection with one thing? What a better world we would live in! I loved that. (MUS 467 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Erin (fourth-year female): I think I just liked the philosophy and rationale of elementary general and early childhood because I find that it's the least hypocritical and elitist of

music education philosophies. Especially, like, when I contrast it with stuff that I learn in musicology and conducting classes. It's like Stockhausen's epitome of academic music: "If you're stupid or not talented enough, you can't understand it. The kind of music we're studying is *exclusive*." That's one end of the spectrum. The other end of the spectrum is I think something that falls more along what the music education department believes, which is *everyone* can participate in music and that, in fact, everyone *should* participate in music because it's part of who we are. I think, when we hear people like Dr. Matthews and Dr. Lee, say, "Hey, we want music to be a lifelong process" and I take a bunch of classes here at this school where the music education department is preaching that philosophy. I found elementary general, and even secondary general, and early childhood to actually follow that. I definitely DON'T get that in the bands here. I definitely don't get that in my studio class. I don't get that in conducting. From the music education department and what they stand for, I find that the 465 and 467 are less elitist in that regard. This elementary and early childhood music is the kind of music education atmosphere you would *want*. *Everyone* is valued. *Everyone* is important. As a member of band class, I would hope that you wouldn't identify yourself as "I'm only 10th chair trumpet, so that's only as much value as I bring to the ensemble." Every person in the ensemble is important. You don't want to be a ranking. It's one thing to conceptualize that and think it, but to actually live in a culture that supports that idea is a totally different thing and I think our experience of, like, music education versus music performance, it's weird because there's also this social segregation...a cultural hierarchy...in the School of Music. (MUS 465 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Stephanie and Erin feel that these two classes offered an escape from the espoused values (Schein, 1985, 2004) of the School of Music, which include valuing performance-based activities over education and valuing elitist perspectives on music, such as which types or genres of music are most worthy of consumption and study. For these students, MUS 465 and 467, in a sense, validated their opinions of musics that may have run contrary to a perception inculcated from previous educational contexts: that certain types of art music were the only forms of music to be studied and performed. Furthermore, the classes validated both collegiate and elementary students as people who have the right to their opinions and musical preferences, whatever they may be. Making connections to music, engaging with music, and having meaningful and educational musical experiences with music, regardless of the genre, were important outcomes that Stephanie and Erin found inspiring enough to consider elementary music education for a career path.

Furthermore, Erin discussed the theme of competition in music education with the “chair placement” system commonly found in musical ensembles that ranks students based on ability, which some students may perceive as their quality of contribution to the ensemble. She believed MUS 465 and MUS 467, as well as elementary music education, in general, to be egalitarian in nature in that all students and their contributions were valued. Robinson (2010) and Shouldice (2013a) found that their studies’ participants—instrumentalists who chose to teach elementary general music rather than instrumental music in school—had an aversion to the emphasis on competition that they perceived in the band culture with which they were familiar as instrumentalists. For Erin, teaching early childhood and elementary general music allowed a means towards a less competitive environment for students and affirmed the legitimacy of all musics.

Dismantling Gender Barriers

Authors have noted the history of gender inequity and stereotyping within the music education profession (Koza, 1993/1994; Kruse, Giebelhausen, Shoudice, & Ramsey, 2015). Additionally, there are more female music teachers than male (Gardner, 2010; Music Educators National Conference, 2001) with females outnumbering males as elementary general music teachers (Gardner, 2010; Music Educators National Conference, 2001) and the opposite being true at the secondary level (Gardner, 2010; Music Educators National Conference, 2001). This social phenomenon could create a sense of tension for males who wish to teach elementary general music. Fletcher, a fourth-year student, spoke to the inner conflict he had as one who identifies as a male and pre-service educator interested in teaching young children and how the conflict was resolved by taking MUS 465 and 467:

When I first got here in the School of Music, I felt like, as a man, I couldn’t be an elementary school music teacher, which is weird because I had a male elementary school

music teacher. But, that's what I thought...that it would be frowned upon in some way. I just thought people would think that it would be weird. It was less about what I thought about it and more what I perceived other people would think about it. Now, I teach early childhood classes and I don't even think about it. I don't think about what the parents are thinking. They must be kind of shocked: "Here's this 21 year old normal looking college student rolling around on the ground singing with my infant child." That's not a normal thing. But that's something I don't think about anymore. I think for me, the gender aspect for me was taken out by hearing Dr. Cunningham talk about her former male students who are now teaching elementary general and from assisting and teaching microlessons in the CMS [Community Music School] early childhood classes. (MUS 465 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Fletcher's self-identification as a cisgender man caused him to experience a sense of "disruption" when he attempted to visualize himself teaching music to young children. Even though his elementary general music teacher was male, he was concerned that parents and other members of the educational community would disapprove of a man teaching music to young children, believing that it was not a "normal" phenomenon. Pete, Shouldice's (2013) study participant in her case study of a man choosing to teach elementary general music, found that gender stereotypes—"warm, kind women" teaching younger children and "strong, hardened men" teaching older children (p. 54)—influenced his peers' reactions to his decision to teach elementary general music. Fletcher had similar concerns about how others, particularly parents, would perceive him. However, being an active participant in an early childhood class allowed him to move beyond the stereotype and provided real experiences to draw upon and influence his occupational identity and, possibly, his career track, as he was an instructor for an early childhood music class at the time of data collection. Listening to stories of prior male students who are now teaching elementary general music also assisted Fletcher with feeling confident to occupy the role of an elementary general music teacher.

New Possibilities

Several students noted their shared meanings (Schein, 1985) that arose from their participation in the class, including the potential for music teaching and learning through early childhood and elementary general music that they had not realized until MUS 465 and MUS 467:

Christina (fourth-year female): With early childhood, I didn't know that that was even a thing and I didn't know that there was so much research on early childhood music. So, that has changed hugely. I didn't think that I would be so into it, but now it's something that I really care about it, always working on, when I'm teaching the classes. I just never imagined myself doing that. For elementary, I just have a totally different perception of what elementary general music is. It's so much different and so much better than what I experienced as an elementary music student. My elementary music class, I guess it wasn't terrible, but in elementary school, I thought that everything we did was SO LAME. It wasn't because the music was lame. We would just sit there and sing these songs. No one knows where they came from or what they were about and sometimes we'd watch movies about composers. There's some little kid who meets Handel [everybody laughs]. We watched the same movies every year. But, I guess I didn't know that it could be so structured and so informal at the same time because I think that my class was pretty formal. It was always sitting in your spot. There wasn't every much movement, ever. But, I don't think there was that much structure. It was like, "All right, now we're doing to sing through these songs." We might talk about the names of the notes on the treble clef, once in fifth grade. I remember once playing with boomwackers, but the pitch just had absolutely nothing to do with it. Everybody just got a boomwacker and just banged it on the floor. I don't know why! Maybe she tried to have something and just went with it. I remember my music teacher always being really angry. It was a really weird experience! I didn't know that it could be so much more than that. And, also, so much more free. Like, thoughtfully free. That's the way how we learn how to do things now. So, yeah, that's totally changed my perception of all of it. I think now I view myself at least equally interested in elementary, especially now since I teach one of the early childhood classes at the Community Music School. Maybe I'm even more interested in early childhood and elementary general than choir, but I think the overall thing is, "I want it all!" [laughing] (MUS 465 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Stephanie: The objectives. "We're going to learn this song and you're going to learn about flow and you're going to learn about minor tonality and you're going to keep a beat and you're going to do all the stuff" and, like, "Wow! They can do so much with just this one thing." But, at the same time, they have no idea that they're doing it. All of this has made me totally rethink how I feel about elementary general music and working with young students. (MUS 467 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Christina: That's SO true. Thinking about the purpose of everything that you do. I feel that way about any kind of music at any level. Why are you singing this song? What is

the point? What are they getting out of it? We had to do that a lot. (MUS 467 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Fletcher: Another thing is that I think just understanding all the research and the theory behind what's being done in early childhood and elementary school, and having an idea of the goals and potential outcomes and ideal outcomes helped me become able to visualize myself as an early childhood or elementary school music teacher. (MUS 465 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Christina described her elementary general music classes as “lame” and deficient in educational purpose. She was quite surprised with the contrast between her own elementary experiences and those that she experienced as a student in MUS 465 and MUS 467 as well as in her current capacity as an instructor for an early childhood class at the local Community Music School. Both she and Stephanie commented on the thorough planning that was required for every class—thoughtful and purposeful inclusion of songs and an array of activities that surreptitiously demonstrate students’ learning and understanding of music. While their music classes may seem like “play” on the surface, they are actually quite substantive in terms of musicianship development. Christina also commented that the critical analysis of her lesson plans for early childhood and elementary general classes has influenced her planning for other music classes in her program of studies. Finally, Christina and Fletcher were surprised at the amount of early childhood and elementary general music education research that informed both classes and understood that these two topics have been topics of sustained lines of inquiry in music education research. This realization “legitimized” this area of music education for them and made them appreciate its importance in a child’s music education.

Dr. Cunningham recognizes the “disruptive” influence of her two methods classes on students’ occupational identities and the inner conflict it causes within students. She referred to one student who experienced an occupational identity “disruption,” taught an early childhood class at the Community Music School, and seriously considered teaching elementary general

music. He subsequently chose to teach secondary choral music, but Dr. Cunningham has observed that his teaching manner at the secondary level has changed as a result of his early childhood and elementary general experiences:

It really is kind of a confusing time for these students because they have always thought that they were going to teach a secondary ensemble and now they find that they're getting all this joy in doing early childhood and elementary general, but they come to me saying "I'm still kind of picturing myself doing this old thing and who am I and what am I supposed to be doing? HELP!!!" They'll come into my office and say "I need to talk with you! I need help here!" I remember Caleb Nordstrom coming into my office and saying, "You've ruined my life!" [laughs] All of a sudden, he felt conflicted about whether he wanted to do choral or elementary general. Oftentimes, it's my saying to them, "You'd be really good at this." That's all they need for them to let go of that old piece and embrace the new identity, but sometimes they're still really conflicted. Caleb remained conflicted and that was probably good because I still think he's doing what he probably should be doing [teaching secondary choral music], but he's teaching it in a different way than he would have as a result of having these experiences. He's teaching differently in that he is interpreting some of the musical behaviors that he sees from his middle school students differently than he would of if he hadn't had these classes. He has a skill set that he developed as a teacher in my classes that he's able to bring to bear on these settings. He knows more about the slope of music learning from taking early childhood and elementary general. Thanks to early childhood, he has a sense of what the beginning of that music learning process looks like, which has implications for what happens later. I suspect that he is being more child centered, more student centered. I suspect he's choosing repertoire differently because I think, often, the goals of music education shift a little bit as a result of some of the discussions we have in terms of developing musical independence in terms of creative process, creative product, in terms of learning what something is by what it's not. All of those things have implications for curricular decisions and for decisions on a daily basis in terms of choice of repertoire and choice of time spent in secondary classrooms. (interview, 1/20/16)

"Disruption" within students who take MUS 465 and 467 does not necessarily have to result in students choosing to pursue a career interest in the early childhood/elementary general music areas of music education. Rather, the "disruptive" components from either class could influence students' classroom practices when they enter the teaching profession.

Developing a Community of Practice: Teacher Modeling, Peer Teaching, and Field Experience

Several teaching components of MUS 465 and 467 interact to create a community of practice within Dr. Cunningham's classes that help to "disrupt" students' occupational identities and preconceptions of music education. The two early childhood/elementary general methods classes provide students with opportunities to manipulate theories of music learning through teacher demonstration, class discussion, peer teaching (student teaching each other during class time) with feedback from instructor and peers, and application with students in microteaching lessons (field experience). Students can then draw upon their experiences when applying the same theories of music learning to subjects taught in other methods classes and to classes they teach when they are in-service educators.

Fletcher spoke more about the usefulness of Dr. Cunningham's teaching demonstrations for teaching concepts and subsequent peer teaching episodes:

Before we had to write any of that stuff down, I feel like Dr. Cunningham taught everything to us and we as a class did the things that we were learning about. She would lead an activity, and then she would talk about the theory behind it and what the kids were getting out of it, and then we would have to come up with our own activity and teach it to the class. That model of her demonstrating, talking about it, and then us trying it out was really effective. (MUS 465 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Dr. Cunningham believes that peer teachings are important for several reasons:

During peer teachings, our students get to practice the things that they're going to try with kids, first with their peers, which is less authentic and probably actually scarier than doing it with children, but it allows them to get some feedback and it allows them to iron out a few of the kinks that are there as a result of them, not as a result of children's behavior being unpredictable or as a result of needing to move to where the kids are in the moment. It helps them clearly state instructions and those sorts of things. It helps them realize that they don't know the songs well enough, which I'd rather have them figure out with their peers than in the moment with children. (interview, 1/20/16)

Peer teachings give students a “dry run” before teaching the lesson to students in a microlesson situation. Peer teachings also give students the opportunity to receive feedback from Dr. Cunningham and peers, as well as provide students with a “performance opportunity” that could reveal weaknesses in a lesson that need to be rectified before its “debut” with early childhood or elementary students. Additionally, Paul (1998) believed that peer teaching episodes can assist pre-service teachers with identity development and their professional knowledge bases as the episodes can facilitate the sharing and teaching of ideas. Following a peer teaching episode, Dr. Cunningham utilizes the community of practice framework (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998) with its three foundational characteristics—the domain, the community, and the practice—to facilitate the debriefing segment of the peer teachings as students provide constructive feedback with the intent of improving instruction:

I actually use the peer teachings as an opportunity to raise issues or to demonstrate traps that people can fall into and, in a single peer teaching, you don't get as much. You expose a little bit of that territory, but when multiple people do it over time, they learn from one another. They learn from seeing what one another does. They learn from the discussion afterwards and, often, the feedback will not be so much of “I wish you had done this better” or “You should think about this next time.” It's becomes more “This raised this question for me.” It gets them thinking in ways that they might not have thought before and it raises questions for them that they may not have thought of on their own unless they had been engaged in that experience. (interview, 1/20/16)

Multiple students learn from the peer teaching debriefing experience, with the potential for the discussion to extend to related topics. However, due to the nature of the exercise and the intimidation students may feel from it, Dr. Cunningham acknowledged that the peer teaching experience must take place within the context of a “safe space” (Holley & Steiner, 2005) with explicitly stated “ground rules” to help establish group norms (Schein, 1985) and observed behavioral regularities (Schein, 1985):

Peer teaching is scary and it does expose for students some of their weaknesses, but I'm always hoping that I can create a safe enough environment in there that we understand

that it's a learning community and we all have strengths and we all have weaknesses, myself included. It's okay to make a mistake. I make lots of mistakes in front of my students and I show them that it's okay to do that. [laughs] I would like to say they're all planned and none of them are. [laughs] In my classes, I lay down ground rules about what happens after a student does a peer teaching. First, I have the student reflect themselves immediately after they teach, before anybody else says a word, about what they were really pleased about in that peer teaching experience and what they feel like they need to think about a little more, reflect on a little bit more, practice a little bit more, any of those kinds of things. A student doesn't need their peers to point out things to them that they already know about their musicianship or about any of those kinds of things. Then, for peer feedback, I make it very clear that the feedback needs to be balanced. It can't be jumping down somebody's throat all in a negative way. They need to do the same thing that I hope the student did, which was reflect on both the strengths and the things that need more attention and more growth. Because even the strong things are going to grow and still need attention as well, but there will be "hot spots" for growth. (interview, 1/20/16)

Dr. Cunningham has found that this sequence of events—self-reflection first, followed by constructive criticism that is balanced and uses appropriate language—creates the potential for a learning opportunity that is beneficial for all students, not just the person who taught.

Communities of practice produce artifacts and histories that aid in the transfer of knowledge and the increase of understanding (Wenger, 1998). Knowledge within the community of practice is expanded through discussion (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999) and facilitation (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999; Fischer, 1998; Palloff & Pratt, 1999). Dr. Cunningham's facilitation of peer teachings and fieldwork experiences at the Community Music School allowed for students to co-construct the community of practice (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999) and create "artifacts" (e.g., histories, symbols, procedures, rules, technology, products) (Schein, 1991, 2004), all of which influence the identity of the participants (Wenger, 1998). During identity "disruption," students feel conflicted between holding on to the identity of an influential person—a secondary ensemble director—and shifting to an identity that had presented itself only recently. Confirmation of potential effectiveness as an early childhood/elementary educator may be all that is needed for the student to relinquish any guilt and affirm and embrace the new

identity. Some students, however, may still be conflicted after having received encouragement from Dr. Cunningham. The “disruption” may resolve to an embracing of the original ensemble director, but the student has been changed by the constructivist nature of the early childhood and elementary general methods classes. These two classes—communities of practice—led to the production of artifacts that assisted in transferring knowledge to another teaching context—secondary choral—and increased his understanding of music learning principles and teaching practices that complement those principles (Wenger, 1998).

MUS 210 & MUS 469: Reconnecting with and Rethinking Musicianship, New Possibilities, and Concerns about Practical Application

MUS 210, Songwriting, and MUS 469, Teaching Secondary General Music, are classes that were taught by Dr. Emerson prior to his retirement from the School of Music. During data analysis, common themes emerged for these two courses. Due to the commonalities in instructor and similarities in themes, these two classes were grouped together for discussion purposes. The common themes for these two courses include reimagining how students think of the concept of musicianship, exploring new ideas for music education, and concerns about how ideas learned in both classes can be implemented effectively.

Reconnecting with and Rethinking Musicianship

MUS 210, Songwriting, is open to all students at the University and typically has a mix of both music majors and non-majors. Throughout the constructivist-based course, students build upon their knowledge about songwriting via exposure to new ideas and songs, analysis of the process of songwriting, giving and receiving feedback, and engaging in the composition and revision process. The class is purposefully structured as a learning community with members learning from each other’s backgrounds and experiences.

Students in the focus group discussed why they took the class and the impact that it had on their identities:

Miriam (fourth-year female): I used to do a lot of songwriting in middle school and high school. That used to be the focus of what I wanted to do. I wanted to do popular music and things like that. And then, going into college, I started getting more concentrated on classical music and opera. Popular music and songwriting fell to the wayside. On a whim, I decided to take this class instead of Orchestration. But, I mean, it's just been really therapeutic and also, changing for my personal musicianship and reconnecting with that part of my identity as a musician. I couldn't imagine having not made that decision now in retrospect. (MUS 210 focus group discussion, 12/11/15)

Christina (fourth-year female): I can echo that almost exactly. Songwriting was something that I was really into when I was younger. I didn't do it much at the beginning of college as I had to intensively study classical music and art songs. Then, I took Songwriting in the fall of my junior year, which was already the craziest semester of college for me. I remember signing up for it on a whim and thinking, "I think I'll be able to handle it. I hope it'll be an outlet and instead of adding stress, it'll decrease stress." I think that's what it did. It was great to come into that part of my musician identity again and to actually get better at it. (MUS 210 focus group discussion, 12/11/15)

Crystal (third-year female): I think, in our daily lives, we're so surrounded and just immersed in this world of popular music. For a lot of us, it's kind of what really speaks to us. Everyone walks around with their iPod and so, I think, for me at least, that's the kind of thing, me being able to write my own lyrics and come up with a melody. It's a little piece of me that I get to put out there. So, by getting back into that, I feel like I kind of rediscover part of my real identity. Maybe that gets lost along the way as you get older, or get drawn into other things. But, for me, at least, my old self or part of this really deeper self of me reconnects with that. And then, I can take that and put it into any music that I'm working on and take that passion. (MUS 210 focus group discussion, 12/11/15)

Students noted that they "lost touch" with their musician identities when they had to stop composing their own songs and concentrate on what the School of Music prescribed for them: the study and performance of Western-based classical repertoire. The Songwriting class, with its emphasis on self-composed works and performance of those works, provided an "escape" from the mandates and perceived pressures of the School of Music. It also allowed them to "reconnect" with the identities that they "lost touch" with when they matriculated into the School of Music, perhaps suggesting that certain components of the School of Music "disconnect" students from

or subsume parts of their musician identities that, as Crystal said, have been with them for an extended period of time.

Students were also impressed with their “untrained” non-music major peers and the skills that they brought to the class, which led them to rethink what it means to be a musician:

Crystal: I think it helped to have a lot of non-majors in the class and getting to see and hear what they do when a lot of them say they have no musical training. I was amazed by how much more I felt that they knew than I did about those things sometimes. Going into it, I initially thought it was just going to be music education majors and we were all going to be in the same boat, whereas I actually felt that I was lagging behind while a bunch of people who “don’t have the training that we do” were excelling in the music. I think, because I struggled with it, I know how someone can struggle with it. Not everybody’s going to want to go the classical route that we’ve gone. I think, in a classroom, you’re going to have a lot of students who want to write their own songs and knowing how to interact with them is good. That’s why having this class be majors and non-majors has been really beneficial because you get to see how music majors interact, how engineering majors interact, how physics majors interact, all these different kinds of majors, what people are really interested in...how it all affects what they do, what kind of outlet this is for them, and how this can be interesting for students that aren’t in band, chorus, and orchestra and don’t want to be. I think it helped to see the musical world from a different perspective than, like, we’re kind of on the inside looking in, whereas they’ve been on the outside looking in, kind of, at the School of Music and it was nice to step back a bit and see that perspective. (MUS 210 focus group discussion, 12/11/15)

Christina: Going through the whole process, it was kind of eye opening to see the talents that came out of those students who weren’t music majors. I think there was a big moment of, “There’s so much raw talent out there and people really put their feelings into music, regardless of what genre it is.” I feel like I can interact with people who are different than me in the music mindset, but still have such a great passion for the music that they produce. (MUS 210 focus group discussion, 12/11/15)

Miriam: The kids that I’m in Songwriting with right now, I feel are better musicians than I am as a “trained musician” who’s been in the School of Music for five years, which I wasn’t expecting at all. I feel that they’re better musicians than I am because they can sit down, accompany themselves, and come up with all these things that are not valued in many music teacher preparation programs. I’m so glad that Songwriting is here because it’s pushed me as a musician more than my choral ensembles have. (MUS 210 focus group discussion, 12/11/15)

All three students expressed notions of “disruption” in their remarks. Not only were they surprised at the level of non-music majors’ “talent” and musicianship, some called their own

musicianship into question while others thought about the implications for their own classroom. For Crystal, being in an environment with a diverse group of musicians who considered themselves “untrained” and uninterested in classical music made her think about secondary music classes with similar populations and how to accommodate their interests. She realized that a songwriting class could be a way for students who do not want to be in band, chorus, and orchestra to exhibit and develop their musicianship. Christina realized that, regardless of the background and interests of her peers, they are all musicians who are passionate about their craft. Miriam expressed particular surprise at the non-music majors’ “untrained” level of musicianship, feeling that they surpass her skills in areas that she feels are not highly regarded in music teacher education programs. She also observed that the Songwriting class challenged and advanced her musicianship more than her choral ensembles—groups whose repertoire is based in Western-based classical repertoire.

Similar to students in Songwriting, Traci, a student teacher who took MUS 469 (Teaching Secondary General Music), questioned the strength of her musicianship both during her time in Secondary General class and when observing high school students in an after school “Coffee Shop” program that serves as a performance space for students, leaving her to question the class processes of her Secondary General methods class:

Traci: We all bring such different talents and experiences to the table. In Secondary General, when we would do cover songs, the arrangements, the compositions, it really made me question how good of a musician I actually am. I see these high school students that do this stuff as an extracurricular in their free time. They do cover songs, they write songs, they were implementing it into this “Coffee Hour” thing, and they would perform. I was like, “Just let me do the eggshakers. I can’t do anything else. I’m a trumpet player. I play a little piano and guitar. Other than that, don’t make me sing. Nobody needs to hear that.” [everyone laughs] As far as coming up with lyrics and chord progressions, I’m great at analyzing them in theory but actually don’t let me come up with anything because that’s just scary. Then, there are people who are so good at it. It makes me want to learn from that. It’s almost like, why couldn’t we have done more learning from our peers in that class. We got to see our peers perform, and Dr. Emerson was great and he

knew so much about that kind of stuff, but I feel that if some of the projects were less about our final performance of that project and more about the process of which we got there, it might have been better because you can hear how these different people got to that final performance or that final lesson. (MUS 469 focus group, 12/13/15)

While inspired by the “Coffee Hour” students and appreciative for what was taught in the Secondary General methods class, as well as the performances that took place in the class, Traci felt that she would have learned more from hearing her peers in her Secondary General class discuss how they negotiated the creative processes that led to the final products that were presented in class (e.g., cover songs, group arrangements, group compositions, listening lessons) and based in vernacular musicianship processes.

Dr. Emerson noted similar types of observations from previous music majors and the “disruptive” influences that the class had on their preconceptions of music education:

In the Songwriting class, there were always between a third and one half of the class members who were from music education. I know that they learned firsthand that there is really wonderful musicianship that is not reflected in a school of music that they learn from their peers who are non-music majors taking that class. For the first class of a Songwriting class that I taught four years ago, I emailed students before the semester started and asked them to prepare a cover song of someone that they really admired and to sing that cover song in class on the first day and accompany themselves. If they’ve ever written a song, they could pick that and sing it. I remember listening to two music education students who were leaving that first class. One of them said, “Those non-majors really kicked our asses in there!” [laughing] To me, it was a delightful sign that they saw firsthand that musicianship comes in various flavors. I think that schools of music are going to have to encompass all of the flavors of music making if they’re going to exist beyond the next 10, 15, 20 years. We had a doctoral student in music education take the class. She had done a master’s degree in vocal performance, was a wonderful singer and pianist, and in the journal that she kept during that semester, she wrote, “This is the most difficult music class I’ve ever taken in my life.” She found out firsthand that all of her studies in music hadn’t exactly prepared her for all forms of music. I think it can be a little disruptive and I think that those are the moments in which we learn the most...when we push ourselves a little bit towards the edge of our comfort zone, we find that we are having to be someone other than we were before and that allows us to see ourselves in a new way...to change. (interview, 11/19/15)

The Songwriting class proved to be a “disruptive” force for these students in that their concepts of what constituted a “musician” were challenged, as were their beliefs in their own

competencies as musicians. Furthermore, according to Dr. Emerson, placing ourselves in uncomfortable situations that force us to “stretch” our thinking and exceed what we think we are capable of creates the potential for learning experiences that expand modes of thinking and transform how we view ourselves—our identities.

New Possibilities

The three students also spoke to how their initial occupational identities as secondary ensemble directors and their preconceptions of music education changed after participating in Songwriting and Secondary General Music.

Miriam: I wanted to be a choral director. I love Eric Whitacre pieces, Z. Randall Stroope pieces...they're beautiful and they make you feel things. But, especially this semester, doing Secondary General Music class and Songwriting, I feel like my idea of what I want to do as a teacher has completely turned around, just because I feel like that it's one-sided to just to pick *one* thing that you think could take emotion and express it. Or just to follow that classical route of, “Well, learn a piece, we'll go to whatever competition, and then get some critiques and then we'll pick another piece and do the same thing.” I think it's our responsibility as teachers to speak to more than just one little dissection of people. And I think it's a big problem that everybody listens to music and you go to the grocery store and there's music going on and not one person probably hasn't hummed a song during the day, but so many people aren't involved in music education because they think they're not musical. I think it's our responsibility to speak to that as teachers and motivators of music, as a whole.

Crystal: I'm guessing that one of the biggest themes that you'll find is so many of us are, “I wanted to teach high school choir...” [all laugh]

Christina: Or band, and have been completely shaken up. And now, I feel that *my* issue is, “How will I be fully satisfied if I'm not teaching all of these things...the rock band class and an elementary class and an early childhood class and choir?” I still love that, and I think Songwriting was one of those places where I was like, “Okay, even if I never teach a songwriting class, I want to be able to incorporate everything I learned in the class and the outlook of this class.” I just feel like the world is SO much bigger than I ever imagined. I feel like I could teach so many different musical things. Some of them will be better than others, but, I just think of myself as so much more of a musician and that I have some little bit of musical wisdom, whereas before it was like, “Well, I can sing and I used to play clarinet and I can teach people that.” Now, it's like, everything's so much deeper and more interesting.

Crystal: Piggybacking off of that, I felt freer to express myself and do more what I wanted to do in a way that I wasn't able to in a theory class. I mean, this semester, I've written compositions for my 20th century class. The composition project for the 20th century class was like, "this is what is has to include, you have to do this, this, and this" whereas, for Songwriting, it was like, [holds arms open, as to mean "you could do anything"]. Someone in the class could say, "Yeah, you could have added this here, but you didn't and it sounds great, still." I think doing the two together was really interesting to see how a more traditional music class is taught versus what I want my classroom to feel like. I want students to compose songs that are meaningful to them and learn from the process, rather than make it about the product, like when we perform and needing it to be perfect. That's the pressure that I feel from the School of Music. (MUS 210 focus group discussion, 12/11/15)

As a result of Songwriting and other experiences in the School of Music, students' occupational identities as educators strengthened with the desire to teach more than choir, band, and orchestra and work with students who may not wish to participate in traditional performance-based ensembles. Christina feels that her identity as a musician has deepened as she has a more comprehensive worldview of music and firsthand experience of the different ways musicianship can manifest itself outside of the conservatory-based confines of the School of Music. Additionally, she and Crystal spoke of their desire to transfer the principles that she learned in Songwriting to all of her future music classes and maintaining an environment that encourages student creativity and celebrates divergent thinking, rather than assignments that are prescriptive and convergent in nature. Crystal, in particular, noted that she wanted her classes to be driven by learning from the process of composing, rather than putting an emphasis on the quality of the final product's performance.

One student, Traci, a fifth-year student who was just finishing her student teaching placement, discussed her interest in taking Teaching Secondary General Music and how such a class in a secondary setting could be important for students:

Secondary General was especially interesting to me because it was something that I had never really thought of and never participated in as a middle school student or a high school student. In high school and middle school, you have band, orchestra, choir, and

you don't tend to think about the general music side. I took Secondary General at the same time I was taking Elementary General with Dr. Cunningham. It was very interesting to see and implement the ideas from Elementary General and how you can continue that on the high school level. Obviously, it wouldn't be singing DO MI SOL patterns all the time, but having that kind of foundation for how you can continue on in high school that's not band, choir, orchestra is very interesting. At my high school, we probably had more classes than most schools that were music-based but *not* band, choir, orchestra. We had two levels of piano class, guitar class, theory and composition class, which I know most of those aren't offered in most schools. I guess, going into that class, I thought at first that it was going to be along those lines of piano, guitar, and theory, but the class was completely different. It wasn't really about any of those things whatsoever, which, was very intriguing for me...just the things that we talked about and how different it was from any of my ideas of what secondary general music would be. There were some moments when I was really blown away and was like, "Wow. I never thought of that!" I was really excited about the ukuleles, too. Everyone knew that Secondary General was the "ukulele class." (MUS 469 focus group, 12/13/15)

Traci spoke to her present and past experiences in regards to the Secondary General Music class. She recalled the secondary general offerings at her high school as including more "traditional" options, such as guitar, theory/composition, and class piano. Additionally, she had never taken a secondary general music class herself in middle or high school. The combination of the "new" learning context—the secondary general classroom—coupled with the concepts that were discussed, such as collaborating to create cover songs and arrangements, using ukuleles, learning how to use song materials, published materials, and electronic media in secondary general music classes, and developing vernacular musicianship skills created several "disruptive" moments for her.

Two students, Alyssa and Cameron, spoke positively about the influence that the class had on their conceptions of music education and identities as educators:

Alyssa (fourth-year female): I think Dr. Emerson's ideas about non-large ensembles were very interesting and particular. Going through Secondary General, it was like, "WOW! This could be a part of the school context that we talk about that's not there now. What can we change in music to make music more accessible for students?" I felt that was the best part of the course...learning about how we can help school music look different because it's so what we've always done, and we've come out of these good school programs and we just want to repeat the same thing. "Oh, my high school band was great.

Let me be this high school band director.” It’s like, “No, what can we add to the conversation about music in the classroom? What other ways can we bring the music and the ways people listen, participate in music, outside of school into a school classroom and reach all these students that aren’t taking music, but doesn’t mean they’re not musical students and not interested? (MUS 469 focus group, 12/13/15)

Cameron: I wanted to be a band director when I first started here. I know that was true and I had been comfortable as an instructor of students, because I had been doing a lot of that and I had more and more experience. I felt comfortable being in front of a group of people, at least in an instrumental setting. I was feeling comfortable at least in my instrumental zone. I remember that, feeling that way going into Secondary General. But, being in the class made me feel more capable of being a teacher of *any* kind of music, I think. It was teaching music of a different *style*. It’s basically what this course was and, I think it was the way that Dr. Emerson taught that the longer I was in that class, the more comfortable I felt being able to use just my musical ability, which I always felt was lacking. I felt like a lot of people at the university are really talented and really good at their instruments. I’m good at my instrument, but I don’t feel extremely musically talented. I think I work really hard and, well, I’m never the best player or musician in general. I just like it and I want to do it. I work hard. That class gave me confidence to be, to use my musical ability and use it to be a very productive teacher. (MUS 469 focus group, 12/13/15)

Alyssa recognizes the self-replication of the music education profession based on students’ interests to recreate their secondary school experiences and empathizes with Dr. Emerson’s philosophies of expanding music offerings to reach more students beyond those in the traditional performance-based ensembles and affirming their identities as musicians. Cameron first identified as a director when he matriculated into the music education program, believing himself to be a competent “instructor of students.” He, however, later spoke of his self-perceived lack of musical ability and thought that the class and Dr. Emerson provided him confidence in his musicianship skills and the conviction that those skills would provide him the means to be successful teaching any type of music in any type of setting. He later went on to discuss some ideas for his future band that are based on what he learned in the Secondary General Methods class:

One of the activities that was eye-opening for me was creating our own composition by writing symbols on the chalkboard. Any person could go up and point to different things.

I think my insecurities with music all lie in creativity. I can read the notes and I can play a trombone, and that's fine, but I'm not good at creating my own *anything*. At least that's what I believed for a long time. I had friends who could write music and do songs and do all kinds of things like that. I was just never comfortable with it. I was always frustrated when I tried to do it. So, when we did that chalkboard activity as a class and I got to thinking about an activity like that that fuels creativity for young kids, people learning about music, it's like an awesome first stepping stone building block to teaching creativity. I think, teaching creativity lies in planting a seed more than anything else. You can get them started on the right path and they have to figure it out themselves. So, learning about activities like that, where I felt like I can inspire my students to feel creative, where that didn't coming up being in band. That was big for me. I'm excited to try to include the more creative aspects. I still don't feel comfortable with it. I don't feel that I can get up and lead an activity and feel perfectly comfortable with it but it's something that I want to try because I think it's necessary. I don't know how feasible this is, but if it were four days of concert band and one day of general music, like people who bring guitars in and teaching kids how to play guitar. Just a general music day and we have forms of people playing performances of people playing songs that they write and doing stuff with other people. I think adding a little of that creative aspect of it can completely change how someone learns music. (MUS 469 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

During his interview, Dr. Emerson discussed how he sought to “disrupt” pre-service music educators’ definitions of musicianship, as well as his approach to having students experience and teach forms of musicianship besides those traditionally taught in secondary schools and reinforced in most Schools of Music:

I think that one of the things that the class has tried to instill in students is the possibility that there are other students, younger people, who are very interested in learning music and benefitting from music education, but do not share the same type of career goals and relationship to large ensembles in music in the same way that our music education students have. So, the big part of that class for me has been a bit of advocacy and philosophy and eye opening for those people to see that something is possible. The second part of that class is to help to redefine for them, or perhaps to expand for them, their definition of musicianship—worthy musicianship. What tends to be reinforced in the conservatory-type experience, as almost all university music programs are, is a very traditional, European conservatory approach to becoming a musician. I'm convinced that that is not the best approach to use with young people in schools. So, what my job is here, I think, was to be the vanguard of being able to promote that alternative musicianship, which is not an alternative in the real world, but is alternative in a school like this. I think there's no doubt that the type of music classes that I was talking about in my methods class—vernacular musicianship, songwriting, music technology, for example—were things that the students who took the class, by and large, had never experienced personally themselves. So, to a certain extent, I needed to be their music teacher, to teach

them that way, have them experience the joy of that kind of music learning, and then show them some methods for how to teach that to younger people. The difficulty, of course, is that I have a job other than being their music teacher. I have a job in helping them to become music teachers themselves. So, it was not just a course in learning vernacular musicianship, but also how would they turn that around and work with students, 6th, 7th grade, up through 12th grade and be able to make that appropriate for those age groups as well. It would be nice if, instead of just one semester to do it all, I had one semester to be a music teacher and not have to worry about the method part at all, and then a second part to show them how to teach younger people how to do this. It's difficult enough to make the transition from musician to teacher, but they have models of who that teacher was: that ensemble teacher from their high school or middle school or wherever, or the conductors who they study with here. But, that transition to a secondary general teacher? That's a hard transition. That's a step even further because they don't have that model. And that's why I think it was important for me to be their teacher in some of these things because they hadn't learned how to do any of this outside of class and so, they needed to see somebody actually do it. They needed to feel what it was like to be a student before they could be a teacher. It's an uncomfortable form of learning for some people because they're very comfortable with what they already know. (interview, 11/19/15)

Dr. Emerson suggested that not all secondary school students might be interested in learning about music through the traditional performance-based ensemble. These groups have traditionally had low participation rates. For example, 21% of American high school seniors participated in band, chorus, and/or orchestra in 2004 (Elpus & Abril, 2011). Furthermore, Elpus (2014) found that, between 1982 and 2009, an average of 34% of secondary students enrolled in a high school music class. Therefore, Dr. Emerson has sought to educate his students regarding the limited reach of ensembles in secondary schools and students' lack of interest in learning about music through the ensemble medium.

These statistics also suggest that music education students' preferred vehicle for teaching music may be biased towards learning through the ensemble medium as their conceptions of music teaching are largely based on their observations of their secondary school experiences (Bergee, 1992; Bergee, et al., 2001; Campbell, 1999; Cox, 1997; Dolloff, 1999; Draves, 2012; Ferguson, 2003; Fredrickson & Williams, 2009; Isbell, 2008; Kelly, 2000; Madsen & Kelly,

2002; Mark, 1998; Rickels et al., 2010; Roberts, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c; Schmidt, 1998; Thompson, 2000; Thompson & Campbell, 2003). Since, in his opinion, most of his students have never experienced concepts that are taught in his Secondary General methods class, nor observed someone teaching those concepts in a formal music education setting, Dr. Emerson believes that students need to experience the concepts firsthand as music students to create a schema, then learn how to teach the concepts to adolescents and implement the concepts within a formal music education setting. He believes that the class could very well be uncomfortable for some students due to the expansion of skills and knowledge outside of what they have been accustomed to for years: learning about and performing Western-based classical repertoire through the “lens” of the traditional European conservatory approach.

Concerns about Practical Application

However, Traci, Stephanie (who is also finishing her student teaching placements) and Steven, a fourth-year male, expressed varying doubts as to the practical implementation of concepts, such as vernacular musicianship skills, into an ensemble or as a stand-alone class:

Traci: I don't think it's very realistic to have a secondary general class unless you have the funding and the time in your daily class schedule to have general music classes. I also don't think there's enough time to implement that into a choir or a band class. There're so many other things that need to be taken care of first. I loved all of the activities that we did and all of the projects that we did in that class in our Secondary General class with Dr. Emerson. I would love to do those activities in a class, but I don't know. It would require the proper resources and A LOT of time, which is limited. We also had four very full bands in my student teaching placement. If you got rid of one of those class periods, we would have over 100 people in all three of the other band classes. It would be a downfall to that program. One thing that did come out of my student teaching that I thought was really cool was we have this thing called “Coffee Shop” where kids can audition to perform at a local coffee shop. It's very laid back, popular style music. We have a group that had a box drum, a bass guitar, regular guitar, and acoustic guitar. That's really cool, but it was an after school activity. We had our chamber orchestra play a piece with drum set, bass guitar, and electric guitar, but that was an after school activity. Those were super cool things and they performed in our concert, but they're after school. My personal belief, after going through student teaching and seeing a very successful music program, not just in band but in chorus and orchestra as well, is that that kind of stuff takes place

really well *after school*. Normally, it's under student direction and not under teacher direction. Teachers can observe, but from what I've seen, they don't really participate because it takes a lot of time out of whoever's doing the schedule. So, as a teacher, how do you teach through an entire school day and then also do this whole different thing after school for, probably, an hour or two, then your score study, and correcting every night? It's just very far fetched. (MUS 469 focus group, 12/13/15)

Steven: You can validate a music program by having groups go to ensemble festivals and solo and ensemble (festival). There's no system in place to have that same kind of evaluation for a secondary general class. You can't send a high school popular music class to a "battle of the bands." A school district would never approve that. It's not the same kind of evaluation, anyways. (MUS 469 focus group, 12/13/15)

Stephanie (fifth-year female): If you put a secondary general class into a classroom setting, how would you fill an entire semester of rock band? I feel that wouldn't take a whole semester. How would you do a whole semester of ukulele? I think that it's awesome, but the kids would get so sick of it, whereas if it were more of an after school setting, you could do it for a month or two, then change to something completely different and not have to, like Steven said, validate it to your school district as to why it's benefitting your students. (MUS 469 focus group, 12/13/15)

These students questioned the realities and "legitimacy" of the secondary general music class in a secondary music program, suggesting that the large ensemble paradigm is still central to their view of a secondary music program. Even after Traci noted the "disruption" that took place during the class, which was reinforced by her student teaching experiences, she voiced her doubt about the implementation of a secondary general class that met during the school day within a music program that was largely ensemble-based. In her opinion, a secondary general class would divert personnel and other resources that would be necessary to sustain a program with multiple ensembles. She advocated for student-directed "secondary general type" activities to take place after school as to not interfere with preparation duties of the ensemble directors.

Furthermore, Steven questioned the legitimacy of secondary general classes as, in his opinion, they do not have quality evaluation mechanisms that can validate the program as to, as Stephanie said, how it is benefitting students. He went on to state that administrators only can support a program that receives positive evaluations from an experience that has the same type of

merit as a large ensemble or smaller solo and ensemble festival. Finally, Stephanie questioned the viability of an entire semester of one type of music teaching medium, such as ukulele or rock band. Rather than suggesting a mix of different music teaching activities within one course, she supported Traci's suggestion for moving "secondary general type" activities to take place outside of the school day. Without observations and fieldwork experiences within secondary school classes that features these types of activities and demonstrate how they might be implemented,¹⁸ pre-service music educators may remain hesitant to include these activities in a stand-alone class or in an ensemble and defer to using the traditional performance-based ensemble paradigm as the main delivery means of providing a music education to students, thereby marginalizing those students who wish to participate in music education experiences but do not wish to participate in performance-based ensembles.

Dr. Emerson spoke from his own experiences as an example of a student who may wish to participate in a formal, school-based music education experience, but, for varying circumstances, may not want to participate in the traditional performance-based ensemble:

I stopped ensemble instruction after 7th grade. In elementary school, we had a wonderful choir and I loved it. But, when I got to junior high school, the boys choir was so badly run and the discipline was so terrible that it just broke my heart because I loved this music. We weren't getting past sea chanteys sung in unison. The kids were just shouting and the teacher just sat down in his chair and wouldn't get up until everybody was quiet. I couldn't stand it and I had to quit. I became a vernacular musician, taught myself whatever I know about reading. I had to teach myself, music theory, harmony, playing in bands...very little formal education. So, I view myself as coming from outside of, perhaps, the same traditions that most college music faculty—music education faculty—have. Of course, that's been a disadvantage to me because I can't say, "Well, when I was in marching band," or "When my choir went to festival," because I've never personally done that myself. But, I think the advantage that that gives me is that because of that different perspective as my own personal story, it gives me much greater insight into the millions of students around the United States who are just like me who so deeply love music that they couldn't stand the music that was being given to them. They love music in a way that was different from the music that was being offered and that's who I hope

¹⁸ See Chapter 5.

to educate. That's why I hope my students go out in a missionary way and consider those to be their students, too. Not just the best and brightest, or the most musical. Not those who can afford to take private lessons, but those kids who like to do rap or sing barbershop or play guitar. I think that there are a lot of those kids out there that music education has simply turned a blind eye to. (interview, 11/19/15)

Dr. Emerson's experience as a vernacular musician who dropped out of a formal music education experience—choir—because he did not like the learning environment provided him with a personal perspective that many other music teacher educators may not have. He was one of many students who, in his opinion, may wish to participate in a music education experience but do not want to participate in “traditional” music education courses. His experiences have informed his teaching philosophy and his goals for his music education students:

We're in a transition period right now between doing exactly what was done in the 1950s, 60s, 70s, 80s, now into the future, versus some kind of transitioning into a large post-ensemble era. I think that's what we're facing right now. So, I look at the musicianship and music teaching approach that I use in that methods class as something that's trying to prepare the students not just for their first job, but for their career, five, ten years from now as well. They may forget, 95% of everything they learned in that class, but there will be some part of themselves that remembers that they had a professor who thought that that was a valid form of music education. When the opportunity opens up when they are teachers, they may well decide to explore that aspect of it. I do think that schools are changing and there are a number of school administrators themselves who are starting to demand that we stop pretending that it's the mid-20th century and start to get on the program with where kids are today in terms of their musical interests. But, look at what our schools of music value...It's very difficult to affect change because the large majority of education in schools of music is in support of the conservatory model and opposed to any other kind of change. The sad truth is that when these young music teachers hit the real world, the reality of their students is that if they go into their fourth grade class with that operatic voice, they'll be laughed out of their first day as a teacher. That won't work. What worked for you in college isn't going to work for you in your elementary general class. (interview, 11/19/15)

Dr. Emerson has been concerned that the conservatory model that schools of music have traditionally embraced, with emphasis on reinforcing what we expected musicians to know in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (College Music Society, 2014; Nettl, 1995), leave students unprepared to work with K-12 students of the 21st century. He remains hopeful that his

music education students, supported by forward-thinking administrators, will implement means of music teaching explored in his class that align with students' musical interests.

Throughout the focus group discussion, students noted the perceived challenges with implementing activities from the Secondary General methods class as a singular class or within existing ensembles, but they were also optimistic about the future at the end of the discussion:

Rose (fourth-year female): I can speak for us all and say that we all learned a lot. I think that it presents a really great challenge for us as the future of music education to get out there and try to implement this in the schools. (MUS 469 focus group, 12/13/15)

Traci: Because it is worthwhile. It's not like, "That's stupid, let's not do that." It's totally, totally, *totally* worthwhile stuff that should be looked into. It's just the amount of time and what exactly we're going to teach. But, all of that stuff that can be thought out in the future. A little bit of an underlying thought was that band, choir, and orchestra may not be the best for every student, but I think, overall, it wasn't trying to degrade what's already in that ensemble experience. I think it's trying to add to what's already in that experience and make music, as a whole, better at the secondary level. (MUS 469 focus group, 12/13/15)

Traci and Rose interpreted the perceived difficulties in a more positive manner: as challenges to be overcome, providing more students with an opportunity to learn more about music, regardless of their previous experiences. Dr. Emerson also acknowledged that very few pre-service music educators will apply all concepts learned in Secondary General methods to all classes, but also voiced a note of optimism:

They're not taking the class and then doing exactly what was done to them when they go out as teachers, but it's nice to know that some of what they learned in that setting is actually being put to use. I do understand as the teacher of a class like that that very few of them will be hired primarily to teach that form of music education. They'll be hired primarily to direct a choir, to teach band and marching band...those kinds of things. Any class like a secondary general class is going to find its way into the margins, usually through a very difficult curriculum process of having to convince others that this is a valid form of music education. However, I've seen increasingly that this is happening and that makes me feel very happy. (interview, 11/19/15)

Although few music education students will teach primarily secondary general music, Dr. Emerson is pleased with the gradual addition of secondary general music classes and implementation of concepts discussed in his class to secondary schools' courses of study.

MUS 455: “Jack of All Trades”

The most salient theme that occurred in the data for MUS 455 (Teaching Instrumental Music) was the notion of the “Jack of All Trades”: being able to “wear several hats.” Students in the focus group discussed how the instructor, Dr. Miles, had them think of the instrumental music educator as having multiple roles:

Joe (third-year male): We had a whole discussion about the role of yourself and your identification as a teacher or educator, and then as a musician, and then as an administrator, and the way to balance those. Also, we had to think about how those three roles relate and work together in your job at the school and how, if you expect to go in and just be a musician, or just to be a teacher or an administrator, you're not going to be very happy. You have to balance these three things and work with them all because there are some administrative things you might have to do with instrumental music. (MUS 455 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

John (fourth-year male): The class changed what I thought I'd have to do as a music teacher...the administrative aspects, the musician aspects, and the teaching aspects... how all of those things are connected. A lot of it was like, “Okay, well, this is what a music teacher has to do. These are the things you'll have to say to people, you'll have to plan concerts and do all these things.” It definitely had an impact on what I thought a music teacher actually does, especially an instrumental music teacher. (MUS 455 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

The position of instrumental music educator encompasses several roles in addition to that of “educator.” Instrumental music educators must be “administrators” with processing important paperwork, collecting items from students and parents, maintaining an instrument inventory, and communicating with important constituents of the educational community. At the same time, instrumental music educators must also be “musicians” and use their musicianship skills to assist students with cultivating lifelong musical skills that help them create satisfying musical experiences. These students perceived that Dr. Miles, the instructor of the course, believed that

all music educators, but instrumental music educators in particular, should identify with all three roles to avoid role conflict (Kahn et al., 1964; Scheib, 2003) between one's perception of a position and the realities of that position.

While students stated that the class forced them to conceptualize the role of instrumental music teacher in a more nuanced sense, they also stated that their philosophies and conceptions of music education remained unchanged:

John (fourth-year male): As far as my actual philosophy, as far as what it is, I'm not sure it really changed it that much. I think it changed what I thought I would have to do and the things that I would have to be, like an administrator, for example. As far as my philosophy of music education and if I was going to, for example, argue music's value to an administrator, I'm not sure it really affected my views there. It didn't really affect my personal philosophy of, like, why music education is important, necessarily. I don't know if anyone had that same experience.

Lily (fourth-year female): It was more, for me, more a specific focus on the logistics of the job itself...what you need to do to have a good band program. As far as philosophy...

John: I'm not sure that there was philosophical talk.

Lily: We learned how to teach band, and that was great. But, I'm not thinking about education differently after taking it. I don't think that's the purpose of that class. That's what the other classes are for.

Michael (fourth-year male): Yeah.

Daniel Albert: Which classes? Just so I'm clear.

Seth: Secondary general, 277 to a certain extent. That's what they try to do in 277, anyways.

John: 177, 277. (MUS 455 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

While results from the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey suggested that MUS 455 was a highly "disruptive" class for students' occupational identities and preconceptions of music education, qualitative data suggested otherwise, providing evidence that the class was merely a

“nuts and bolts” course that focused on creating and sustaining a high performing instrumental music program.

MUS 456: Diversity in the Classroom, Student Empowerment, and New Possibilities

Diversity in the Classroom

The main purpose of MUS 456, Teaching Stringed Instruments, is for students to develop skills and knowledge for teaching string and orchestra programs in schools. Class activities included effective scaffolding strategies for all students, infusing creativity activities in string settings, and administration of a string program. During her interview, Dr. Woolfolk noted that the field experience unit at a low socioeconomic status and racially and ethnically diverse school is a substantive part of the class:

The major thing that we do is we spend eight weeks at Lakeview High School with Linda Brenner, who loves to have the students come in. For a couple of weeks, we observe, then I have the students sit in and they do a sectional, and then they get to conduct a couple of times. We do that for one of the two hours of our class, and the other hour, we either debrief on what we just done and, many times, Linda comes in and talks to us about it, which has been just a highlight of the students’ experience. (interview, 1/20/16)

One student, Leah, discussed how the course’s embedded field experience unit provided opportunities for them to work with diverse groups of students:

Leah: I came from a pretty well to do town that was, pretty much, white. White, white, white. The ensemble was all white, middle class to upper middle class. *No* people of color in my ensembles growing up. I thought about the lack of diversity in music education before, but this class made it really hit home. Lakeview, where we did our fieldwork, is a Title I school...very diverse socioeconomically, racially...it was really eye-opening for us to see diversity in an ensemble and to see how the cooperating teacher catered to a wide variety of abilities and interests. Why can’t our ensembles be as diverse as the country? It’s something that we have to look at more. (MUS 456 focus group discussion, 12/15/15)

Leah discussed her experiences of performing in an ensemble that consisted of mostly upper middle class white students. This is a wide spread phenomenon, as Elpus and Abril (2011) found that white students from higher socioeconomic backgrounds were overrepresented in

secondary school performance-based ensembles. For her, observing and teaching a diverse ensemble turned an abstract notion into concrete reality and made her realize that lack of diversity in music education is problematic in that high school ensembles tended to not be representative of the population of the United States (Elpus & Abril, 2011).

Dr. Woolfolk provided her perspective on how the diversity of the ensemble could be influential for students:

The students that go to Lakeview are not so privileged a lot of the time. And, so, that's one thing that I think is very disruptive to some of our students here in the School of Music, who mostly come from privileged backgrounds. That's how they got into music school, right? I think that's really different for our students to see. These students don't come in, sit down, and want to compete for the first chair of the Tchaikovsky serenade or something like that. They want to do different things. (interview, 1/20/16)

Observing students from a diverse background in an ensemble may be “disruptive” as many students in a school of music may come from privileged backgrounds and music programs whose students were mostly or all white.

Student Empowerment

Jonah, a fourth-year male student previously enrolled in MUS 456, spoke to how Ms. Brenner's (the cooperating teacher for the fieldwork component of the class) teaching methods served as “disruptive” forces for him. Jonah's secondary school music teachers were strong teacher-centered directors who demanded obedience and silence from their students.

Observing Ms. Brenner [the cooperating teacher for the high school strings class] teach was a huge, like, take-away for me. At first, I really didn't like how she taught the class. I thought she was way too laid back with the students talking amongst themselves and what I thought was playing out of turn. It was really weird for me to observe...I grew up under really strict directors. They taught and demanded that everyone be silent. I was so scared! [laughs] But, I thought that was what teaching an ensemble was. It wasn't until later in the semester that I started to realize that students were actually learning from each other...she was letting them teach each other. Which is probably more efficient than her trying to teach all these different parts by herself. It was really neat for me to see students learn from each other and for her to make the classroom more about them and less about

her. You could let them go for a little bit and it was going to be *okay*. [laughs] You don't have to teach everything all the time! (MUS 456 focus group discussion, 12/15/15)

At first, he was uncomfortable with the “disruption” based on the conflict between his models of music education from secondary school and his present observations, perhaps suggesting that he himself had a teacher-centered teaching philosophy. Jonah realized later in the course that Ms. Brenner was facilitating an empowering, student-centered teaching environment that allowed students to help each other, letting him see that there are other ways to teach besides the traditional teacher-centered model of music teaching.

Dr. Woolfolk discussed how observing Ms. Brenner's teaching style has influenced her students:

I think that another piece of the disruption there is the “revisioning” of orchestra as a strings class rather than an authoritarian-directed ensemble...the idea of facilitator rather than director. They see that really clearly with Linda Brenner because she'll stand on the podium and let them talk for quite a while. To our students, at first, it looked like she didn't have control of the class. But, she knew exactly what she wanted them to talk about and she's trained them to solve their own problems. So, when you stop her orchestra, you say, “What do you think, guys? What do we need to work on?” They know the answer to the question. So, they're very empowered. She works very hard to empower the kids. They're very engaged in their own progress. Some of our students really don't like it at first and some of them even finish with, “I don't think I could do that quite the way she does it. It doesn't fit me.” But they struggle with it and I like to see them struggle with it because I want them to find their own way. (interview, 1/20/16)

Observing Ms. Brenner as a student-centered facilitator, rather than a teacher-centered director, is a particularly “disruptive” experience for students. Ms. Brenner can serve as a role model for how a music teacher can create an environment in which students help and learn from each other—driving the learning process themselves—with the teacher providing help only as necessary. Providing students the skills to be sufficient with minimal help from an authority figure could be of great assistance to them as performers when they graduate from secondary schools and colleges and are no longer under the direction of a conductor. As Dr. Woolfolk noted,

some students are uncomfortable with this type of teaching style, believing that the method is not a good “fit” for their personality and philosophy. Others, however, may recognize the benefits of this teaching strategy for students and learn to embrace it.

New Possibilities

Observing Ms. Brenner gave Leah a template for how to implement creativity into performance-based ensemble rehearsals. During the focus group discussion, Leah discussed what she learned from watching an improvisation activity during rehearsal:

Leah: Ms. Brenner was a really good role model in how to incorporate improvisation in an ensemble. That’s something that’s been a totally mystery to me and for me to see it was huge. We talk about it in classes and how it’s important, but it always seemed like pie-in-the-sky stuff. Now that I’ve *seen* it in action, I believe that it can be done and I have more faith in myself that I can do it well. I really enjoyed talking with her after some classes and hearing why she decided what to do during class...to hear her thoughts on how she did class the way she did. It was very informative. (MUS 456 focus group discussion, 12/15/15)

Leah enjoyed watching Ms. Brenner teach improvisation within an ensemble setting. It had been discussed before in her music education classes, but she never observed the actual act of teaching improvisation until this class. The experience gave credibility to the possibility of implementing improvisational practices in an ensemble. Conversely, students in MUS 469 (Teaching Secondary General Music) did not observe practices discussed in music education classes in a real-life setting, leading them to doubt the plausibility of implementation of class concepts in music education settings. Also, Leah mentioned how she learned from conversing with the teacher following a class and hearing her thoughts on decisions that she made throughout the class, reminiscent of Conkling’s (2003) suggestion that hearing an experienced educator’s decision-making processes could be a powerful influence on pre-service educators’ professional growth and identity development.

MUS 171: Thinking Like Teachers

Students in the MUS 171 focus group appreciated the attention to classroom scenarios that helped them prepare for the realities of music teaching:

Sam (fourth-year male): I really liked the discussions that we had in Dr. Woolfolk's class strings course. This phrase would come up three times a class, "Now, kids are going to do this. They're going to do this because of my experience with them." It was like, "Okay, this is real life that we're talking about. This is going to help me because it's from someone who's *been there*." I don't learn nearly as much from the tech classes that are taught by GAs [graduate assistants]. (MUS 171 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

Leah (fourth-year female): I'm a string player but I don't really remember how I started on my instrument. I've had my own opinions and theories on how to start students on string instruments and teach them basic skills, like how to tune, but they weren't really informed. You know what I mean? Taking this class gave me a really good idea of how to teach the instruments and give kids a successful starting experience...teaching songs by ear, then notation later. Kids are too into the notation. I was that way growing up. They need to listen first, then work with notation. (MUS 171 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

Not dissimilar to a mentor/mentee arrangement, Sam learned from Dr. Woolfolk speaking from her experience about what students will do in certain situations and how to proactively avoid problematic situations with students. Leah, whose "native" instrument is violin, appreciated the background on how to teach a beginner as she forgot how she started, perhaps as many as over ten years prior to her participation in the class. She also had no beginner teaching experience and only had her own "theories" on how to start students on their instruments with no real grounding in research or literature. MUS 171 provided, in their opinions, a good model for her in her work with future students.

Dr. Woolfolk noted that MUS 171 is taught explicitly with the purpose of treating students as beginners:

171 and 172 [Class Strings II] are taught as group classes—as beginning ensembles. Students are taught as if they're beginners—because most of them are! It's very different than other types of instrument methods class. What a lot of class instrument teachers do is teach the history of the instrument and what kinds of method books are available. They don't play very much. They also read right away, which isn't the best thing for younger

students. So, we do things by rote...and I also emphasize improvising and composing during that class. Those are disruptions of what they may have done at the beginning of their study on whatever instrument they're on and a lot of times, they haven't done improvisation in a class before, in a college class, on their instrument. (interview, 1/20/15)

As with MUS 456 (Teaching Stringed Instruments), music education students also compose and improvise as “beginners,” providing ideas for activities that are approachable for their future students and can provide them with successful musical experiences. According to Dr. Woolfolk, her class may be the first time that students have improvised on an instrument in a college class throughout the School of Music, an observation supported by researchers (Ward-Steinman, 2007; West, 2014). Implementation of creative musical activities, including composition, arranging, and improvising, in pre-service music education classes may encourage music education students to implement the same types of activities in their future classes (Kaschub & Smith, 2013; Reese, 2003; Webster, 2009).

MUS 495: “Now It’s Real”

Most of students’ comments regarding the “disruptive” nature of the student teaching experience were in regards to working out in a school context on an extended basis; that is, interacting with students, the cooperating teacher, parents, education colleagues, and members of the community that were discussed in the previous chapter. However, during a focus group discussion, students also mentioned some aspects of the student teaching seminar that is the nine-credit weekly seminar course that coincides with the formal 14-week practicum experience that takes place during an undergraduate music education student’s last semester.

Students mentioned how the student teaching seminar helped to contribute to the student teaching experience’s sense of “realness”:

Jeremiah (fifth-year male): I totally agree with that. We talk about all this *stuff* in our methods classes, but looking back on it now, it didn’t seem like it was *real*. I wasn’t

connected to it because I didn't have experience in it. Now, we can get in more detail because I have experience. Also, I like getting together with my classmates and hearing about what they're going through...because, oftentimes, it'll be the same things (laughing). But, how are they dealing with those issues? It's really been a good learning experience. (MUS 495 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Alicia (fifth-year female): I really like the discussions that we have in student teaching seminar about stuff that's happening out there right now. Topics that are really relevant that we may or may not have talked about in our classes here in the School of Music. I remember talking about the activities that we talk about in secondary general and that they may be better as after school activities or clubs rather than implemented into an actual classroom setting. That's a huge argument that we've had in our student teaching seminar and TE 496. Now that I have some *context*, I can actually speak more intelligently on these things because it's all real now. I also like having the space to talk and learn from my peers. They can have different thoughts and I can learn from them. (MUS 495 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Tammy (fifth-year female): During my classes, I took notes and did my assignments and all that, but I was kind of like, "Yeah, okay...is this real?!" Then, I get out to student teach and it's like, "Yeah, it's real!" [laughs] "Oh, my God!" [laughs] So, this has been great for me because I get perspectives from my co-op (cooperating teacher), Dr. Matthews, and my friends. (MUS 495 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

These students appreciated how the seminar provided a "space" for them to discuss and "unpack" issues of interest that arose throughout their student teaching placements and connecting what was learned in methods classes to real-life practice. They also identified the discussion-based format of the student teaching seminar as allowing their peers to voice their opinions on those issues and share what they learned with others. Finally, students suggested their peers as being influential in informing their opinions on issues of particular importance.

However, some students also noted that some activities of the seminar were too divorced from students' teaching context, providing a sense of "falseness" that did not add to the learning environment:

Joseph (fifth-year male): We were told to bring in footage of our teaching for others to critique. I never got a chance to present my student teaching video!

Caleb: NEITHER DID I!

Jeanne: I didn't either!! I don't care! I have a coop (cooperating teacher) who's telling me what I'm doing well and what I'm not doing well. I'd much rather hear from her than you because she watches me teach every day and *knows* me and my style. And, guess what? I'm smart enough to pick that out on my own, for the most part.

Caleb: Right. Because we had so many good opportunities to watch and critique each other in choral methods (MUS 468). It's not a productive use of time to watch others, especially since we aren't with them day to day in their contexts. The coop is the best person to give them that type of feedback.

Jeanne: Right. We don't need to watch everybody's awkward five minutes of teaching. (MUS 336B focus group discussion, 12/8/15)

Jeanne, when responding to Caleb and Joseph's disappointment in not having their videos shown to their peers, noted that receiving feedback from her peers is not nearly as important as the feedback she has received from her cooperating teacher. Jeanne argued that their feedback might be uninformed, as they do not occupy her daily teaching context and are unaware of influences within it that may affect her planning and instruction. Caleb followed up by voicing his concern that because he is detached from his peers' teaching contexts, he does not feel informed enough to provide helpful critical opinions for his peers. He also feels that the cooperating teacher is the best person to provide feedback to student teachers.

Overarching Theme: Community

An analysis of all qualitative data across all classes revealed an overarching theme of community within the cultural cohort, with participants oftentimes saying the word "community" explicitly. For the purpose of this study, "community" is defined as a "group of people who are organized and unified according to a common and shared purpose, who have ongoing dialogue with one another, or...have 'life in association with others'" (Jorgensen, 1990). In particular, undergraduate music education students noted the feeling of community during interactions with themselves (peers), faculty, graduate students, and graduate students' influence in two collegiate

music education organizations in the School of Music: the National Association for Music Association and the American Choral Directors Association.

Peer-Peer Influences

During multiple focus group discussions, students discussed how they influenced each other and created shared meanings (Schein, 1985), both within classes and across the music education degree program:

Jana (third-year female): We don't necessarily go to Women's Chamber Ensemble to create perfect music and learn from Dr. Lee. We go there to be a community, to work together and form bonds and friendships, those kinds of things, rather than because it's a requirement of my major... "I must complete these credits to do these types of things." (Women's Chamber Ensemble focus group discussion, 12/4/15)

Erica (fourth-year female): We're all really showing each other that we want each other to succeed. We want each other to know all of these things. And I think in a lot of previous classes in the School of Music that I've been in, it's been, "I want to be the best and I'm not going to help you because I want to be better than you." I don't feel that AT ALL in this elementary general class... I think it's because we're so supportive of each other, like in giving feedback to each other following peer teachings. (MUS 467 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

May (second-year female): Our School of Music is pretty intimate. So, you're friends with the people you're in classes with. So, like, we would get done with 277 and go to the coffee shop in the Student Union or whatever and talk with our peers about stuff that we've done in class. It's really cool having people that you can toss ideas around with and since you see everyone so much, it kind of becomes a judgment free zone. Especially in 277 and 177, I feel like you can be open with what you're going to say there because they want to hear opinions. It's really cool having friends where you can go and talk about that with. (MUS 177 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

Matthew (second-year male): I've learned a lot from interacting with my peers and my friends. I feel like, at least for me, when there's that relationship there, that's really strong, I'm better at listening and applying and changing the way I've thought about things. I know that Mike and I will talk about music stuff all the time and from those conversations, I learn a lot and develop my philosophies and ways of approaching music. (MUS 177 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

Fletcher (fourth-year male): With this community, there isn't competition between music education students. We all want everyone to be awesome. I'm never like, "Oh, I hope I do better than someone else." We all do really well. There's a sense of we're all struggling to teach. We're not going to be perfect, but we can all help each other be as

good as we can be. It's been really helpful for me in developing my identity as an educator. (MUS 467 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Erica (fourth-year female): The sense of community...it happens in our classes when we're doing activities. It happens in our class discussions. I see it happening at the Community Music School with our teaching episodes. We throw each other's ideas around in the air for quite a while before we realize, "You know, maybe we could be doing this differently." "I like how you did this, but what if you tried this?" It happens in our email logs. It happens when I'm in passing and I'm like, "Hey, so and so, I know you're really good at Lydian. Can you help me distinguish between Lydian and Locrian?" And, I haven't met a person yet from that class that has said, "No, I'm not going to help you." That's really awesome, I think. (MUS 465 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

The quotes above demonstrate the community nature of peer interactions within the cultural cohort—the music teacher education program. Feedback received from peers following peer-teaching episodes and casual, informal gatherings between students created emergent understandings among group members (Schein, 1985) and served as influences that "disrupted" students' occupational identities and preconceptions of music education. Additionally, Bielaczyc and Collins (1999) wrote that peer interactions allow for negotiation and co-construction of a community of practice, which, in turn, mediates the identities of the participants (Wenger, 1998).

One student, Adele, discussed the importance in establishing and maintaining positive peer relationships during uncomfortable teaching situations:

Adele (fifth-year female): I felt so comfortable just completely crashing and burning in front of you guys in, specifically, this class and our other music education classes...469 (Teaching Secondary General Methods), 465 (Teaching Early Childhood Methods), 467 (Teaching Elementary Methods). I think it was really important to feel comfortable and supported because, for a lot of us, this was our first time getting up there with a baton and trying to relearn our bodies and coming up with creative warm-ups and coming up with creative rehearsal techniques and things like that. I think the positive relationships that go all the way back to 177 were so important for letting me feel that way...that I could crash and burn and it would be okay.

Adele stated her comfort with performing poorly in front of her peers and learning from the experience as a result of the positive culture that had been established between peers since their first year in the music education program. In her statement, it is clear that "disruptive"

experiences are taking place across the music education program in addition to within specifically cited music education classes, as discussed in the following dialogue of students in the MUS 465 (Teaching Early Childhood Music) focus group. It also is evident that the peers are learning from one another in this community of practice, thus mediating their occupational identities (Wenger, 1998).

Sara (fifth-year female): I think this music education program does a really good job about modeling how to be compassionate and how important it is. Like, Dr. Cunningham talked about calling parents and letting them know that their children are doing well. You have to care about your students as students first, and musicians also, but first and foremost, these are little people...or bigger people, depending on who you're teaching. [laughs] Your job first is to make sure that these people are "okay" and safe people in your class, and then you teach the music also. I'm pretty sure that's a quote from either Dr. Emerson or Dr. Matthews. I get that feeling in my music education classes and from the faculty. I feel that the majority of students who get accepted to this program come in with a little bit of that background because of the interviews. Like, they ask you that question in the music education interview.

Jenna (fifth-year female): I feel a strong sense of support and community in the music education world. I know, like, especially junior year when I took both of these classes (MUS 465 and MUS 467), there were lots of late nights with groups of people and we're all like, bouncing ideas off of each other about music education online. "Do you think it would make sense to do this song as a movement activity? I want to try it like this..." Just so much idea bouncing happened and still happens. I feel like it's really cool that I do still have conversations all the time about music education in other classes and outside of my classes and it's so, I'm going to miss that so much in a building when I'm the only one, or maybe there are others who are teaching music specifically. I feel like peers have been such a positive influence, especially in the education part of the College of Music. Very supportive...like, in our peer teachings and lessons at the Community Music School: "Oh, your teaching was so good today." "You were so engaged!" "I really like your activity. Can I use that?" I use Fletcher's activities...

Fletcher (fourth-year male): I've used so many of her activities. [all laughing]

Jenna: Because he assisted my class, he had so many great activities that I put in my own class now. I think that's so cool. Carter, too, working together this semester. She had so many great activities. I feel like most people are so open and want to collaborate. I think it's a good community of peers. I've had a positive experience.

Carter (fourth-year female): Yeah, I love stealing ideas. Whenever I can steal ideas...I've stolen so many of Jenna's ideas for lesson planning assignments. I'm like, "Wait, why am I working so hard! I'm working with someone who already has good ideas and Dr.

Cunningham said it was okay!” It’s been really great and she posted Fletcher’s final project as one of the samples. It’s really nice having that sense of, “You’re not alone and not on an island of music making.” Normally, I feel like, not every class in the School of Music is like that...

Fletcher and Jenna: Yeah...

Carter: Where people want to work together and share ideas and sometimes it’s very like, “Oh, this is my idea. I can’t share with anyone! You’ll steal it!” It’s totally NOT like that here.

Fletcher: There isn’t competition between the music education students. We all want everyone to be awesome. I’m never like, “Oh, I hope I do better than someone else.” We all do really well. There’s a sense of we’re all struggling to teach. We’re not going to be perfect, but we can all help each other be as good as we can be. (MUS 465 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

Sara’s remarks, especially with reference to the music education interview that is a component of the admissions process, suggest an overarching core value (Schein, 1985, 2004) of the music education department: that all students be compassionate, understand that they are teaching people, and that these people feel like they are in a safe environment. She believes that these are strong tenets of the music education department that permeate all classes. Furthermore, students observe each other teaching classes and learn from each other, perhaps going as far as “stealing” teaching activities and ideas for their lessons. Instead of a feeling of opaqueness and possessiveness, the culture of the music education program has an air of openness, encouragement, and collaboration, implicitly encouraging students to use each other as resources and share lesson plans for the benefit of K-12 students’ education.

In this example, fieldwork and peer teaching experiences facilitated expert-to-apprentice relationships, known as “legitimate peripheral participation,” which place novices at the periphery and experts at the center of a community of practice (Gherardi & Nicolini, 2000; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). In communities of practice, novices develop and use skills that require collaboration and combining skills. For this example, students developed skills with each

other and assisted each other during discussions, peer teaching experience, microlessons, and conversations outside of class, “stealing” and adapting each other’s lessons for their own purposes.

Faculty Influences on Students

Students also discussed the influences of faculty and how they contributed to the overall sense of community with the music teacher education program:

May (second-year female): I think it’s really cool how Dr. Lee has guest lecturers in the 177 classes. Oftentimes, those guest lecturers are music education faculty that you don’t really get to work with until your 300 or 400 level classes. You get a sneak peek of what this person does. With Dr. Cunningham, part of her discussion was like “Come join this class and learn more!” I think that’s really cool. The faculty here knows you and they try to know you. It’s not just like, “We see you when we see you that one semester, then it’s over.” (MUS 177 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

Heidi (second-year female): “Dr. Lee really cares about students as individuals, [Another person says, “Yes.”] which is something that I think a lot of the education faculty at MSU in particular does, which is a major reason why I’m here. She’s been an amazing influence and has really gotten me to think differently of myself as an educator. (Women’s Chamber Ensemble focus group discussion, 12/4/15)

Matthew (fifth-year student): All of the music education professors really make an effort to keep in touch with you after you leave their classes. They get to know you as students while you’re in their classes and you’re still their students and they still really care about you when you leave...and probably talk about you! [everyone laughs] It’s really been a model for how I need to work with my students...show that they’re individuals and that I care about them. Relationships are so important. It’s really made me think differently about education, because my band director wasn’t like that at all and he wasn’t a good role model for how to work and care for students. I think they and all of us help to make a really nice community here. (MUS 469 focus group discussion, 12/13/15)

These students discussed how the faculty makes a concerted effort to know students in their classes and maintain those relationships both during the class and after classes have concluded. May referenced Dr. Lee’s guest lecturer series in her MUS 177 class that “introduces” first-year students to the music education faculty, which helps to build visibility to these professors, build relationships with these teachers, and inculcate them to the culture and

community of the music education program. Laura mentioned that the music education faculty's presence during identity "shifts" and being able to answer questions have been very helpful during a time which could be filled with angst and anxiety.

Additionally, both Heidi and Matthew cited the music education faculty as being prominent role models. Heidi specifically mentioned Dr. Lee as being a particularly influential role model who has "disrupted" her identity enough to make her see herself differently as an educator. Matthew appreciated the modeling in creating and sustaining relationships—a key part of education and learning—that he did not receive from his high school band director.

Graduate Student Assistant Influences on Students

Several students noted the influence of graduate student assistants to help create the sense of community that "disrupted" their occupational identities and preconceptions of music education. After Dr. Emerson retired, two graduate students, Chris and Matt, taught MUS 210 (Songwriting) as part of their graduate assistantships. Megan, a third-year student in the class, discussed how they helped to create a meaningful experience for her:

Both of them are songwriters. They shared their songs with us, too. It wasn't like they lectured the class. There were no lectures. We'd spend maybe half an hour, 20 minutes every Wednesday. "Here's how story songs generally go. Let's listen to them and analyze what these lyrics mean and who's in this story and those kind of things. How can you incorporate that into your song?" But then, there were times when the two of them would get up and be like, "Hey, we have a song. Would you listen to it?" It kind of showed that it was more of a community than a teacher versus student thing. They were so open that it never made us feel insecure about our writing. It was never like, "Well, now we'll show off. This is how songwriting should be." In fact, you could tell they were vulnerable going up there. Chris cracked a note and was a little embarrassed by it. Matt's hand was shaking before he started playing his song. It was nice to have it as a community, a student motivated thing instead of teacher-led where someone's standing up at a podium and telling us the right way to do things. They showed me that a class can be more community-oriented and that teachers can learn just as much as students. (MUS 210 focus group discussion, 12/11/15)

Rather than creating a top-down, teacher-directed class, Chris and Matt helped to create a learning community in which teachers and students shared their songs to receive feedback. The teachers, who acted mostly as facilitators throughout the course, made themselves vulnerable to criticism from students and demonstrated that they are learners as well. As a result, Megan perceived that students felt more comfortable sharing their materials and found that effective teaching and learning can take place in an environment where both students and teachers are partners in the meaning making process.

Additionally, Chris and Matt's use of discussion in their roles as facilitators—a key constituent in communities of practice (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999; Fischer, 1998; Palloff & Pratt, 1999)—assisted with the construction of knowledge (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999). Palloff and Pratt (1999) recommended that instructors of classes act as facilitators who “nudge” discussion and learning in the right direction, rather than delivering content in a unidirectional (teacher to student) manner. Also, Squire and Johnson (2000) found that the facilitator role of an instructor is more valuable than a content provider or information source.

David, a second-year student, spoke about how graduate students have been models for lifelong learning:

I think the biggest thing that's affected me is that you don't just come here and learn and you're set to go and everything is kind of all set for you. As you go out after college, you're still learning all the time and even seeing other people who are just coming here in their 30s and 40s or however old to get their master's degree or they're changing paths because of their teaching and life experiences. It shows that we should be very malleable and not so set in a kind of DUT DUT DUT DUT DUT [in rapid fashion] path of what you must do. (MUS 177 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

By observing graduate students, David realized that learning does not stop at the end of an undergraduate degree. Rather than being static, teachers should be open to changes in their practice based on their experiences and should continue to learn. Some make sacrifices after

years of teaching to return to school full time to pursue a graduate degree. Some may also change careers within the music education field and earn a terminal graduate degree to become a music teacher educator.

During the MUS 336B (Ensemble Conducting II: Choral) focus group discussion, students stated that Dr. Lee and Dr. Sterling's connection to what is currently happening in public schools is directly related to the graduate student assistants. For example, Drs. Lee and Sterling periodically bring graduate student assistants into their MUS 336B (Ensemble Conducting: Choral) and MUS 468 (Teaching Choral Music) classes to serve as guest lecturers and lead projects for pre-service educators to undertake:

Tanya (fourth-year female): I think that a lot of why Dr. Lee and Dr. Sterling are so great is because they're so aware, even though they themselves haven't necessarily been in front of a K-12 classroom in so long. They're so aware of what kids today need and what classrooms today look like. I think a lot of that is because of you guys [graduate assistants]. It's because we work so closely with our grad students and our grad students work so closely with us. I mean, the whole project where we had to do partner songs and arrange songs for middle school. That's stuff that I feel people at other schools probably didn't do but our great grad students did and they're sharing their knowledge with us. I just last night had to, I just made a song that I multitracked because I knew how to do it from this class. I feel comfortable now going into a classroom and being like, "That's not working for you? Okay, let's rewrite this part."

Joseph (fifth-year male): Matt Duncan (a graduate student) right there! [Tapping the table] I would echo that the grad students were a major part of the classes. I mean, Matt was wonderful and David (another graduate student) was amazing. I feel like I learned a lot from Dr. Sterling and Dr. Lee and I will always channel a lot of that, but there are definitely also grad students that I know, like Ed (a former graduate student). [all say "Ed!" in a very endearing way] I use the stinkin' duck pedal almost every day. Or the doggy door! That's all great for teaching vocal technique. I mean, anytime it comes to arranging, even like, I was doing my barbershop student teaching project and I need to arrange something really quickly. I can hear Matt saying, "Just try it and if it doesn't work, just do this." Oh, look! There's Matt in my head! David's sensitivity about gender identity. I have a student in my chorale who is going through an identity, kind of finding herself and I just, on a side cuff, somebody was like, "Well, only the guys should be in it." I was like, "Well, I don't know. I don't always buy into that gender binary thing." And she just lit up and that was her moment when I said that. I think so much has been changed by the professors in the classes, but also just some of the grad students who really change your philosophy, too.

Caleb: You look at what the basis of all that is. It's what their passions are. Each of those grad students come in knowing what they love. What is your thing? (MUS 468 focus group discussion, 12/8/15)

Tanya believes that the relationship that Drs. Lee and Sterling have with the graduate students keeps them informed as to what is happening in K-12 schools so current music education students are educated in current topics and trends, preparing them to be relevant for when they begin their first jobs. Furthermore, graduate students are actively involved in the undergraduate music education program as guest presenters and, similar to MUS 210 (Songwriting), class instructors. Topics that were presented include arranging, vocal techniques, and transgender issues in music education, demonstrating a wide breadth of topics. The graduate students serve as role models for students—what they could become in the future—and are inspired by their passion and knowledge base, leading them to respect the graduate students and incorporate their passion for teaching into their identities and changing their conceptions of music education.

Graduate students and collegiate music education organizations. The School of Music has two collegiate music education organizations: the National Association for Music Association and the American Choral Directors Association. Graduate assistants are influential components of the School of Music's collegiate organizations and music education students have considered their actions within these organizations to have been influential for “disrupting” their occupational identities:

Danielle (third-year female): Going to NAFME or ACDA, any presentation that those organizations give, I've found that I learn a lot more and am exposed to new ideas and think of music education differently. Chris (a graduate student) was talking with NAFME about being out in the middle of nowhere in Wyoming and how classical music just wasn't a thing for them because they're all going to be ranchers and that's not going to be applicable. Ways that he found music to be applicable to them. They did the “Song Quote of the Day” and they would have to figure out what song it was from by the end of the

class. Things that just involved the students more. They did classical music stuff and covers. Going to those meetings, for both ACDA and NAFME, just opened your eyes and made you think about music education in different ways. (MUS 277 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

May (second-year female): In ACDA, a different grad student lead interest sessions all the time so you get to hear about their thoughts and experiences on things. It helps broaden their horizons. Music education is not this “blinds on” thing. It all helps with how you teach music. There are always different people to learn from because everyone comes from a different past and everything and the collegiate organizations help graduate students share their expertise. (MUS 177 focus group discussion, 12/14/15)

Daniel (fourth-year male): I think another thing that helped me was ACDA. We had these kind of conversations. “Hey, how do you deal with a problem parent?” “How do you deal with parents that can help you?” And that was a thing. “What happens if you have never stepped into a band classroom in your life and you have to teach band? Here are the basic nuggets that I, a current graduate student but former public school teacher, can give you in 50 minutes.” Those things, again, were from the grad students. That helped so much. (MUS 468 focus group discussion, 12/8/15)

These sessions offer graduate students the opportunity to further influence undergraduate music education students by giving them a sponsored forum to discuss topics of importance that could be helpful once students graduate from the program. These workshops, with topics such as rural music education and teaching band with little to no prior experience, have been quite helpful and gave students additional information to add to their knowledge base and expand their conceptions of music education.

Summary

Students’ occupational identities are first “disrupted” in the two “foundational” discussion-based classes of the music teacher education program: MUS 177 (Introduction to Music Education) and 277 (Principles of Music Education). The purpose of the former is to develop students’ identities as pre-service music education students at the beginning of their music teacher education experience and help them “find their voices” through discussions of important sociological and philosophical topics, which, in the faculty’s view, help to create an

“orientating lens” through which students view their instructional experiences within the School of Music, the university at large, and fieldwork experiences. The latter includes more discussion of these topics, as well as content on the history of music education, assessment practices, and classroom management. Instructors stated that the underlying environment for these classes, and for others with a desired effect of “disruption” should be that of a supportive “safe place” (Carter, 2011) or “safe space” (Holley & Steiner, 2005) that lets students feel comfortable enough to open oneself up to vulnerability, but allow for moments of discomfort that may provide an impetus for students to become “disrupted.”

Some students, however, were disappointed at the failure to reference students’ philosophies of music education later in the program, particularly during student teaching, as these discussions could have benefitted them during student teaching and the first years of in-service teaching. Participants also discussed their desire to teach early in the music teacher education program and to “fight” against “disruptive” influences and replicate their secondary school experiences, fearing that peers’ definitions of “effective” teaching will be influenced only by what is taught in the music teacher education program and how they are taught.

As students proceed through the music teacher education program, they build and reflect upon discussions in MUS 177 and 277, shifting, deepening, and “disrupting” their identities as educators as they continue to learn and discuss more content through other music education courses, a women’s vocal chamber ensemble, interactions with peers within classes and across the music education program, and interactions between peers, graduate students, and faculty. During focus group discussions, pre-service music education students commented the feeling of community during interactions with themselves (peers), faculty, graduate students, and graduate

students' influence in two collegiate music education organizations in the School of Music: the National Association for Music Association and the American Choral Directors Association.

Centrality of Fieldwork Experiences

Observations in area schools and microteaching experiences that accompany classes are important as they inform class discussions and provide students with experiences that may be “disruptive” due to differences from their secondary school programs. Observations begin in MUS 177 (Introduction to Music Education), ideally in settings that are different enough from their secondary school experiences to provide initial “disruptions” of their occupational identities and “prime the pump” for future music education classes. Within upper-level classes, students participate in classes weekly at the local community music school and at area public schools, first observing to gain an understanding of the context, then teaching microlessons during every site visit. These fieldwork experiences provide music education students with opportunities to manipulate theories of music learning via “real life” applications and experiences that put theory to practice. These fieldwork opportunities, when carefully planned and well framed, provide multiple opportunities to “disrupt” pre-service music educators’ occupational identities and preconceptions of music education, particularly when accompanied by discussion opportunities or debriefing activities that include feedback from instructors.

MUS 469 (Teaching Secondary General Music), however, did not have a fieldwork component, leaving students to doubt the realities and “legitimacy” of concepts learned in class to be implemented in secondary schools for those students who wish to participate in music education experiences but do not wish to participate in performance-based ensembles. Therefore, these pre-service music educators may remain hesitant to include these activities in a stand-alone class or in an ensemble and defer to using the traditional performance-based ensemble paradigm

as the main delivery means of providing a music education to students. Even after students noted the influence of the class on their occupational identities, they advocated for student-directed “secondary general type” activities to take place after school so as to not interfere with music education programs. Therefore, lack of fieldwork experiences for courses regarding areas of music education that are outside of the ensemble paradigm may minimize powerfully “disruptive” influences and influence students to disregard the “legitimacy” and practicality of those areas, leading to a reinforcement of the status quo.

Communities of Practice

Introductory/foundational and instructional methods courses and student teaching, with embedded discussions and facilitation by faculty, create artifacts (Schein, 1985, 2004) and histories that increase understanding of the topic at hand (Wenger, 1998)—music education—and allow for students to co-construct a community of practice and provide opportunities for students’ identities to be “disrupted” (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999; Fischer, 1998; Palloff & Pratt, 1999; Wenger, 1998). Culture is then created and sustained by the interaction and borrowing of ideas among its constituent communities of practice (Wenger, 1998), as was seen with the “foundational” MUS 177 and MUS 277 courses creating an “orientating” lens for pre-service music educators to use throughout their time in the music teacher education program. Additionally, theories discussed in one course and applied in fieldwork experiences could be applied in subsequent courses and their respective fieldwork components.

Knowledge is expanded through discussion (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999); thus, a main function of a community of practice is to help establish discussion. Facilitation, a concept embedded within constructivism, also applies to communities of practice (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999; Fischer, 1998; Palloff & Pratt, 1999). Palloff and Pratt (1999) recommend that class

instructors facilitate, rather than dominate, and “nudge” discussion towards an area that encourages learning and enlightenment. Discussion-based classes in the music teacher education program encouraged student input and sharing of ideas that helped to “disrupt” students’ preconceptions of music education.

Student teaching, introductory/foundational and instructional methods courses, and fieldwork experiences throughout the music teacher education program facilitated expert-to-apprentice relationships, which are important in communities of practice (Soden & Halliday, 2000) and known as “legitimate peripheral participation.” This model conceptualizes novices at the periphery and experts at the center of a community of practice (Gherardi & Nicolini, 2000; Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998). Peripheral roles (e.g., novices) play an important part in the community of practice by developing and using skills that require collaboration and mixing different types of expertise. In the music teacher education program, students are in the role of novices learning from experts, such as instructors, cooperating teachers, and graduate students. Students developed skills amongst themselves through discussion, peer teaching experience, and microlessons, assisting each other in conversations outside of class, “stealing” and adapting each other’s lessons for their own purposes. Furthermore, common themes emerged between several classes: “New Possibilities,” “Student Ownership and Empowerment,” and “Gender.”

New Possibilities

Students in MUS 210 (Songwriting), MUS 469 (Teaching Secondary General Music), MUS 465 (Teaching Early Childhood Music), MUS 456 (Teaching Stringed Instruments), and MUS 467 (Teaching Elementary General Music) became cognizant of new means of teaching music, as well as new ways of understanding musicianship. Additionally, some students may change interests in career areas in music education and choose to teach early childhood or

elementary general music. Finally, “disruptive” components of these classes could influence students’ teaching practices—regardless of the type of class—when they enter the teaching profession.

Student Ownership and Empowerment

Students experienced a sense of ownership, empowerment, and community in Dr. Lee’s classes (Women’s Chamber Ensemble, Ensemble Conducting: Choral, and Teaching Choral Music) as she modeled how to provide similar types of learning experiences for future students of pre-service music educators. She also helped to facilitate the creation of a welcoming atmosphere within her classes that further encouraged student participation. Additionally, in Dr. Woolfolk’s MUS 456 (Teaching Stringed Instruments), pre-service educators observed a student-centered teaching environment that guided students to help each other without direct assistance from the classroom teacher, providing music education students with a model of how to teach other than the traditional teacher-centered model of music teaching.

Gender

During Women’s Chamber Ensemble, Dr. Lee “disrupted” stereotypes of females in higher education and served as a role model for women in academia. Dr. Lee also provided examples of how to deal with potentially sexist situations in a professional but assertive manner. Also, field experiences in MUS 465 (Teaching Early Childhood Music) and 467 (Teaching Elementary General Music) helped to resolve the inner tension for one cisgender male student who was conflicted by his gender and interest in teaching young children.

CHAPTER VII: SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH, AND CONCLUSION

The purpose of this chapter is to provide a summary of the present study, including the purpose and research questions, methodological approach and design, as well as to draw conclusions. Based on the conclusions, I then provide implications for music teacher education and suggestions for future research.

Purpose and Research Questions

In response to the need for music teacher educators to break the cycle of self-perpetuation of repeating practices that have been in place in part due to the influence of secondary school educators on pre-service students' occupational identities and in part due to monolithic systems in music education that are difficult to change, the purpose of the study was to examine the interactions within the cultural cohort communities of a music teacher education program embedded within the culture of a school of music and the role that these interactions play in “disrupting” pre-service educators' occupational identities, including occupational identities already formed when they began music teacher preparation studies and throughout the music teacher preparation program. The guiding research questions for this explanatory sequential design mixed methods study were as follows:

Quantitative research questions:

1. Which structural components of the music teacher education program (e.g., course curricula, University/College of Education/School of Music/music education program requirements, music education program sequence), if any, assist with “disrupting” pre-service music educators' occupational identities?
2. Which communities, interactions, and persons within the cultural cohort and the

- culture are the most significant “disruptive” influences on pre-service music educators’ occupational identities?
3. How do structural components of the music teacher education program (e.g., University/College of Education/School of Music/music education program requirements, music education program sequence) assist with “disrupting” pre-service music educators’ occupational identities?

Qualitative research questions:

4. Why are certain communities, interactions, and persons within the cultural cohort and the culture the most significant “disruptive” influences on pre-service music educators’ occupational identities? How are those “disruptions” created?
5. How do these “disruptions” manifest themselves in pre-service music educators’ occupational identities? How do these “disruptions” manifest themselves in pre-service music educators’ conceptions of and beliefs and attitudes about music education?

Summary of Methodological Approach and Design

Quantitative Methodology: Pre-Service Music Educator Survey

Drawing upon Wenger’s (1998) Communities of Practice model and Schein’s (1985, 2004) Three Levels of Culture model of organizational culture for theoretical frameworks and utilizing an explanatory sequential mixed methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2011), I first created a Pre-Service Music Educator Survey that captured basic demographic information, memberships in collegiate music education organizations, and participants’ understandings of how they viewed themselves at the beginning of their time in the cultural cohort and at the time

of the study in terms of musician/performer and teacher identities. I also asked participants to indicate which courses, persons, and social interactions, or other influences within or outside of the School of Music most influenced them to change their beliefs of music education and identities as music educators between matriculation into the School of Music and the time of taking the survey. Additionally, I asked them to identify their past and present areas of teaching interest in order to detect shifts in students' occupational identities and teaching areas of interest. Areas of teaching included both traditional areas of music teaching (i.e., performance-based ensembles), as well as emerging modalities of music teaching (i.e., music technology, popular music, etc.). The results of the survey allowed me to identify which courses and influences were most disruptive to students' occupational identities.

Qualitative Methodology

Following data collection and analysis of the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey, I created cohort groups of students from classes that were identified by undergraduate music education students as being highly “disruptive” to participate in focus group discussions. Additionally, all music education faculty participated in a focus group discussion and each participated in an individual interview. I used a semi-structured interview format (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2003; Seidman, 2006) for all focus group discussions and interviews and transcribed each as soon as possible following the interview. After all student/faculty focus group discussions and faculty interviews were completed and transcribed, I read interview transcripts and logbook/journal entries multiple times to become intimately familiar with the data, employed multiple coding techniques to create an inventory of codes, and then I analyzed the codes to develop within-case themes (Charmaz, 2006; Miles & Huberman, 1994; Saldaña, 2013). Finally, I developed overarching themes by comparing, contrasting, and analyzing codes from all

transcripts.

Summary of Results

Quantitative Results

Eighty-three students in the School of Music participated in the beginning of the survey to provide a survey response rate of 63.8% ($N = 130$). However, only 62-65 completed the last three questions, providing a survey response rate for these questions of 47.7-50%. In regards to changes in occupational identities from matriculation into the music teacher preparation program to the time of taking the survey (L’Roy, 1983; Roberts, 1990, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c, 1993, 2000, 2003), the Musician and Performer identity categories were the strongest of all identity categories upon matriculation into the music teacher education program, which is consistent with previous research (Aróstegui, 2004; Bernard, 2005; Beynon, 1998; Bouij, 1998, 2004; Cox, 1997; Frink, 1997; Froehlich & L’Roy, 1985; L’Roy, 1983; Mark, 1998; Pellegrino, 2009; Roberts, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c; Scheib, 2006; Woodford, 2002). However, all other identity categories, including Teacher, Educator, Conductor, and Director had a greater change in observed mean, suggesting that the Musician and Performer identities did not intensify to the extent of other categories as they continued their participation in the music teacher education program. The greatest positive change was in the Educator identity category, followed closely by the Conductor identity category. Students also viewed themselves more strongly as music educators and directors since matriculation into the pre-service music teacher education program.

Students identified the following classes as being the most influential in changing their beliefs about music education and changing their identities as music educators:

MUS 125 – Women’s Chamber Ensemble

MUS 171 – Class Strings I

MUS 177 – Introduction to Music Education

MUS 210 – Songwriting

MUS 277 – Principles of Music Education

MUS 336B – Ensemble Conducting II: Choral

MUS 455 – Teaching Instrumental Music

MUS 456 – Teaching Stringed Instruments

MUS 465 – Teaching Early Childhood Music

MUS 467 – Teaching Elementary General Music

MUS 468 – Teaching Choral Music

MUS 469 – Teaching Secondary General Music

MUS 495 – Student Teaching in Music

Additionally, analysis of qualitative open-ended responses on the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey prompted me to also examine interactions between undergraduate music education students and their peers in that cultural cohort, interactions between undergraduate music education students and music education faculty, and interactions between undergraduate music education students and graduate music education students, as well as the influences of collegiate music education associations (e.g., Collegiate National Association for Music Education, American Choral Directors Association), supporting findings on the socialization and peer interactions that take place within communities of practice (Chickering, 1974) and identity development (Bielaczyc & Collins, 1999; Conkling, 2003; Haston & Russell, 2012; Isbell, 2008; Wenger, 1998). Other influential events included participation in off-campus events not affiliated with the University or the School of Music, such as a youth choir, instrument-specific events, and teaching private lessons. Two students specifically noted that the Music Education “Rally,”

an event held once a year, increased camaraderie and a sense of community among the undergraduate music education students.

Results from the Survey suggested a change of interest in occupational types of music teaching (e.g., early childhood music educator, high school performance-based ensemble teacher, etc.) between matriculation into the music education program and the time participants took the survey. The most prominent changes in interest were increases in the desire to teach middle school general music, followed by early childhood music, and elementary general music. Even so, students still indicated the most interest in the High School Performance-Based Ensemble Teacher category, which is consistent with findings of previous researchers (Bergee et al., 2001; Fredrickson & Williams, 2009; Hellman, 2008), but there was a slight decrease in interest in teaching music through that medium as their interest in other occupational types of music teaching became more pronounced.

Respondents also rated their past and current interest in different means of teaching music: both traditional means of music teaching (i.e., performance-based ensembles, teaching elementary general music, etc.) and emerging modalities of music teaching (i.e., music technology, popular music, etc.). Students indicated the most interest in teaching music through the performance-based ensemble, but the change in observed mean between matriculation and survey administration was the smallest of all categories, meaning that students' interest in teaching music through a traditional performance-based ensemble did not intensify to the extent that it did for other types of music teaching, particularly improvisation, a non-traditional ensemble, musical concepts using technology, and elementary general music.

Results from the Survey also revealed that students' identities as educators and music educators developed during participation within the music teacher education program, suggesting

that educator and music educator identities can be developed in a pre-service music teacher education program and that identity formation and development does not necessarily require employment as a music teacher, which contradicts some researchers who have suggested that pre-service students lacked any sense of teacher identity (Roberts, 1991b) and could not begin to develop a teacher identity until they became in-service educators (Cox, 1997).

Qualitative Results

Using results from the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey, I created student cohort focus group discussion questions (see Appendix C) with the intent of having the qualitative data inform the results of the quantitative survey and illuminate the phenomena of interest. Following data analysis of responses from students in the cohort focus group discussions, I devised faculty focus group discussion questions (see Appendix D) and then undertook another series of data analysis and created individual faculty interview questions (see Appendix E) that were based on data derived from the Pre-Service Music Educator Survey and the student and faculty focus group discussions.

“De-tracked” music education program. Several components of the music teacher education program were found to be “disruptive” influences on students’ occupational identities and preconceptions of music education. The “de-tracked” nature of the program allows students to take classes that may differ from their primary means of music making production (vocal or instrumental) and provides additional options to satisfy program requirements. Students believed that the absence of “tracks” and resulting curricular course structure helped to facilitate the creation of relationships among the pre-service music educator population, foster a sense of educator identity, and increase the potential for students to experience “disruptive” moments throughout the music teacher education program. Additionally, the “de-tracked” program

sequence facilitated the feeling of “community” among students, which helped students support each other towards reaching the common goal of becoming outstanding K-12 music educators.

MUS 177 & MUS 277: The “foundational” courses. Students first experienced the common “community” of music educators in MUS 177, Introduction to Music Education, which is among the first music education classes they take and among the first “disruptive” influence students experience in the music teacher education program. The purpose of MUS 177 is to develop students’ identities as pre-service music education students at the beginning of their music teacher education experience. Through discussions of important sociological and philosophical topics, students create an “orientating lens” through which students view their future experiences throughout their time at the University. The other “foundational” course, MUS 277, Principles of Music Education, includes discussion of similar sociological topics, as well as discussion of assessment practices and classroom management and was viewed as an extension of MUS 177 to help deepen students’ identities as music educators, prepare students for upper-level methods courses, and provide further exploration of teaching identities, foundational topics, and social issues in music education.

Timing of philosophical development in the context of lack of experience. Some participants voiced a desire to teach early in the music teacher education program and to replicate their secondary school experiences, which would make their being “disrupted” more difficult. They would not have explored new avenues of practice that they could put into play in their teaching, leaving them only with the possibility of teaching in the way that they themselves had been taught. Additionally, students were frustrated by the lack of focus on and opportunity to revise and reflect upon the philosophical statements that they had written early in the degree program during the latter half of the music teacher education program. They believed that, after

multiple fieldwork experiences and during student teaching, their philosophies had changed to the point that they needed to be revisited and rethought.

Fieldwork experiences. Observations and microteachings within contexts that were likely to be different from pre-service music educators' elementary and secondary experiences were also found to be "disruptive" influences on students' occupational identities and conceptions of music education. When carefully planned, observations across multiple grade levels, socioeconomic contexts, and teaching styles were components of music teacher education classes that provided additional perspectives of what music education can be. Additionally, observing and working with the same class over a period of time gave pre-service educators opportunities to view growth in children over time and provided them with valuable teaching experiences within contexts that challenged their notions of music education. However, students in classes without this type of field experience doubted the viability of the course's methods within a school music program and spoke of a lack of credibility for concepts discussed in the course due to the absence of a fieldwork component. Additionally, two students described how poor observation settings and modeling can have a negative impact on occupational identities. Therefore, music teacher educators also should be judicious with who pre-service educators observe.

Identity "shifting" & "safe spaces." For some students, student teaching was a pivotal time for occupational identity development as their occupational identities shifted dramatically to assume the role of teachers. Having a full college schedule, including attending multiple classes daily, may prevent students' "disruption" and "shifting" of occupational identities from happening. However, many students had "microshifts" in occupational identities throughout their time in the music teacher education program. Interactions between individuals of the cultural

cohort—the music education program—should lead to the creation of supportive relationships within “safe space” that elicits students to discuss personal viewpoints and past experiences, thereby having students feel discomfort and providing an impetus for students to become “disrupted.”

Stigmatization of music education students. Both students and faculty spoke of problematic aspects of the School of Music that interfered with occupational identity development and identity “disruption.” In the School of Music, performance is valued over music education. Inequitable amounts of lesson time between performance and education majors and higher performance standards for performance majors led education majors to believe that that performance majors are valued more within the culture of the School of Music. Additionally, being labeled as “educators,” rather than “performers,” was stigmatizing for some music education students and led to feelings of “role” tension for these students. These types of situations may prove to be difficult for students with a less developed sense of teacher identity and may influence them to drop the music education major or leave the School of Music entirely.

Community. An analysis of all qualitative data across all classes revealed an overarching theme of community within the cultural cohort. For the purpose of this study, “community” was defined as a “group of people who are organized and unified according to a common and shared purpose, who have ongoing dialogue with one another, or...have ‘life in association with others’” (Jorgensen, 1990). The community nature of peer interactions within the cultural cohort in both formal (class discussions, peer teachings, fieldwork experiences) and casual, informal settings (conversations online, in hallways, and in coffee shops) served as influences that “disrupted” students’ occupational identities and preconceptions of music education. Furthermore, within this community environment, students observe each other teaching classes and learn from each other,

sometimes “stealing” teaching activities and ideas for their own purposes. Participants stated that the community feeling of the music education program has a feeling of collaboration, implicitly encouraging them to use each other as resources and share lesson plans for the benefit of K-12 students’ education. Additionally, students recognized how the faculty makes a concerted effort to create relationships with students and maintain those relationships both during the class and after classes have concluded, serving as resources for them during identity “shifts” that could be filled with angst. Students are “introduced” to all music education faculty during MUS 177 (Introduction to Music Education), which also helps to build visibility for these professors and inculcate the students to the culture and community of the music education program. Finally, graduate student assistants are actively involved in the undergraduate music education program as guest presenters and class instructors who act as facilitators and make themselves vulnerable to their students. These recent practitioners serve as role models for undergraduate students who are inspired by their passion, leading them to incorporate that same passion for teaching into their identities and positively influencing their conceptions of music education.

Admissions and scholarship policies. Additional problematic areas include School of Music admissions policies that favor students with outstanding musicality and performance skills, but not necessarily the possession of a music teacher identity in School of Music audition requirements that are restricted to traditional Western-European based repertoire and performance practices, and societal factors that have influenced participation in formal music education experiences, such as race, class, and socioeconomic status. Scholarship monies can improve access to a music teacher education program, but are traditionally awarded only via studio faculty’s recommendations to outstanding auditionees who had access to quality K-12

preparatory experiences that are steeped in traditional Western-European performance practices that schools of music tend to favor.

Common themes across several classes emerged from analysis of the qualitative data. These are “New Possibilities,” “Student Ownership and Empowerment,” and “Gender.”

New possibilities. MUS 210 (Songwriting), MUS 469 (Teaching Secondary General Music), MUS 465 (Teaching Early Childhood Music), MUS 456 (Teaching Stringed Instruments), and MUS 467 (Teaching Elementary General Music) provided students with opportunities to imagine new learning activities and opportunities in music education, as well as realize the importance of music education for young children. Students in MUS 465 and MUS 467 commented on the purposeful inclusion of songs and activities that surreptitiously demonstrate students’ learning and understanding of music. Early childhood and elementary general music classes may seem like “play” on the surface, but require thorough planning and are actually quite substantive in terms of musicianship development. As a result of classroom and fieldwork experiences in these two classes, some students chose to change their career path to teaching early childhood and/or elementary general music. Teaching activities and discussions of music learning theory also may influence students’ classroom practices when they enter the teaching profession.

Students’ experiences in MUS 210 (Songwriting) provided a more comprehensive understanding of how musicianship can manifest itself outside of a traditional Western-based music education setting, leading to a desire to work with K-12 students who may not wish to participate in traditional performance-based ensembles. Additionally, pre-service educators wished to create a classroom environment that encourages student creativity and learning from the process of creating a new work, rather than putting an emphasis on the quality of the final

product's performance. Concepts that were discussed in MUS 469 (Teaching Secondary General Music)—creating cover songs, arranging, using ukuleles and electronic media in secondary general music classes, and developing vernacular musicianship skills—and MUS 456 (Teaching Stringed Instruments)—implementing creative activities in an ensemble setting—also provided several “disruptive” moments for pre-service music educators that made them think about new possibilities for what music teaching could be.

Student ownership and empowerment. Students in MUS 125B (Women's Chamber Ensemble), MUS 336B (Ensemble Conducting: Choral), and MUS 468 (Teaching Choral Music) experienced a sense of ownership, empowerment, and community. In MUS 125B, students perceive Women's Chamber Ensemble to be an empowering student-centered ensemble built on the importance of relationships. Dr. Lee, the instructor of record, continually encourages students to provide their opinions and assist with making musical decisions, thus creating a sense of ownership within the ensemble and helping to facilitate the creation of an atmosphere that encourages student participation. Students in MUS 336B also perceive Dr. Lee as being authentic in her interactions, which helps her to create relationships with them and an effective learning environment for them.

Additionally, during fieldwork experiences in a low socioeconomic status, racially and ethnically diverse high school, students in MUS 456 (Teaching Stringed Instruments) observed and worked with a cooperating teacher who empowered her students by acting as a student-centered facilitator, thus guiding them to help each other without her constant assistance. These experiences provide pre-service music educators with a model of how to create an environment in which K-12 students can learn from each other, which could be of great assistance to them as performers when they are no longer under the direction of a conductor.

Gender. Three courses—MUS 125B (Women’s Chamber Ensemble), MUS 465 (Teaching Early Childhood Music), and MUS 467 (Teaching Elementary General Music) “disrupted” gender stereotypes in education. The processes that Dr. Lee employs in Women’s Chamber Ensemble, coupled with the repertoire she chooses for the ensemble, “disrupt” sexist tropes that have been associated with women and women in music for centuries, providing students with a sense of empowerment and offering them a model for how to program repertoire with their future ensembles. Additionally, Dr. Lee serves as a role model for women in academia and provides students with examples of how to address sexist situations in a professional but assertive manner.

Fletcher, a cisgender male who participated in MUS 465 and MUS 467, discussed how gender inequity and stereotyping within the music education profession (Koza, 1993/1994; Kruse, Giebelhausen, Shoudice, & Ramsey, 2015) created a sense of tension for him, a pre-service educator who wished to teach early childhood and elementary general music, since most early childhood music and elementary general music teachers are female. He was also concerned about how others, particularly parents, would perceive him and whether they would feel that it was appropriate for him to teach their young children. Participation in MUS 465 and 467, as well as being an active participant in an early childhood class at the local community music school, helped him to resolve his inner tension and provided real experiences to draw upon and influence his occupational identity. Listening to stories of current male elementary general music teachers also assisted Fletcher with feeling confident to occupy the role as an elementary general music teacher.

Implications for Music Teacher Education

Introduction to Music Education courses

The music teacher education program includes two introductory courses: MUS 177 and 277. The purpose of these classes is for students to have “disruptive” experiences and start developing their teacher identity, as well as create an “orientating lens” through which to view the remainder of experiences within the music teacher education program, including class discussions, fieldwork experiences, and observations. Students’ identities as educators developed by building on and reflecting upon discussions from the two introductory classes and using the “orientating lens” when discussing observations in area school and fieldwork experiences. Several students commented on how their preconceptions of music education were “disrupted” by the two classes with their occupational identities changing as a result of the experiences within the class: discussions and fieldwork observations.

Consequently, music teacher education programs should create an introductory course sequence early in the degree program—within the first two years, if possible—that create opportunities to “disrupt” students’ preconceptions of music education and start to create a teacher identity. Discussion topics for the classes could include the importance of meaningful student-teacher relationships, music teacher identity and vision, and philosophy of music education, competition/festivals, social class, gender and gender identity, sexual orientation, race, religion, special education, popular/vernacular music, and technology. As some of these topics may be especially strong parts of students’ identities, instructors should take care to create a classroom environment in which students feel safe and are respectful of varying opinions. Some discussions may have moments of discomfort, but there should be an underlying feeling of “safe space” that is foundational to the class ethos.

Fieldwork Experiences

Students should observe classes in school settings that would, most likely, be substantially different from their secondary school experiences and would complement class discussions and activities in order to further assist with “disrupting” students’ occupational identities and preconceptions of music education. Ideally, observations would take place early in the degree program, perhaps within the introductory course(s) in music education, and continue throughout the music teacher education program. Possible observation opportunities could include large ensemble settings that incorporate creativity (composition, arranging, improvisation) as an important learning component, exemplary elementary general music classes (as some students may not recall their elementary general experiences or had negative experiences in that context), exemplary secondary general music classes (e.g., music technology, songwriting, hip-hop production, popular music, class guitar, etc.), music classes within varying settings and working with diverse student populations (e.g., urban, rural) (Conway, 2012; Emmanuel, 2003; Hourigan, 2007; Hunt, 2009), early childhood music classes, and classes with teachers who are student-centered in their teaching practices. Music teacher educators should take considerable care as to who they have their students observe, as two students in the present study almost left the music teacher education program due to poorly framed and selected observations that were required by a College of Education course. Using guiding instructor-generated observation and fieldwork questions that correspond to units within courses may help students to guide their focus for observations and subsequent reflection papers, as students stated in Conway’s (2002) study that they were not sure what to observe and analyze during fieldwork observations.

As researchers have previously discussed (Draves, 2008, 2014; Knowles, 1992; Teachout & McCoy, 2010), pre-service music educators should interact with in-service educators and K-12 students early in the music teacher preparation program and participate in microteaching experiences and other authentic learning experiences to further develop their emerging teacher identities. Music teacher educators will need to discuss when they feel that these types of experiences in an authentic K-12 context are appropriate. Faculty may wish to have students meet a certain threshold of knowledge, such as an introduction to music education course and one methods course, before teaching in a public school. Additionally, students must have opportunities to reflect on microteaching experiences to help pre-service educators develop concepts of teaching identity (Draves, 2008; Samuels & Stephens, 2000).

A university, however, may only have access to school districts that offer a dearth of exemplar educational experiences for pre-service music educators to observe. This may especially be true for secondary general music classes, as fewer than 45% of schools offer a general music class, and even fewer offer classes in technology, guitar, and composition (Abril & Gault, 2008). In this circumstance, music teacher educators and school of music administrators should consider housing a program within a professional development school (Conkling, 2003; Henry, 2001) that would supplement an existing public school's music education program and provide authentic context learning experiences (Haston & Russell, 2012) to pre-service music education students. A similar program could be arranged with a local community music school. If these options are not viable, music teacher educators may wish to, with permission from teachers, administrators, and, if necessary, parents, show their students video recordings of classes where concepts discussed in class are successfully implemented or use Skype or a similar videoconferencing program to allow students to observe exemplary teachers who are not nearby.

to serve as a substitute for in-person observations. Additionally, instructors may need to first teach students as if they were secondary school students, with instructors assuming the role of secondary school teachers, then discuss the implications for student learning, followed by application of the material via peer teachings. This may be less effective than observing and teaching K-12 students in an authentic environment, but it may provide students with some context of how a concept can be implemented in a class, as well as the benefits of implementation.

Creation of New Courses

The School of Music in the present study has a Songwriting course that was a “disruptive” experience for pre-service music educators in that their concepts of what constituted a “musician” were expanded as they created a more comprehensive worldview of music and experienced firsthand the different ways musicianship can manifest itself outside of the conservatory-based confines of the School of Music. Additionally, their occupational identities as educators strengthened with the desire to teach more than choir, band, and orchestra and work with students who may not wish to participate in traditional performance-based ensembles. Schools of music should provide similar types of courses that challenge and expand pre-service educators’ conceptions of musicianship and provide ideas for activities to be implemented in existing K-12 school music contexts, or could provide ideas for new music courses for all students to experience. Given the influence of non-majors on pre-service music educators’ conceptions of musicianship, music teacher educators could consider making some of these courses open to all students, regardless of major. Instructors of these courses would provide pre-service educators with a philosophical rationale for teaching these topics to K-12 students and

provide hands-on learning experiences so students can understand the learning process themselves and gain confidence in their teaching abilities. Possibilities for new courses include:

- Teaching popular music (infusing informal music learning, composition, improvisation, arranging)
- Creativity in Music Education: Teaching composition, improvisation, and arranging to K-12 students
- Technology in Music Education
- Culturally relevant ensembles (e.g., mariachi, salsa, etc.) (may vary based on geographic location)
- Voice techniques
- Hip Hop: History, pedagogy, and creating beats
- Guitar and ukulele techniques

Evaluation of Existing Courses

It may not be possible to add additional courses due to credit limits for degree programs, among other reasons. Therefore, as suggested by the College Music Society's Task Force on the Undergraduate Music Major (College Music Society, 2014), it may be wiser to revamp the undergraduate instrumental music teacher curriculum within the credit hours that it is already allotted by a school of music or revise the content of existing music teacher education courses. The Task Force advocates for music teacher education faculty to evaluate existing course content and eliminate topics or activities that may not be as significant to the curriculum as they may have been in the past, thereby creating space for educational experiences for students that are congruent with current trends and practices in contemporary music making (Williams, 2007). For example, composition, arranging, and improvisation activities can be implemented in an

instrumental methods class via informal music learning practices in small group ensembles. Furthermore, these activities, as well as activities pertinent to technology, hip-hop, and popular music, can be infused throughout a pre-service music teacher education curriculum, as well as in musicology and theory courses. Additional solutions from the Task Force include streamlining the typical two or three years of theory and musicology coursework to a one-year core for each area, then having students devote the remaining credit hours towards music studies of their choice. Also, music education faculty could determine their program's curriculum requirements as they know best the needs of their students and could devise a curriculum map that would best prepare them to work with *all* students in a school setting.

Philosophy Units

While some students remarked that the discussions of philosophical and sociological topics in MUS 177 and MUS 277 helped to “disrupt” their initial occupational identities and preconceptions of music education and provided the means to create an orientating “lens” within which to view the remainder of their pre-service experiences, other upper-level students felt that they could have created a more informed philosophy of music education towards the latter half of their pre-service careers after fieldwork experiences and, in particular, towards the end of the student teaching experience. It is important that course work subsequent to classes like MUS 177 and 277 continue to feature philosophical discussions regarding contemporary topics in music education so students' identities and preconceptions of music education can continue to be shaped and “disrupted,” leading to development of a revised and informed philosophy of music education that can guide pre-service educators' initial decisions as in-service music educators.

Music education curricula should, in the words of one focus group participant, “bookend” a philosophy construction portion of the curriculum by providing opportunities to introduce

philosophy and sociology in introductory music education courses—courses analogous to MUS 177 and 277 in the present study—then return to those same topics towards the end of the music teacher education program, such as during the student teaching seminar, to inform students’ philosophies with what has been learned from teaching experiences. Similarly, music teacher educators could have a philosophy component for all classes, particularly those with fieldwork components, so that students may “update” their philosophies as they are informed by their recent teaching experiences. The process of revising one’s philosophy statement could be a rewarding and informative activity for pre-service educators in helping them understand how their thought processes, beliefs, and identities have deepened and become more nuanced over time. Reflecting on and revising one’s philosophy statement over the course of the music teacher education program could allow students and their instructors to monitor the development of occupational identity throughout the degree program. Music teacher educators may then wish to reconceptualize their music teacher education curricula in response to multi-year trends in students’ occupational identity development.

Identity Development Discussions

MUS 177 was created in part for students to start developing their occupational identities and use these identities as “orientating lenses” throughout their time in the music education degree program. As pre-service music educators continue to progress through the music teacher education program, music teacher education faculty may wish to devote time during music education courses for students to examine the present state of their occupational identities, including present or recent identity “shifts,” through forms of representation such as writing activities or drawings (Dolloff, 1999). Alsup (2006) stated that identity construction never ends; it is continuously changing as a result of our interactions with our environments (Reinharz, 1979;

Roberts, 1991b, 2003; Turino, 2008; Wenger, 1998) and should be understood as “a space of continual becoming rather than an endpoint culminating in a singular identity construction” (Alsup, 2006, p. 7). Students may feel confusion with the interaction of experiences within a music teacher education program, along with the implicit and explicit messages—some of which may contradict each other—that are received in a school of music. Draves (2014) suggested that music teacher educators should teach pre-service educators conceptions of identity and the forces that contribute to them in their classes as well as discuss the challenges of identity development to assure them that trials and angst are normal feelings during identity “shifts.”

Music Teacher Education Program Student Evaluations

Students in this study were able to articulate their educational needs clearly. Music teacher educators may wish to consult periodically with current pre-service music educators to assess if the music teacher education curriculum is meeting the needs of students. An “advisory panel” consisting of a cross-section of students in the cultural cohort including diversity of applied instrument/voice, years in the program, and diverse backgrounds, may have suggestions on how to improve the program for future pre-service music teacher educators. “Exit interviews” with the most recent cohort of graduates could glean additional useful information. Faculty also should have conversations with graduates of the program who are veteran educators (those with five or more years of teaching) and are innovative in their practices, as these teachers can give suggestions for the music teacher education program informed by their experiences. This type of rich feedback could be quite helpful for both music teacher education faculty in making adjustments in the program, which would then benefit future pre-service music teacher educators.

Community

Music teacher educators need to create a community within the cultural cohort that is the music teacher education program. Students commented on the perceived overarching philosophy of the music education department— that all teacher education students be compassionate, understand that they are teaching people, and that these people feel like they are in a safe environment—and that the culture of the music education program has an air of openness, encouragement, and collaboration. This can result in students feeling supported enough to change.

Towards this end, music teacher educators need to consider how to structure their classes and music teacher education program to foster an overall feeling of community. Faculty should strive to co-create with students a “safe” classroom environment that encourages sharing of divergent perspectives. Courses need to start immediately with the establishment of relationships with students: getting to know them as people, understanding who they are, their backgrounds, and how to best meet their needs. Additionally, faculty need to provide space during classes for students to talk amongst themselves and share opinions on the topic at hand, whether in small groups or in a discussion with the entire class. The building of relationships between students, as well as between students and teacher, should lead to a classroom culture in which, as recently discussed, students feel safe and encouraged to share divergent views.

Peer teaching activities with resultant feedback could be effective learning opportunities, but should be prefaced by brief “ground rules” from the course instructor that include the tone and type of language students should use to respond to each other following the teaching activity. Additionally, faculty should be respectful and affirming of students’ viewpoints that are based in their experiences and identities, rather than discounting them. Faculty also should approach the

act of teaching as facilitating learning experiences between students, teachers learning from students, and students learning from teacher, as well as model professional interactions between themselves for students to observe.

Music education students and faculty can gather together for a semi-annual or annual celebratory event to affirm the importance of music education in schools and build a sense of pride in a school of music's education program. Guest speakers, such as graduates and area K-12 teachers, can deliver a speech that affirms students' choices to pursue music education as a career. Music education faculty also can recognize students' accomplishments in a celebratory environment that builds camaraderie among students and increase the sense of "community" for all those involved in the music teacher education program: undergraduates, graduate students, K-12 teacher colleagues, and collegiate faculty.

Students in the present study found the music education collegiate associations to be particularly helpful with giving students additional information to add to their knowledge base and expand their conceptions of music education. Faculty should consider becoming advisors for music education collegiate associations and convening an executive board of officers. Under the supervision and counsel of the advisor, executive board officers can solicit activities can solicit from faculty, graduate students, undergraduate students, and in-service teachers on topics of interest and importance to students. Service-learning projects (Burton & Reynolds, 2009) and participation at state music education conferences provide additional learning opportunities under the umbrella of an organization that functions as a community.

"De-Tracking" of Music Teacher Education Program

Schools of music should offer "de-tracked" music education programs so music education students that can take classes in areas outside of their means of music production—

elementary/secondary general, instrumental, choral—in order to prepare for the possibility of teaching any or all of these areas in a future position. Student participants found that the “de-tracked” program sequence helped to foster a sense of “educator” identity within an environment that tends to bestow a higher social status upon the identity of “performers” (Aróstegui, 2004; Kingsbury, 1984, 1988; Nettle, 1995; Woodford, 2002) than “teachers,” and facilitates the creation of relationships between them. Additionally, similar to Conway’s (2002, 2012) findings, the “de-tracked” program sequence fostered a feeling of mutual support for students to take classes in multiple areas of music education. The “de-tracked” nature of a music teacher education program can also enhance the feeling of “community” among students as they come together as “music education majors” learning together and having “disruptive” moments together that change how they think of themselves as educators. Finally, in the words of the faculty, a “de-tracked” program sequence will let students “find their voices” as educators by teaching in an area that is the best occupational “fit” for them (Robinson, 2010; Shouldice, 2013a).

School of music faculty also will need to engage in a critical dialogue regarding the preparation of students to function in the extremely dynamic and rich musical environment that we inhabit in the 21st century and alter curricula to best meet students’ needs with the outcome of restructuring degree programs and/or redistributing credit loads among degree programs. Questions from the College Music Society’s Task Force on the Undergraduate Music Major (College Music Society, 2014), including “What does it mean to be an educated individual in the 21st century?”, “What might a new worldview for music study look like?”, and “Why, after over 50 years of appeals for reform, has change in music study remained superficial rather than substantive?” (p. 5), will be of assistance during these important conversations.

Admissions and Scholarship Policies

The School of Music's current admission practices present challenges to "disrupting" pre-service music educators' occupational identities and preconceptions of music education in several ways. Students may be admitted to a School of Music for their performance and musicianship skills and be enticed with scholarship funds to matriculate, but not have the proper dispositions and personal skills to be effective music teachers. Furthermore, students who are good musicians and do have outstanding music teacher dispositions may not receive enough scholarship funding to allow them to matriculate, as the scholarship funding is awarded solely on the basis of performance skill. This sends a clear message to students about what is valued in the School of Music and makes it more difficult to claim the identity of "music teacher." Additionally, a student's occupational identity may, in fact, become "disrupted," but the absence of necessary teaching dispositions could limit her effectiveness in the classroom.

There are several factors for schools of music to reconsider in regards to admissions and scholarship policies. First, schools of music need to reevaluate admissions criteria. At present, schools of music tend to favor only those auditioning students who have an excellent grounding in Western-based performance practices as demonstrated through traditional classical instruments or voice, thereby eliminating entire populations of potentially excellent educators who may be extremely well versed in styles and instruments that are not currently valued by institutions (Koza, 2008). This, by extension, perpetuates the dominance of Western-based practices in public schools. Administrators and faculty need to reconsider their thoughts on musicianship in the 21st century, as most schools of music still embrace a conservatory model that reinforces what we expected musicians to know in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries (College Music Society, 2014; Nettl, 1995). Schools of music need to end "othering"

practices that exclude musicians who exhibit outstanding musicianship through means that currently are not validated by the academy. Finally, personnel in schools of music need to embrace musicianship that is congruent with current musical practices and trends, support the development of a culture that embraces these new forms of musicianship, and, if necessary, invest in new faculty that will teach students admitted under these new admissions policies.

Lack of financial resources may act as a barrier that prevents potentially outstanding music educators from matriculating into a school of music. Administrators need to evaluate how scholarship monies are allocated. The music education faculty devised a method towards addressing what they described as “flawed policy”—having no input in the decision to admit a student into a music teacher education program—by instituting a short interview that assesses students’ interests in and dispositions towards teaching, as well as an aural skills test that includes the echoing of rhythm and tonal patterns, singing a familiar song, and sight-reading a line of music. These processes make music education faculty visible on audition days and demonstrate their interest in the auditions and admissions processes. It also allows them to start a conversation with and create relationships with applied faculty that have benefitted the music teacher education program with successful matriculation of excellent music education candidates. Music teacher education faculty should implement a similar set of procedures for auditioning music education students so they may assess students’ depth of teacher dispositions and musicianship skills, create dialogue between them and applied faculty, and have their “voices” be heard on these important days.

Suggestions for Future Research

Longitudinal Study of Participants

The present study features pre-service music educators and their occupational identities and conceptions of music education. It may be of interest to speak with these same participants as veteran in-service educators who have taught for several years and gained experience in the field to understand their occupational identities at that moment and how their undergraduate experiences have influenced their ongoing occupational identity construction, if at all. It may also be informative to determine other factors that may have influenced the construction of their occupational identities since graduating from the undergraduate teacher education program, such as potential pressure to conform to teaching through more “traditional” aspects of music education or expectations from a community or school administration to maintain the status quo. A longitudinal study of these pre-service participants over the course of their teaching careers could be a fascinating study in occupational identity construction and what influences the construction process.

Other areas to explore include determining areas within which music educators are teaching (e.g., band, chorus, orchestra, secondary general) and the areas within which music educators *desire* to teach. Are they the same, or is there a desire to teach within another area of music education (e.g., high school instrumental music educator desiring to teach secondary general music) or incorporate one means of teaching into another (e.g., integrating creativity into a performance-based ensemble)? Additionally, researchers should identify what types of “disruptive” events occur during in-service teaching and the effects of those “disruptive” moments.

“Tracking” Through a Music Teacher Education Program

Researchers and music teacher educators may wish to assess pre-service music education students’ occupational identities immediately upon matriculation into a school of music, then “track” the emerging occupational identities and conceptions of music education of that cohort group periodically throughout their time in the music teacher education program to determine how those identities and conceptions “shift” over time and why. With examination of successive cohort groups, music teacher educators may be able to determine more fully which factors within a music teacher education program cause “disruption,” if disruption is indeed occurring. Faculty can then make adjustments to the music teacher education program based on results.

Replication of Study

The present study was situated within a school of music at a suburban public research university located in the Midwestern region of the United States. One of the limitations of this study is that the findings of this study are not generalizable to all contexts, but may be relevant and transferable to similar contexts (Schwartz, 1996, p. 7). Therefore, while these findings may be transferable to other suburban large research universities, these findings may not necessarily be transferable to other types of institutions, such as small liberal arts colleges, teaching-intensive institutions, private colleges/universities, and institutions in urban and rural contexts. It may be of interest for music teacher educators who work in these types of schools to replicate this study in their own settings to determine which interactions and elements of the music teacher education program are most “disruptive” for their institution. After multiple program evaluations, comparisons of results between similar institutions might identify commonalities, if they exist, that could be helpful in guiding music teacher educators during a program revision process.

Comparison of Music Teacher Education Curricula Revisions

Music teacher education programs, such as those at Arizona State University, may have recently revamped their music teacher education curricula (Stauffer, Sullivan, Schmidt, & Tobias, 2013), or may be in the process of revising curricula to prepare pre-service educators to create culturally congruent experiences for K-12 students. A survey that details the process that institutions undertook to reconceptualize music teacher education curriculum and provides specifics on what changed within the curriculum could be helpful for music teacher education faculty at peer institutions who are in the process of revising curricula. Then, researchers could replicate or extend this study to examine how those newly-designed programs influence students' identities or disrupt their beliefs about music teaching and learning.

Conclusion

I now return to the concept that I discussed at the beginning of this study: change. Change does not have to be made for "change's sake," but can and should be made when it is appropriate and necessary. Over the past 30 years, only about one-third of high school students have consistently participated in music courses (Elpus, 2014) with band and chorus being the most common secondary music courses offered (Abril & Gault, 2008). The performance-based ensemble has been a mainstay of American music education (Mark & Gary, 2007) and continues to serve as the dominant paradigm of secondary school music teaching and learning in the United States (Abril & Gault, 2008). In some contexts, it is the sole means of delivering musical instruction to students in secondary settings. How can we, as a profession, prepare music educators to teach the students who may be interested in learning about music in a school setting through other means? How can we prepare pre-service music educators to integrate technology into the music curriculum, as technology is central to their lives outside of school? How can we

prepare our future educators to become more aware of the diversity of students in their classrooms: race, ethnicity, gender identity, sexual orientation, religion, and social class, among others? Influences from primary socialization that inform definitions of effective learning and influence pre-service students' occupational identities (Brewer, 2009, 2014; Campbell, 1999; Miranda, Robbins, & Stauffer, 2007; Schmidt, 1998; Thompson, 2000; Thompson & Campbell, 2003), combined with schools of music that continue to offer stagnant music teacher education curricula (Campbell, 2007; Cutietta, 2007; Emmon, 2004; Jones, 2005, 2007; Robinson, 2002) have been creating classes of novice music teachers that may not have the skills to be prepared to work with all types of students, and may not have the drive or intellectual curiosity to create educational experiences that are relevant to the students they are supposed to serve.

A music teacher education program offers multiple communities of practice that could contain purposefully created opportunities for students' occupational identities to be developed and "disrupted" during secondary socialization, a pivotal period for occupational identity formation. Music education programs must prepare teachers who can create compelling opportunities for *all* students to learn about music within the nation's schools. This can only occur if programs are successful in disrupting the primary socialization of their students so that they can think more broadly and creatively about what music education could be, thereby improving access to music education for all students, improving the quality of music education for all students and, by extension, improving the lives of all students.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Institutional Review Board Approval Letter

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

September 15, 2015

To: Cynthia Taggart
209 Music Practice Bldg.

Re: **IRB# x15-952e** Category: Exempt 2
Approval Date: September 15, 2015

Title: Disruptions and Transformations: The Influence of Culture and Community on Pre-Service Music Educators' Occupational Identities

The Institutional Review Board has completed their review of your project. I am pleased to advise you that **your project has been deemed as exempt** in accordance with federal regulations.

The IRB has found that your research project meets the criteria for exempt status and the criteria for the protection of human subjects in exempt research. **Under our exempt policy the Principal Investigator assumes the responsibilities for the protection of human subjects** in this project as outlined in the assurance letter and exempt educational material. The IRB office has received your signed assurance for exempt research. A copy of this signed agreement is appended for your information and records.

Renewals: Exempt protocols do not need to be renewed. If the project is completed, please submit an *Application for Permanent Closure*.

Revisions: Exempt protocols do not require revisions. However, if changes are made to a protocol that may no longer meet the exempt criteria, a new initial application will be required.

Problems: If issues should arise during the conduct of the research, such as unanticipated problems, adverse events, or any problem that may increase the risk to the human subjects and change the category of review, notify the IRB office promptly. Any complaints from participants regarding the risk and benefits of the project must be reported to the IRB.

Follow-up: If your exempt project is not completed and closed after three years, the IRB office will contact you regarding the status of the project and to verify that no changes have occurred that may affect exempt status.

Please use the IRB number listed above on any forms submitted which relate to this project, or on any correspondence with the IRB office.

Good luck in your research. If we can be of further assistance, please contact us at 517-355-2180 or via email at IRB@msu.edu. Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,



Harry McGee, MPH
SIRB Chair

c: Daniel Albert



**Office of Regulatory Affairs
Human Research
Protection Programs**

**Biomedical & Health
Institutional Review Board
(BIRB)**

**Community Research
Institutional Review Board
(CRIRB)**

**Social Science
Behavioral/Education
Institutional Review Board
(SIRB)**

Olds Hall
408 West Circle Drive, #207
East Lansing, MI 48824
(517) 355-2180
Fax: (517) 432-4503
Email: irb@msu.edu
www.hrpp.msu.edu

MSU is an affirmative-action,
equal-opportunity employer.

**Initial IRB
Application
Determination
*Exempt***

APPENDIX B

Pre-Service Music Educator Survey

Instructions to Survey Participants (adapted from Isbell, 2006)

The purpose of this survey is to obtain an overall picture of the music education program here at this institution. The information that you provide will be helpful in improving the education of future music educators. Your cooperation in answering these questions—based upon your present feelings—is essential to the success of this study.

Please keep the following in mind when completing this survey:

1. This is not a test. The only right answers are those which best express *your* opinions.
2. Your individual identity will not be revealed and your personal answers will be kept confidential.
3. Read every question or statement carefully before answering. Please answer every question according to the directions.

Thank you again for your participation!

—Daniel Albert, Ph.D. candidate, Michigan State University

Pre-Service Music Educator Survey Questions

1. “I identify my gender as (if you prefer not to answer, please leave blank) _____.”
2. “I identify my race as (if you prefer not to answer, please leave blank) _____.”
3. “I identify my ethnicity as (if you prefer not to answer, please leave blank) _____.”
4. “What is your major instrument/voice?” _____ (type in your answer)
5. “What is your current year at the University?”

First-year Sophomore Junior Senior Fifth year Sixth year and above

6. “What is your current year in the School of Music?”

First-year Sophomore Junior Senior Fifth year Sixth year and above

7. “What is your current year in the music education program?”

First-year Sophomore Junior Senior Fifth year Sixth year and above

8. “To which of the following collegiate music education associations do you belong?”

_____ National Association for Music Education (NAfME)

_____ American Choral Directors Association (ACDA)

_____ American String Teachers Association (ASTA)

_____ None of the above

9. “To what extent have you participated in your collegiate music education association (e.g., attended meetings, assisted at association-sponsored events, served as a board member)?” (For those who indicated membership in any professional music education association) (Open-ended)

10. “*When I first started participating* in the music education program, I saw *myself* as a _____.” (give the best rating for each label)

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)

Musician
Music educator
Educator
Director
Conductor
Performer
Other (please list)

11. “*I now see myself* as a _____.” (give the best rating for each label)

Strongly Agree	Agree	Somewhat Agree	Somewhat Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)

Musician
Music educator
Educator
Director
Conductor
Performer

Other (please list)

12. “Which of the following music education, School of Music, College of Education, and University classes influenced you to change your beliefs or conceptions about music education (if any)?” (check those classes that apply)

MUS 141-142/241-242 – Class Piano

MUS 143-145 – Diction for Singers

MUS 150J-155J – Jazz classes

MUS 160-174 – Secondary instrument classes

MUS 177 – Introduction to Music Education

MUS 230-231 – Beginning Jazz Improvisation

MUS 277 – Principles of Music Education

MUS 335-336A/B – Conducting

MUS 340 – Methods and Literature for Voice

MUS 341 – String Pedagogy

MUS 441 – Introduction to Computer Music

MUS 455 – Teaching Instrumental Music

MUS 456 – Teaching Stringed Instruments

MUS 461 – Marching Band Methods

MUS 462 – Suzuki Methods and Materials

MUS 465 – Teaching Early Childhood Music

MUS 467 – Teaching Elementary General Music

MUS 468 – Teaching Choral Music

MUS 469 – Teaching Secondary General Music

MUS 483 – Composition

MUS 484 – Instrumentation and Basic Orchestration

MUS 495 – Student Teaching in Music

Ethnomusicology courses (specify)

Musicology courses (specify)

Music Theory courses, including Aural Skills (specify)

Chamber music ensembles (specify)

Large ensembles (specify)

Applied lessons with faculty

TE 150 – Reflections on Learning

TE 250 – Human Diversity, Power, and Opportunity in Social Institutions

TE 302 – Learners and Learning in Context – Secondary

TE 801 – Professional Roles and Teaching Practice I

TE 803 – Professional Roles and Teaching Practice II

General Education classes (specify)

Other (specify)

13. “Give an example from at least one class that you checked in the previous question that influenced you to change your beliefs or conceptions about music education. Please identify the class(es) in your answer.
14. “Identify the individual(s) and/or groups of people who have influenced you to change your beliefs and conceptions about music education, if any. Also, please identify additional person(s) if they are outside the collegiate community and how you are connected to them.”

15. “Which of the following music education, School of Music, College of Education, and University classes influenced you to think differently about yourself as a music educator, if at all?” (check those classes that apply – if none, please click “None”)

MUS 141-142/241-242 – Class Piano

MUS 143-145 – Diction for Singers

MUS 150J-155J – Jazz classes

MUS 160-174 – Secondary instrument classes

MUS 177 – Introduction to Music Education

MUS 230-231 – Beginning Jazz Improvisation

MUS 277 – Principles of Music Education

MUS 335-336A/B – Conducting

MUS 340 – Methods and Literature for Voice

MUS 341 – String Pedagogy

MUS 441 – Introduction to Computer Music

MUS 455 – Teaching Instrumental Music

MUS 456 – Teaching Stringed Instruments

MUS 461 – Marching Band Methods

MUS 462 – Suzuki Methods and Materials

MUS 465 – Teaching Early Childhood Music

MUS 467 – Teaching Elementary General Music

MUS 468 – Teaching Choral Music

MUS 469 – Teaching Secondary General Music

MUS 483 – Composition

MUS 484 – Instrumentation and Basic Orchestration

MUS 495 – Student Teaching in Music

Ethnomusicology courses (specify)

Musicology courses (specify)

Music Theory courses, including Aural Skills (specify)

Chamber music ensembles (specify)

Large ensembles (specify)

Applied lessons with faculty

TE 150 – Reflections on Learning

TE 250 – Human Diversity, Power, and Opportunity in Social Institutions

TE 302 – Learners and Learning in Context – Secondary

TE 801 – Professional Roles and Teaching Practice I

TE 803 – Professional Roles and Teaching Practice II

General Education classes (specify)

Other (specify)

16. “Give an example from at least one class that you checked in the previous question that influenced you to think of yourself differently as a music educator, if at all. Please identify the class(es) in your answer.
17. “Identify the individuals and/or groups of people who have significantly influenced you to think differently of yourself as a music educator, if there are any. Also, please identify additional person(s) if they are outside the collegiate community and how you are connected to them. If none, please leave blank.”

18. “Which classes have you already taken? If a first semester freshman, please check and list your current classes.”

MUS 141-142/241-242 – Class Piano

MUS 143-145 – Diction for Singers

MUS 150J-155J – Jazz classes

MUS 160-174 – Secondary instrument classes

MUS 177 – Introduction to Music Education

MUS 230-231 – Beginning Jazz Improvisation

MUS 277 – Principles of Music Education

MUS 335-336A/B – Conducting

MUS 340 – Methods and Literature for Voice

MUS 341 – String Pedagogy

MUS 441 – Introduction to Computer Music

MUS 455 – Teaching Instrumental Music

MUS 456 – Teaching Stringed Instruments

MUS 461 – Marching Band Methods

MUS 462 – Suzuki Methods and Materials

MUS 465 – Teaching Early Childhood Music

MUS 467 – Teaching Elementary General Music

MUS 468 – Teaching Choral Music

MUS 469 – Teaching Secondary General Music

MUS 483 – Composition

MUS 484 – Instrumentation and Basic Orchestration

MUS 495 – Student Teaching in Music

Ethnomusicology courses (specify)

Musicology courses (specify)

Music Theory courses, including Aural Skills (specify)

Chamber music ensembles (specify)

Large ensembles (specify)

Applied lessons with faculty

TE 150 – Reflections on Learning

TE 250 – Human Diversity, Power, and Opportunity in Social Institutions

TE 302 – Learners and Learning in Context – Secondary

TE 801 – Professional Roles and Teaching Practice I

TE 803 – Professional Roles and Teaching Practice II

General Education classes (specify)

19. “Are there other experiences within the School of Music and/or the University besides classes or persons that influenced you to think of yourself differently as a music educator or influenced you to change your beliefs and conceptions about music education. If so, what? If none, please leave blank.”

20. “To what extent were you interested in each of the following kinds of music teaching when you first entered the music education degree program?”

Very Interested (1)	Interested (2)	Somewhat Interested (3)	Somewhat Uninterested (4)	Uninterested (5)	Very Uninterested (6)
---------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------

Early childhood music teacher

Elementary general music teacher

Elementary performance-based ensemble teacher

Middle school performance-based ensemble teacher

Middle school general music teacher (e.g., music technology, songwriting, music theory, popular music class etc.)

High school performance-based ensemble teacher

High school general music teacher (e.g., music technology, songwriting, music theory, popular music class, etc.)

College ensemble conductor

Collegiate music education professor

University studio teacher

Other (specify)

21. “To what extent are you currently interested in pursuing the following kinds of music teaching?”

Very Interested (1)	Interested (2)	Somewhat Interested (3)	Somewhat Uninterested (4)	Uninterested (5)	Very Uninterested (6)
---------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------

Early childhood music teacher

Elementary general music teacher

Elementary performance-based ensemble teacher

Middle school performance-based ensemble teacher

Middle school general music teacher (e.g., music technology, songwriting, music theory, popular music class etc.)

High school performance-based ensemble teacher

High school general music teacher (e.g., music technology, songwriting, music theory, popular music class, etc.)

College ensemble conductor

Collegiate music education professor

University studio teacher

Other (specify)

22. “To what extent were you interested in each of the following when you first entered the music education degree program?”

Very Interested (1)	Interested (2)	Somewhat Interested (3)	Somewhat Uninterested (4)	Uninterested (5)	Very Uninterested (6)
---------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------

Teaching musical concepts using technology (i.e., GarageBand, music production tools)

Teaching musical concepts using popular music

Teaching musical concepts using culturally relevant pedagogy/ensembles

Teaching early childhood music

Teaching composition

Teaching elementary general music

Teaching secondary (middle/high school) general music
 Teaching arranging
 Teaching/conducting a traditional ensemble(s) (band, chorus, orchestra)
 Teaching/conducting a non-traditional ensemble(s) (for example, steel pan ensemble)
 Teaching/conducting a collegiate ensemble(s)
 Teaching improvisation
 Teaching collegiate applied lessons
 Teaching music education at the college level
 Other (specify)

23. “To what extent are you currently interested in the following?”

Very Interested (1)	Interested (2)	Somewhat Interested (3)	Somewhat Uninterested (4)	Uninterested (5)	Very Uninterested (6)
---------------------------	-------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	---------------------	-----------------------------

Teaching musical concepts using technology (i.e., GarageBand, music production tools)
 Teaching musical concepts using popular music
 Teaching early childhood music
 Teaching composition
 Teaching elementary general music
 Teaching secondary (middle/high school) general music
 Teaching arranging
 Teaching/conducting a traditional ensemble(s) (band, chorus, orchestra)
 Teaching/conducting a non-traditional ensemble(s) (for example, steel pan ensemble)
 Teaching/conducting a collegiate ensemble(s)
 Teaching improvisation
 Teaching collegiate applied lessons
 Teaching music education at the college level
 Other (specify)

24. “Would you be willing to answer additional questions in a focus group discussion, interview, or via email? If so, what is your email address?”

APPENDIX C

Student Cohort Focus Group Discussion Questions

1. What were your beliefs on education and music education both when you matriculated into the School of Music and took this class? Tell me about any experiences that informed those thoughts.
2. How did you self-identify both when you matriculated into the School of Music and took this class?
3. Before you took the class, what were your thoughts about the subjects that the class discussed?
4. In what way(s) did this class influence your identity as an educator and challenge your preconceptions of music education, if at all?
5. What moments in the class stood out to you as influential experiences in the development of your identity as an educator and development of your conception of music education? Were there particular readings, units, teacher actions, peer actions—anything—that made it particularly influential for you?
6. Results from the survey indicated that interactions with peers, graduate students, and faculty were particularly “disruptive.” Did you have similar experiences? If so, please describe them.
7. Have there been any other influences in the School of Music, besides this class, that have been particularly influential for your identity as an educator or that challenged your preconceptions of music education? If so, what?

APPENDIX D

Faculty Focus Group Discussion Questions

1. Reflect on whether you think your department has a unified philosophy of music teacher education. What is it? [How did you arrive at that philosophy? How is the program structured to assist with the execution of the philosophy? How pervasive is this philosophy in the School of Music?]
2. Has the structure and sequence of the program always been as it is now or have you changed the structure/sequence of the program over time? If so, why and how?
3. Tell me about students in their last year/semester here. Do you believe that there are changes in their occupational identities and preconceptions of music education as they go through their degree programs? If so, how do they change? What part of it is the program and its experiences? What part of it could be maturation? What do you hope to see, if anything, in your students when they are about to graduate? What do you hope they have learned?
4. Tell me about MUS 177 and MUS 277. This is a two-semester course spread out over two years. What is the department's philosophy on these courses and what is the philosophy behind the structure of these courses?
5. Tell me about your philosophy of observing public school teachers and microteachings at the Community Music School and area public schools. What is the structure of observations and microteachings from 177 through your upper level methods classes? How are students placed and why? What do you hope students gain from the experience and have you observed that?

6. Do you stay connected with your students as they progress through the program? If so, how?
7. What do you feel are the strengths and weaknesses of your program in regards to pre-service music teacher educator identity development? What would you like to see changed, if anything?
8. Is there anything else that you would like to add to anything that we discussed, or anything we did not discuss that you feel is important?

APPENDIX E

Individual Faculty Interview Questions

Dr. Lee (Women's Chamber Ensemble, MUS 177, and MUS 468):

1. What do you view as the purposes of MUS 177, WCE, and MUS 468? What are their functions within the music education program and the School of Music?
2. Please provide a broad overview of the structure of your classes, from beginning to end.
3. Why do you think so many students cited your classes as being critically influential in disrupting their conceptions of music education and themselves as music educators?
4. Can you please provide background information for the term that you employ on a regular basis: "conductor-teacher?"
5. Can you speak to the themes of female empowerment and being a role model for women in academia and how those themes situate themselves within your classes?
6. Can you discuss the importance of authenticity, confidence, and vulnerability in teaching?
7. What are some components of the classes that may have influenced students to have their preconceptions in music education become disrupted? Would you describe the components?
8. What are the purposes of public school observations (for MUS 177 & MUS 468) and the in-class teachings (for MUS 177)?
9. Are there other factors within these classes that could have contributed to the "disruption" of their identities and conceptions of music education?
10. What do you hope students take away from your classes for the future?

11. Is there anything else that you would like to add to anything that we discussed, or anything we did not discuss that you feel is important?

Dr. Matthews (MUS 277 and Student Teaching Seminar):

1. What do you view as the purposes of MUS 277 and student teaching? What are their functions within the music education program and the School of Music?
2. Please provide a broad overview of the structure of MUS 277 and the student teaching seminar, from beginning to end.
3. How do you approach teaching these classes? What are your methods? Why do you employ them?
4. Why do you think so many students cited these classes as being critically influential in disrupting their conceptions of music education and themselves as music educators?
5. What are some components of the classes that may have influenced students to have their preconceptions in music education become disrupted? Would you describe the components?
6. What is the purpose of the public school observations and the accompanying microteaching episodes?
7. Are there other factors within these classes that could have contributed to the “disruption” of their identities and conceptions of music education?
8. How are students placed for their student teaching experiences? Why are students placed where they are?
9. What do you hope students take away from these courses for the future?
10. Is there anything else that you would like to add to anything that we discussed, or anything we did not discuss that you feel is important?

Dr. Sterling (MUS 336B: Choral Conducting):

1. What do you view as the purpose of MUS 336B? What is its function within the music education program and the School of Music?
2. Please provide a broad overview of the structure of your class, from beginning to end.
3. Why do you think so many students cited your classes as being critically influential in disrupting their conceptions of music education and themselves as music educators?
4. Several students spoke about how this class changed their conceptions of choral conducting. Can you speak as to why you think that is?
5. Students also cited your “connection” to K-12 teaching. How do you stay connected and relevant to what is happening in schools?
6. What role do the graduate students play in the class? Do you see their actions as being “disruptive”? If so, in what ways?
7. What are some components of the classes that may have influenced students to have their preconceptions in music education become “disrupted”? Would you describe the components?
8. Several students spoke about being authentic in front of ensembles and having a sense of teacher confidence and vulnerability. Can you discuss this in greater depth?
9. Are there other factors in the School of Music that could have contributed to the “disruption” of their identities and conceptions of music education?
10. What do you hope students take away from your classes for the future?
11. Is there anything else that you would like to add to anything that we discussed, or anything we did not discuss that you feel is important?

Dr. Cunningham (MUS 465 and MUS 467):

1. What do you view as the purposes of MUS 465 and MUS 467? What are their functions within the music education program and the School of Music?
2. Please provide a broad overview of the structure of your class, from beginning to end.
3. Why do you think so many students cited your classes as being critically influential in disrupting their conceptions of music education and themselves as music educators?
4. What are some components of the classes that may have influenced students to have their preconceptions in music education become disrupted? Would you describe the components?
5. Why do you employ peer teaching activities? Have you found any benefits and, if so, what are they? Any detriments?
6. Tell me about students assisting and teaching at the Community Music School. How have these experiences benefitted students with “disrupting” their identities as pre-service music educators, if at all? If so, how?
7. Are there other factors within these classes that could have contributed to the “disruption” of their identities and conceptions of music education?
8. What do you hope students take away from your classes for the future?
9. Is there anything else that you would like to add to anything that we discussed, or anything we did not discuss that you feel is important?

Dr. Woolfolk (MUS 171 and MUS 456):

1. What do you view as the purposes of MUS 171 and MUS 456? What are their functions within the music education program and the School of Music?
2. Please provide a broad overview of the structure of your class, from beginning to end.

3. Why do you think students cited your classes as being influential in disrupting their conceptions of music education and themselves as music educators?
4. What are some components of the classes that may have influenced students to have their preconceptions in music education become disrupted? Would you describe the components?
5. Are there other factors within these classes that could have contributed to the “disruption” of their identities and conceptions of music education?
6. What do you hope students take away from your classes for the future?
7. Is there anything else that you would like to add to anything that we discussed, or anything we did not discuss that you feel is important?

Dr. Emerson (MUS 210 and MUS 469):

1. What are the purposes of MUS 210 and MUS 469? What are their functions within the music education program and the School of Music?
2. Please provide a broad overview of the structure of your classes, from beginning to end.
3. Why do you think so many students cited your classes being critically influential in disrupting their conceptions of music education and themselves as music educators?
4. What are some components of the classes that may have influenced students to have their preconceptions in music education become disrupted? Would you describe the components?
5. Are there other factors within these classes that could have contributed to the “disruption” of their identities and conceptions of music education?
6. What do you hope students take away from your classes for the future?

7. Is there anything else that you would like to add to anything that we discussed, or anything we did not discuss that you feel is important?

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

- Abril, C., & Gault, B. (2008). The state of music in secondary schools: The principal's perspective. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 56, 68-81. doi:10.1177/0022429408317516
- Adams, R. D., & Craig, J. R. (1983). A status report of teacher education program evaluation. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 34(2), 33-36.
- Adams, G. R., Bennion, L., & Huh, K. (1989). *Objective measure of ego identity status: A reference manual*. Available from first author, Department of Family Studies, University of Guelph, Ontario, Canada N1G 2W1.
- Albert, D. J. (2015). Social media and music education: Extending learning to where students "live." *Music Educators Journal*, 102(2), 31-38. doi:10.1177/0027432115606976
- Allsup, R. E. (2003). Mutual learning and democratic action in instrumental music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51, 24-37. doi:10.2307/3345646
- Allsup, R. E., & Shieh, E. (2012). Social justice and music education: The call for a public pedagogy. *Music Educators Journal*, 98(4), 47-51. doi:10.1177/0027432112442969
- Alsup, J. (2006). *Teacher identity discourses: Negotiating personal and professional spaces*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Anderson, C. (1981). The identity crisis of the art educator: Artist? Educator? Both? *Art Educator*, 34(4), 45-46.
- Aróstegui, J. L. (2004). Much more than music: Music education instruction at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. In J. L. Aróstegui (Ed.), *The social context of music education* (pp. 127-210). Champaign, IL: Center for Instructional Research and Curriculum Evaluation.
- Austin, J. R., Isbell, D. S., & Russell, J. A. (2012). A multi-institution exploration of secondary socialization and occupational identity among undergraduate music majors. *Psychology of Music*, 40, 66-83. doi:10.1177/0305735610381886
- Ballantyne, J., & Parker, J. (2004). Effectiveness of preservice music teacher education programs: Perceptions of early-career music teachers. *Music Education Research*, 6, 299-312. doi:10.1080/1461380042000281749
- Ballantyne, J., Kerchner, J. K., & Aróstegui, J. L. (2012). Developing music teacher identities: An international multi-site study. *International Journal of Music Education*, 30, 211-226. doi:10.1177/0255761411433720

- Barone, T. (1992). Beyond theory and method: A case of critical storytelling. *Theory Into Practice*, 31(2), 142-146.
- Barone, T. (1995). Persuasive writings, vigilant readings, and reconstructed characters: The paradox of trust in educational storytelling. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 8(1), 63-74. doi:10.1080/0951839950080107
- Barrett, M. S., & Stauffer, S. L. (2012). *Narrative soundings: An anthology of narrative inquiry in music education*. New York, NY: Springer.
- Bates, V. C. (2012). Social class and school music. *Music Educators Journal*, 98(4), 33-37. doi:10.1177/0027432112442944
- Bauer, W. I. (2014). *Music learning today: Digital pedagogy for creating, performing, and responding to music*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Becker, H., & Carper, J. (1956). The elements of identification with an occupation. In H. Becker (Ed.), *Sociological Work* (pp. 189-201). Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing.
- Benedict, R. (1934). *Patterns of culture*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Beijaard, D., Meijer, P. C., & Verloop, N. (2004). Reconsidering research on teachers' professional identity. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 20, 107-128.
- Bergee, M. J. (1992). Certain attitudes toward occupational status held by music education majors. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 40, 104-113.
- Bergee, M. J., & Demorest, S. M. (2003). Developing tomorrow's music teachers today. *Music Educators Journal*, 89(4), 17-20.
- Bergee, M. J., Coffman, D. D., Demorest, S. M., Humphreys, J. T., & Thornton, L. P. (2001). *Influences on collegiate students' decision to become a music educator*. Retrieved from <http://repository.asu.edu/items/17550>
- Bergonzi, L. (2009). Sexual orientation and music education: Continuing a tradition. *Music Educators Journal*, 96(2), 21-25. doi:10.1177/0027432109350929
- Bernard, R. (2005). Making music, making selves: A call for reframing music teacher education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 4(2). Retrieved from http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bernard4_2.pdf
- Beynon, C. (1998). From music student to music teacher: Negotiating an identity. In P. Woodford (Ed.), *Critical thinking in music: Theory and practice*. *Studies in Music from the University of Western Ontario*, 17 (pp. 83-105).

- Bielaczyc, K. & Collins, A. (1999). Learning communities in classrooms: A reconceptualization of educational practice. In C. Reigeluth (Ed.), *Instructional-design theories and models: A new paradigm of instructional theory* (Vol. 2, pp. 269-292). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Blacking, J. (1986). *Culture and the arts*. London, UK: National Association for Education in the Arts.
- Blumer, H. (1969). *Symbolic interactionism: Perspective and method*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bouij, C. (1998). Swedish music teachers in training and professional life. *International Journal of Music Education*, 32, 24-34.
- Bouij, C. (2004). Two theoretical perspectives on the socialization of music teachers. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 3(3). Retrieved from http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bouij3_3.pdf
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Brewer, W. D. (2009). *Conceptions of effective teaching and role-identity development among preservice music educators* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3361859)
- Brewer, W. D. (2010). Inside/outside: School music on the line. In L. Thompson & M. R. Campbell (Eds.), *Advances in music education research: Issues of identity in music education* (pp. 37-64). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.
- Brewer, W. D. (2014). Searching for community: The role-identity development of a dually nontraditional music education student enrolled in a traditional degree program. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 200, 23-40.
- Broyles, J. (1997). *Effects of videotape analysis on role development of student teachers in music* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9728706)
- Buechler, S. M. (2008). *Critical sociology*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Burke, P. J. (Ed.) (2006). *Contemporary social psychological theories*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Burke, P. J. & Tully, J. C. (1977). The measurement of role identity. *Social Forces*, 55, 881-897.

- Burton, S., & Reynolds, A. (2009). Transforming music teacher education through service learning. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 18(2), 18-33.
doi:10.1177/1057083708327872
- Campbell, M. R. (1999). Learning to teach music: A collaborative ethnography. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 139, 12-36.
- Campbell, M. R. (2007). Introduction: Special focus on music teacher preparation. *Music Educators Journal*, 93(3), 26-29.
- Campbell, P. S. (1996). Music, education, and community in a multicultural society. In M. McCarthy (Ed.), *Cross currents: Setting an agenda for music education in community culture* (pp. 4-33). College Park: University of Maryland, College Park.
- Carper, J. (1970). The elements of identification with an occupation. In H. Becker (Ed.), *Sociological work* (pp. 177-188). Chicago, IL: Aldine Publishing.
- Carter, B. A. (2011). A safe education for all: Recognizing and stemming harassment in music classes and ensembles. *Music Educators Journal*, 97(4), 29-32.
doi:10.1177/0027432111405342
- Cayari, C. (2014). Using informal education through music video creation. *General Music Today*, 27(3), 17-22.
- Chaffee, E. E., & Tierney, W. G. (1988). *Collegiate culture and leadership strategies*. New York, NY: American Council on Education/Macmillan Publishing.
- Charmaz, K. (2006). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Chickering, A. W. (1974). *Commuting versus resident students: Overcoming educational inequities of living off campus*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Clay, R. (2008). The corporatization of higher education. *Monitor on Psychology*, 39(11), 50.
- Clements, A. C. (Ed.). (2013). *Alternative approaches in music education: Case studies from the field*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Clinton, J. E. (1991). *An investigation of the self-perceptions certified fine arts teachers have toward their roles as artist and instructional staff member in selected public high schools of Oklahoma* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9201505)
- Coleman, T. R. (1999). *The music student teaching experience: Making connections* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9961813)

- College Music Society. (2013). *Annual Report of the College Music Society*. Retrieved from http://www.music.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1734&Itemid=1501
- College Music Society. (2014). Transforming music study from its foundations: A manifesto for progressive change in the undergraduate preparation of music majors. Retrieved from http://www.music.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=1859:transforming-music-study-from-its-foundations-a-manifesto-for-progressive-change-in-the-undergraduate-preparation-of-music-majors&catid=139&Itemid=1123
- Colwell, R. (1985). Program evaluation in music teacher education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 81, 18-64.
- Colwell, R. (2006a). Music teacher education in this century: Part I. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 108(1), 15-27.
- Colwell, R. (2006b). Music teacher education in this century: Part II. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 108(2), 17-29.
- Conkling, S. W. (2003). Uncovering preservice music teachers' reflective thinking: Making sense of learning to teach. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 155, 11-23.
- 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.
- Conway, C. M. (2012). Ten years later: Teachers reflect on "Perceptions of beginning teachers, their mentors, and administrators regarding preservice music teacher preparation." *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 60, 324-338. doi:10.1177/0022429412453601
- Conway, C., Eros, J., Hourigan, R., & Stanley, A. M. (2007). Perceptions of beginning teachers regarding brass and woodwind instrument techniques. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 173, 39-54.
- Conway, C., Eros, J., Pellegrino, K., & West, C. (2010). Instrumental music education students' perceptions of tensions experienced during their undergraduate degree. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 58, 260-275.
- Cox, P. (1997). The professional socialization of music teachers as musicians and educators. In R. Rideout (Ed.), *On the sociology of music education* (pp. 112-120). Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.

- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W. (2008). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative research. *Theory Into Practice*, 39(3), 124-130. doi:10.1207/s15430421tip3903_2
- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2011). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Cumings, K. D. (1997). *Student culture at Wheaton College: Understanding student life on an Evangelical Christian college campus* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9726374)
- Cutietta, R. (2007). Content for music teacher education in this century. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 108(4), 11-18.
- Dalton, J. (1989). The influence of peer culture on college student values. *NASPA Journal*, 26(3), 180-186.
- Delamater, J. (Ed.). (2003). *Handbook of social psychology*. New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- DeLorenzo, L. C. (2012). Missing faces from the orchestra: An issue of social justice? *Music Educators Journal*, 98(4), 39-46. doi:10.1177/0027432112443263
- DeLorenzo, L. C. (Ed.) (2015). *Giving voice to democracy in music education: Diversity and social justice in the classroom*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Delpit, L. D. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflict in the classroom*. New York, NY: Norton.
- Demir, Y. (2015). All or nothing: English as a foreign language (EFL) student teachers' and teacher trainers' reflections on a pre-service English teacher education program in Turkey. *Anthropology*, 19(1), 157-165.
- Digón Regueiro, P. (2000). An analysis of gender in a Spanish music textbook. *Music Education Research*, 2, 57-73. doi:10.1080/1461380050004431
- Dolloff, L. A. (1999). Imagining ourselves as teachers: The development of teacher identity in music teacher education. *Music Education Research*, 1(2), 191-207.

- Dolloff, L. A. (2006). Celebrating and nurturing the identity of the musician/teacher. In B. Stålhammar (Ed.), *Music and human beings: Music and identity* (pp. 123-136). Orebro, Sweden: Universitebiblioteket.
- Dolloff, L. A. (2007). "All the things we are": Balancing our multiple identities in music teacher. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 6(2). Retrieved from http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Dolloff6_2.pdf
- Dorfman, J. (2013). *Theory and practice of technology-based music instruction*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Dove, L. A. (1986). *Teachers and teacher education in developing countries*. London, UK: Croom Held.
- Draves, T. (2008). *Nurturing our future colleagues: Cooperating music teachers' relationships with their student teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3312680)
- Draves, T. (2012). Teaching ambition: A case study of high school music students. *Music Education Research*, 14, 347-364. doi:10.1080/14613808.2012.685463
- Draves, T. (2014). Under construction: Undergraduates' perceptions of their music teacher role-identities. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 36, 199-214. doi:10.1177/1321103X14547982
- Duling, E. (2000). Student teachers' descriptions and perceptions of their mentors. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 19(1), 17-21.
- Edmondson, J. (Ed.). (2013). *Music in American life: An encyclopedia of the songs, styles, stars, and stories that shaped our culture*. Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood.
- Elpus, K. (2014). Evaluating the effect of No Child Left Behind on U.S. music course enrollments. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 62, 215-233. doi:10.1177/0022429414530759
- Elpus, K., & Abril, C. R. (2011). High school music ensemble students in the United States: A demographic profile. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 59, 128-145. doi:10.1177/0022429411405207
- Emmanuel, D. (2003). An immersion field experience: An undergraduate music education course in intercultural competence. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 13(1), 33-41. doi:10.1177/10570837030130010105
- Emmons, S. E. (2004). Preparing teachers for popular music processes and practices. In C. Rodriguez (Ed.), *Bridging the gap: Popular music and music education* (pp. 159-174). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.

- Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd ed., pp. 119-161). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Ferguson, D. A. (2007). Program evaluations in music education: A review of the literature. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 25(2), 4-15. doi:10.1177/87551233070250020102
- Ferguson, K. (2003). Becoming a string teacher. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 157, 38-48.
- Fischer, M. (1998). Using lotus notes learning space for staff development in public schools. *Journal of Interactive Learning Research*, 9(3/4), 221-234.
- Fiske, J. A. (1997). *A profile of women music educators in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9802239)
- Fitzpatrick, K. R. (2014). Cultural diversity and the formation of identity: Our role as music teachers. *Music Educators Journal*, 98(4), 53-59. doi:10.1177/0027432112442903
- Fitzpatrick, K. R. (2014). Blogging through the music student teaching experience: Developing virtual communities of practice. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 36, 91-105. doi:10.1177/1321103X13509350
- Fitzpatrick, K. R., & Hansen, E. (2010, May). "Off the radar": Reflections of lesbian and gay undergraduates on their experiences within high school music programs. Paper presented at the Establishing Identity: LGBT Studies & Music Education Conference, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign. Retrieved from http://bcrme.press.illinois.edu/proceedings/Establishing_Identity/6_Fitzpatrick-Hansen.pdf
- Fredrickson, W. E., & Williams, L. R. (2009). Influences on Introduction to Music Education class members: A survey of recollection of future teachers. *Missouri Journal of Research in Music Education*, 46, 60-74.
- Freedman, B. (2013). *Teaching music through composition: A curriculum using technology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Freer, P. K. (2010). Choral improvisation: Tensions and resolutions. *Choral Journal*, 51(5), 18-31.
- French, R. M. (2009). *Engineering the guitar: Theory and practice*. New York, NY: Springer.

- Frink, K. L. (1997). *Undergraduate string majors' attitudes toward high school orchestra experiences, high school orchestra instructors, and string teaching*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Colorado, Boulder.
- Froehlich, H. C., & L'Roy, D. (1985). An investigation of occupancy identity in undergraduate music education majors. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 85, 65-75.
- Fuller, F. F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6(2), 207-266.
- Fuller, F. F., & Brown, O. H. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *The seventy-four yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education: Part II* (pp. 25-52). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Gall, M., Gall, M., & Borg, W. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction* (7th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Gardner, R. D. (2010). Should I stay or should I go? Factors that influence the retention, turnover, and attrition of K-12 music teachers in the United States. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 111, 112-121. doi:10.1080/10632910903458896
- Garrett, M. L. (2012). The LGBTQ component of 21st century music teacher training: Strategies for inclusion from the research literature. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 31(1), 55-62.
- Gay, G. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of cultures*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Geertz, C. (1983). From the native's point of view: On the nature of anthropological understanding. In C. Geertz (Ed.), *Local knowledge: Further essays in interpretive anthropology* (pp. 55-70). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Gergen, K. J. (2009). *An invitation to social construction* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Gherardi, S., & Nicolini, D. (2000). The organizational learning of safety in communities of practice. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 9(1), 7-18.
- Giebelhausen, R. (2015). What the tech is going on? Social media and your music classroom. *General Music Today*, 28(2), 39-46.

- Gillespie, R., & Hamann, D. L. (1999). Career choice among string music education students in American colleges and universities. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 47, 266-278.
- Gordon, E. E. (2013). *A music learning theory for newborn and young children*. (4th ed.). Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.
- Gould, E. (2009). Women working in music education: The war machine. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 17, 126-143. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40495496>
- Green, L. (2001). *How popular musicians learn: A way ahead for music education*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Green, L. (2005). The music curriculum as lived experience: Children's "natural" music-learning processes. *Music Educators Journal*, 91(4), 27-32.
- Green, L. (2008). *Music, informal learning and the school: A new classroom pedagogy*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate.
- Griff, M. (1963). The commercial artist. In G. B. Levitas (Ed.), *The world of psychology* (pp. 339-363). New York, NY: George Braziller, Inc.
- Handel, G. (2006). *Childhood socialization*. Piscataway, NJ: Aldine Transaction.
- Hargreaves, D. J., & Marshall, N. A. (2003). Developing identities in music education. *Music Education Research*, 5(3), 263-274.
- Haston, W., & Russell, J. A. (2012). Turning into teachers: Influence of authentic context learning experiences on occupational identity development of preservice music teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 59, 369-392. doi:10.1177/0022429411414716
- Hazen, M., & Hazen, R. (1987). *The music men: An illustrated history of brass bands in America 1800-1920*. Washington, DC: Smithsonian Institution Press of America.
- He, Y., Rohr, J., Miller, S. D., Levin, B. B., & Mercier, S. (2010). Toward continuous program improvement: Using a logic model for professional development school program evaluation. *School-University Partnerships*, 4(1), 15-28.
- Hellman, D. (2008). Do music education majors intend to teach music?: An explanatory survey. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 27(1), 65-70. doi:10.1177/8755123308322378
- Hemke, F. L. (1975) *The early history of the saxophone* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (AAT 7526506)

- Henry, W. (2001). Music teacher education and the professional development school. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 10(2), 23-28. doi:10.1177/10570837010100020105
- Hess, J. (2014). Radical musicking: Towards a pedagogy of social change. *Music Education Research*, 16, 229-250. doi:10.1080/14613808.2014.909397
- Hess, J. L. (2015). Upping the “anti-”: The value of an anti-racist theoretical framework in music education. *Action, Criticism, & Theory for Music Education*, 14(1), 66-92. Retrieved from http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Hess14_1.pdf
- Heuser, F. (2011). Ensemble-based instrumental music instruction: Dead-end tradition or opportunity for socially enlightened teaching. *Music Education Research*, 13, 293-305. doi:10.1080/14613808.2011.603043
- Hewitt, M., & Thompson, L. (2006). A survey of music teacher educators’ professional backgrounds, responsibilities and demographics. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 170, 47-62.
- Hickey, M. (1997a). The computer as a tool in creative music making. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 8, 56-70. doi:10.1177/1321103X9700800106
- Hickey, M. (1997b). Teaching ensembles to compose and improvise. *Music Educators Journal*, 83(6), 17-21.
- Hickey, M. (1999). Assessment rubrics for music composition. *Music Educators Journal*, 85(4), 26-33, 52.
- Hickey, M. (Ed.). (2003). *Why and how to teach music composition: A new horizon for music education*. Reston, VA: The National Association for Music Education.
- Hickey, M. (2012). *Music outside the lines: Ideas for composing in K-12 music classrooms*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Holland, J. L. (1973). *Making vocational choices: A theory of careers*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Holland, J. L. (1976). Vocational preferences. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 521-570). New York, NY: Wiley.
- Holland, J. L. (1985). *Making vocational choices: A theory of vocational personalities and work environments* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Holley, L. C., & Steiner, S. (2005). Safe space: Students perspectives on classroom environment. *Journal of Social Work Education*, 41(1), 49-64. doi:10.5175/JSWE.2005200300343

- Hourigan, R. M. (2007). *Teaching music to students with special needs: A phenomenological examination of participants in a fieldwork experience*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Howe, M. J., & Sloboda, J. A. (1991). Young musicians' accounts of significant influences in their early lives. *British Journal of Music Education*, 8, 53-63.
- Humphreys, J. T. (1997). Sex and geographic representation in two music education history books. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 131, 67-86. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40318825>
- Hunt, C. (2009). Perspectives on rural and urban music teaching: Developing contextual awareness in music education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 18(1), 34-47. doi:10.1177/1057083708327613
- Isbell, D. (2006). Socialization and occupational identity among preservice music teachers enrolled in traditional baccalaureate degree programs (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3239420)
- Isbell, D. (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
- Isbell, D., & Stanley, A. M. (2011). Keeping instruments out of the attic: The concert band experiences of the non-music major. *Music Education Research International*, 5, 22-33. Retrieved from <http://cmer.arts.usf.edu/content/articlefiles/3345-MERI05pp22-33IsbellStanley.pdf>
- Jaffurs, S. E. (2004). The impact of informal music learning practices in the classroom, or how I learned how to teach from a garage band. *International Journal of Music Education*, 22(3), 189-200. doi:10.1177/0255761404047401
- Jenkins, R. (2008). *Social identity* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Jick, T. D. (1979). Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods: Triangulation in action. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 602-611.
- Jones, P. M. (2005). Music education and the knowledge economy: Developing creativity, strengthening communities. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 106(4), 5-12.
- Jones, P. M. (2007). Developing strategic thinkers through music teacher education: A "best practice" for overcoming professional myopia and transforming music education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 108(6), 3-10.

- Jones, P. M. (2008). Preparing music teachers for change: Broadening instrument class offerings to foster lifewide and lifelong musicing. *Visions of Research in Music Education*, 12(1). Retrieved from <http://www-usr.rider.edu/~vrme/v12n1/vision/2%20AERA%20-%20Jones.pdf>
- Jones, B. D., & Parkes, K. A. (2010). The motivation of undergraduate music students: The impact of identification and talent beliefs on choosing a career in music education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 19(2), 41-56.
- Jorgensen, E. R. (1990). Towards an enhanced community of scholars in music education. *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning*, 1(1-2), 36-42. Retrieved from <http://www-usr.rider.edu/~vrme/v16n1/visions/spring5>
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., & Snoek, J. D. (1964). *Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Karvelis, N. (2016). Idea bank: Reapproaching hip-hop. *Music Educators Journal*, 102(3), 13-14. doi:10.1177/0027432116631718
- Kaschub, M., & Smith, J. P. (2009a). A principled approach to teaching music composition to children. *Research & Issues in Music Education*, 7(1).
- Kaschub, M., & Smith, J. (2009b). *Minds on music: Composition for creative and critical thinking*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Kaschub, M., & Smith, J. P. (Eds.). (2013). *Composing our future: Preparing music educators to teach composition*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Kastner, J. D. (2012). *Exploring informal music pedagogy in a professional development community of elementary music teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3548741)
- Katz, L., Rath, J., Mohanty, C., Kurachi, A., & Irving, J. (1981). Follow-up studies: Are they worth the trouble? *Journal of Teacher Education*, 32(2), 18-22.
- Kelly, S. N. (2000). Sociological and musical influences of prospective undergraduate music teacher candidates. In *On the sociology of music education II: Papers from the music education symposium at the University of Oklahoma* (pp. 121-130). Amherst: University of Massachusetts.
- Khan, A. I. (1994). *Education: Concept and practice*. Lahore, Pakistan: Polymer Publications.
- Kingsbury, H. (1984). *Music as a cultural system: Structure and process in an American conservatory* (Master's thesis). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8506113)

- Kingsbury, H. (1988). *Music, talent, and performance: A conservatory cultural system*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Knowles, J. G. (1992). Models for understanding pre-service and beginning teachers' biographies: Illustrations from case studies. In I. F. Goodson (Ed.), *Studying teachers' lives* (pp. 99-152). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Koza, J. E. (1993/1994). Big boys don't cry (or sing). Gender, misogyny, and homophobia in college choral methods texts. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning*, 4-5, 48-64. Retrieved from <http://www-usr.rider.edu/~vrme/v16n1/volume5/visions/combined5>
- Koza, J. E. (2008). Listening for whiteness: Hearing racial politics in undergraduate school music. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 16, 145-155. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40327298>
- Kratus, J. (2007). Music education at the tipping point. *Music Educators Journal*, 94(2), 42-48. doi:10.1177/002743210709400209
- Kratus, J. (2016). Songwriting: A new direction for secondary music education. *Music Educators Journal*, 102(3), 60-65. doi:10.1177/0027432115620660
- Kroeber, A. L. (1948). *Anthropology*. New York, NY: Harcourt, Brace, and Company.
- Kroeber, A. L. (1952). *The nature of culture*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Kruse, A. J. (2016). Featherless dinosaurs and the hip-hop simulacrum: Reconsidering hip-hop's appropriateness for the music classroom. *Music Educators Journal*, 102(4), 13-21. doi:10.1177/0027432116638904
- Kruse, A. J., Giebelhausen, R., Shouldice, H. N., & Ramsey, A. L. (2015). Male and female photographic representation in 50 years of *Music Educators Journal*. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 62, 485-500. doi:10.1177/0022429414555910
- Kuh, G. D. (1990). Assessing student culture. In W. G. Tierney (Ed.), *Assessing academic climates and cultures: New directions for institutional research* (No. 68, pp. 47-60). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Kuh, G. D., & Hall, J. E. (1993). Using cultural perspectives in student affairs. In G. D. Kuh (Ed.), *Cultural perspectives in student affairs work* (pp. 1-20). Lanham, MD: American College Personnel Administrators.
- Kuh, G. D., Schuh, J. H., Whitt, E., Andreas, R., Lyons, J., Strange, C., Krehbiel, L., & McKay, K. (1991). *Involving colleges: Successful approaches to fostering student learning and development outside the classroom*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American Children* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Landes, H. A. (2008). *On being a music major: A comparative study of student culture in a conservatory and a university school of music* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3313151)
- Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning: Legitimate peripheral participation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Leong, S. (1996). *The relationship between music competencies perceived as important for novice teachers and the professional expectations of high school music teachers in Australia*. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Western Australia, Perth.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Lind, V. R., & McKoy, C. L. (2016). *Culturally responsive teaching in music education: From understanding to application*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Love, P. G., Boschini, V. J., Jacobs, B. A., Hardy, C. M., & Kuh, G. D. (1993). Student culture. In G. Kuh (Ed.), *Cultural perspectives in student affairs work* (pp. 59-79). Lanham, MD: American College Personnel Association.
- Lortie, D. (1977). *The schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- L'Roy, D. (1983). *The development of occupational identity in undergraduate music education majors* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 8327044)
- MacLure, M. (1993). Arguing for your self: Identity as an organising principle in teachers' jobs and lives. *British Educational Research Journal*, 19(4), 311-322.
- Madsen, C. K., & Kelly, S. N. (2002). First remembrances of wanting to become a music teacher. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 50, 323-332.
- Manning, K. (1993). Properties of institutional culture. In G. D. Kuh (Ed.), *Cultural perspectives in student affairs work* (pp. 21-36). Lanham, MD: American College Personnel Association.
- Mark, D. (1998). The music teacher's dilemma: Musician or teacher? *International Journal of Music Education*, 32, 3-22.
- Mark, M. L. (1982). The evolution of music education philosophy from utilitarian to aesthetic. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 30, 15-21.

- Mark, M. L., & Gary, C. L. (3rd ed.). (2007). *A concise history of American music education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Marshall, G. (Ed.). (1994). *The concise Oxford dictionary of sociology*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- McBride, N. R. (2016). Singing, sissies, and sexual identity: How LGBTQ choral directors negotiate gender discourse. *Music Educators Journal*, 102(4), 36-40.
doi:10.1177/0027432116644653
- McCall, G. J. (2006). Symbolic interaction. In P. J. Burke (Ed.), *Contemporary social psychological theories* (pp. 1-23). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- McCall, G. J., & Simmons, J. L. (1978). *Identities and interactions: An examination of human associations in everyday life*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- McCall, G. J., & Simmons, J. L. (2009). Symbolic interaction: Core concepts and principles. In J. Chin & C. K. Jacobson (Eds.), *Within the social world: Essays in social psychology* (pp. 137-148). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- McWilliams, H. J. (2003). *Gender equity issues in the depiction of females in The Instrumentalist magazine* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (UMI No. 3089721)
- Mead, G. H. (1934). *Mind, self, and society*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Merriam, S. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Miranda, M. L., Robbins, J., & Stauffer, S. L. (2007). Seeing and hearing music teaching and learning: Transforming classroom observations through ethnography and portraiture. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 28, 3-21.
- Moore, T. W. (1986). *Philosophy of education: An introduction*. New York, NY: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Morgan, D. L. (1997). *Focus groups as qualitative research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morgan, D. L. (1998). Practical strategies for combining qualitative and quantitative methods: Applications to health research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 8(3), 362-376.

- Music Educators National Conference. (2001). Gender trends among MENC music educators. *Teaching Music*, 8(6), 52-53. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/870778>
- Musolf, G. L. (2009). Childhood socialization. In J. C. Chin & C. K. Jacobson (Eds.), *Within the social world: Essays in social psychology* (pp. 187-201). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.
- National Association of Music Merchants. (2014). The 2014 NAMM global report. Retrieved from https://www.namm.org/files/ihdp-viewer/global-report-2014/A7352D4907B25A95B2CE27A075D3956F/2014MusicUSA_final.pdf
- National Association of Music Merchants. (2015). The 2015 NAMM global report. Retrieved from <https://www.namm.org/files/ihdp-viewer/global-report-2015/25FF24A6E7431147F8F4505BB0555478/2015-GlobalReport.pdf>
- National Association of Schools of Music. (2013). National Association of Schools of Music Handbook 2013-2014. Retrieved from http://nasm.arts-accredit.org/site/docs/Handbook/NASM_HANDBOOK_2013-14.pdf
- National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (2001). *Standards for professional development schools*. Washington, DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.ncate.org/LinkClick.aspx?fileticket=FcHbf2B%2b670%3d&tabid=499>
- Nettl, B. (1995). *Heartland excursions: Ethnomusicological reflections on schools of music*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Nias, J. (1989). *Primary teachers talking: A study of teaching as work*. London, UK: Routledge.
- Nichols, J. (2013). Rie's story, Ryan's journey: Music in the life of a transgender student. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 61, 262-279. doi:10.1177/0022429413498259
- Nierman, G. E., Zeichner, K., & Hobbel, N. (2002). Changing concepts of teacher education. In R. Colwell & C. P. Richardson (Eds.), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 818-839). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Onwuegbuzie, A. J., & Teddlie, C. (2003). A framework for analyzing data in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioral sciences* (pp. 351-383). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Paise, M. P. (2010). *Six beginning music teachers' music teacher role identities* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3432446)
- Palkki, J. (2015). Gender trouble: Males, adolescents, and masculinity in the choral context. *Choral Journal*, 56(4), 25-35.

- Palkki, J. (2016). *"My voice speaks for itself": The experiences of three transgender students in secondary school choral programs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, East Lansing.
- Palloff, R., & Pratt, K. (1999). *Building learning communities in cyberspace: Effective strategies for the online classroom*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Palvalko, R. (1971). *Sociology of occupations and professions*. Itsaca, Illinois: F. E. Peacock Publishers.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Peacock, M. (2009). The evaluation of foreign-language-teacher education programmes. *Language Teaching Research*, 13(3), 259-278.
- Pellegrino, K. (2009). Connections between performer and teacher identities in music teachers: Setting an agenda for research. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 19(1), 39-55. doi:10.1177/1057083709343908
- Powers, S., & Guan, S. (2000). Examining the range of student needs in the design and development of a Web-based course. In B. Abbey (Ed.), *Instructional and cognitive impacts of Web-based education* (pp. 200-216). Hershey, PA: Idea Publishing Group.
- Prescesky, R. E. (1997). *A study of preservice music education students: Their struggle to establish a professional identity* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. NQ30362)
- Randles, C., & Stringham, D. (Eds.). (2013). *Musicianship: Composing in band and orchestra*. Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.
- Rao, R. R. (2004). *Methods of Teacher Training*. New Delhi, India: Discovery Publishing House.
- Reese, S. (2003). Responding to student compositions. In M. Hickey (Ed.), *Why and how to teach music composition: A new horizon for music education* (pp. 211-232). Reston, VA: MENC: The National Association for Music Education.
- Reinharz, S. (1979). *On becoming a social scientist: From survey research and participant observation to experiential analysis*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Rickels, D. A., Council, K. H., Fredrickson, W. E., Hairston, M. J., Porter, A. M., & Schmidt, M. (2010). Influences on career choice among music education audition candidates: A pilot study. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 57, 292-307. doi:10.1177/0022429409350779

- Rickels, D. A., Brewer, W. D., Councill, K. H., Fredrickson, W. E., Hairston, M., Perry, D. L., Porter, A. M., & Schmidt, M. (2013). Career influences of music education audition candidates. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 61, 115-134. doi:10.1177/0022429412474896
- Rideout, R., & Feldman, R. (2002). Research in music student teaching. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning* (pp. 874-886). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Roberts, B. A. (1990). *The social construction of "musician" identity in music education students in Canadian universities* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 922217970)
- Roberts, B. A. (1991a). *Musician: A process of labeling*. St. John's, Canada: Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Roberts, B. A. (1991b). Music teacher education as identity construction. *International Journal of Music Education*, 18(1), 30-39. doi:10.1177/025576149101800104
- Roberts, B. A. (1991c). *A place to play: The social world of university schools of music*. St. John's, Canada: Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Roberts, B. A. (1993). *I, Musician: Towards a model of identity construction and maintenance by music education students as musicians*. St. John's, Canada: Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Roberts, B. A. (2000). The sociologist's snare: Identity construction and socialization in music. *International Journal of Music Education*, 35, 54-58.
- Roberts, B. (2003). Newcomers in psychology discover "identity": A review of musical identities. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 3(1). Retrieved from http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Roberts3_1.pdf
- Robinson, K. (2002). Teacher education for a new world of musics. In B. Reimer (Ed.), *World musics and music education: Facing the issues* (pp. 219-238). Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Robinson, M. (2010). From the band room to the general music classroom: Why instrumentalists choose to teach general music. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 185, 33-48.
- Rodriguez, C. X. (Ed.). (2004). *Bridging the gap: Popular music and music education*. Reston, VA: The National Association for Music Education.
- Rogers, J. (2000). Communities of practice: A framework for fostering coherence in virtual learning communities. *Educational Technology and Society*, 3(3), 384-392.

- Roulston, K., Legette, R., & Womack, S. T. (2005). Beginning music teachers' perceptions of the transition from university to teaching in schools. *Music Education Research*, 7, 59-82. doi:10.1080/14613800500042141
- Rudolph, T. E. (2004). *Teaching music with technology* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: GIA Publications.
- Rudolph, T. E., & Frankel, J. (2009). *YouTube in music education*. Milwaukee, WI: Hal Leonard.
- Saldaña, J. (2003). *Longitudinal qualitative research: Analyzing change through time*. New York, NY: AltaMira Press.
- Saldaña, J. (2013). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Samuel, M., & Stephens, D. (2000). Critical dialogues with self: Developing teacher identities and roles-a case of South African student teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 33, 475-491.
- Scheib, J. W. (2006). Policy implications for retention: Meeting the needs of the dual identities of arts educators. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 107(6), 5-10.
- Schein, E. H. (1985) (1st ed.). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schein, E. H. (1991). What is culture? In P. J. Frost, L. F. Moore, M. R. Louis, C. C. Lundberg, & J. Martin (Eds.), *Reframing organizational culture* (pp. 243-253). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Schein, E. H. (2004) (3rd ed.). *Organizational culture and leadership*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schmidt, M. (1998). Defining "good" music teaching: Four student teachers' beliefs and practices. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 138, 19-46.
- Schofield, H. (1972). *The philosophy of education: An introduction*. London, UK: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.
- Schön, D. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. London, UK: Temple Smith.
- Schön, D. (1987). *Educating the reflective practitioner*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schonauer, A. L. M. (2002). *Teaching at the foundation: Role development and identification among elementary general music teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (AAT 3042516)

- Schutz, P. A., Crowder, K. C., & White, V. E. (2001). The development of a goal to become a teacher. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 93, 299-308.
- Schwartz, H. (1996). The changing nature of teacher education. In J. Sikula, T. J. Buttery, & E. Guyton (Eds.), *Handbook of Research on Teacher Education* (2nd ed., pp. 2-13). New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Segell, M. (2006). *The devil's horn: The story of the saxophone, from noisy novelty to king of cool*. New York, NY: Picador.
- Seidman, I. (2006). *Interviewing as qualitative research* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Shaw, J. (2012). The skin that we sing: Culturally responsive choral music education. *Music Educators Journal*, 98(4), 75-81. doi:10.1177/0027432112443561
- Shaw, R. D. (2015). *The vulnerability of urban elementary school arts programs: A case study* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (UMI No. 3719668)
- Shieh, E., & Allsup, R. E. (2016). Fostering musical independence. *Music Educators Journal*, 102(4), 30-35. doi:10.1177/0027432116645841
- Shouldice, H. N. (2009). *A mixed methods investigation of K-12 music teacher beliefs and their relationship to teaching practice*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.
- Shouldice, H. N. (2013a). Trading Hindemith for "Hugs, high-fives, and handshakes": One preservice music teacher's decision to teach elementary general music. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 195, 41-57.
- Shouldice, H. N. (2013b). *One elementary music teacher's beliefs about musical ability: Connections to teaching practice and classroom culture* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3600989)
- Shrauger, J. S., & Schoeneman, T. J. (1979). Symbolic interactionist view of self-concept: Through the looking glass darkly. *Psychological Bulletin*, 86, 549-573.
- Shulman, L. S. (1987). Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. *Harvard Educational Review*, 57, 1-22.
- Sindberg, L. K. (2012). *Just good teaching: Comprehensive Musicianship through Performance (CMP) in theory and practice*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.

- Slife, B. D., & Williams, R. N. (1995). *What's behind the research? Discovering hidden assumptions in the behavioral sciences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Smith, N. L. (1979). The limitations of ERIC in reviewing evaluation literature. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 1(1), 68-73.
- Soden, R., & Halliday, J. (2000). Rethinking vocational education: A case study in care. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 19(2), 172-182.
- Spano, F. P. (2011). The inclusion of sexuality topics in undergraduate music teacher preparation programs. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education. Special issue: Conference Proceedings: Establishing Identity: LGBT Studies & Music Education*, 189, 45-50.
- Squire, K., & Johnson, C. (2000). Supporting distributed communities of practice with interactive television. *Educational Technology Research and Development*, 48(1), 23-43.
- Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Stauffer, S. L. (2014). Narrative inquiry and the uses of narrative in music education research. In C. Conway (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research in American music education* (pp. 163-185). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Stauffer, S., Sullivan, J., Schmidt, M., & Tobias, E. (2013, September). Aligning conceptions and capacity: Turning visions into reality. Paper presented at the 2013 Society for Music Teacher Education Symposium, University of North Carolina Greensboro. Retrieved from http://smte.us/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/SMTE_2013_PlenaryIIIa_Handouts1.pdf and http://smte.us/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/SMTE_2013_PlenaryIIIa_Handouts2.pdf
- Stewart, D. W., & Shamdasani, P. N. (1990). *Focus groups: Theory and practice*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Strand, K. D. (2009). A narrative analysis of action research on teaching composition. *Music Education Research*, 11, 349-363. doi:10.1080/14613800903144288
- Strange, C. C., & Banning, J. H. (2001). *Educating by design: Creating campus learning environments that work*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Tashakkori, A., & Teddlie, C. (1998). *Mixed methodology: Combining qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Taylor, D. M. (2011). Bullying: What can music teachers do? *Music Educators Journal*, 98(4), 41-44. doi:10.1177/0027432111411717

- Teachout, D. J., & McCoy, C. L. (2010). The effect of teacher role development training on undergraduate music education majors: A preliminary study. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 20(1), 88-104. doi:10.1177/1057083710365052
- Teitel, L. (2001). *How professional development schools make a difference: A review of the research* (6th ed.). Washington, DC: National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education.
- Thornton, L., & Bergee, M. (2008). Career choice influences among music education students at major schools of music. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 177, 7-17.
- Thompson, L. K. (2000). *Freshmen music education majors' preconceived beliefs about the people and processes involved in teaching* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9983878)
- Thompson, L. K., & Campbell, M. R. (2003). Gods, guides and gardeners: Preservice music educators' personal teaching metaphors. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 158, 43-54.
- Tierney, W. G. (1989). *Curricular landscapes, democratic vistas: Transformative leadership in higher education*. New York, NY: Praeger.
- Tobias, E. S. (2013). Toward convergence: Adapting music education to contemporary society and participatory culture. *Music Educators Journal*, 99(4), 29-36. doi:10.1177/0027432113483318
- Turino, T. (2008). *Music as social life: The politics of participation*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Tylor, E. B. (1871/1973). Primitive culture. Excerpted in P. Bohannan & M. Glazer (Eds.), *Highpoints in anthropology* (pp. 61-78). New York, NY: Alfred A. Knopf.
- United States Census Bureau (2014). United States Census Fast Facts. Retrieved from https://www.census.gov/history/www/through_the_decades/fast_facts/
- Van Maanen, J. (1977). Linking ways of knowing with ways of being practical. *Curriculum Inquiry*, 6, 205-228.
- Van Maanen, J. (1991). Reflectivity and the pedagogical moment: The normativity of pedagogical thinking and acting. *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 23(6), 507-536.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). *Thought and language*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

- Wagoner, C. L. (2011). *Defining and measuring music teacher identity: A study of self-efficacy and commitment among music teachers* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 3457596)
- Walker, K., & Smith, L. (2004). Creative disruption – A task-based approach to engaging with original works of art. *International Journal of Art & Design Education*, 23(1), 16-25.
- Wallace, R. A., & Wolf, A. (1999). *Contemporary sociological theory: Expanding the classical tradition* (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Ward-Steinman, P. M. (2008). Vocal improvisation and creative thinking by Australian and American university jazz singers: A factor analytic study. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 56, 5-17. doi: 10.1177/0022429408322458
- Watson S. (Ed.). (2006). *Technology guide for music educators*. Boston, MA: Thomson.
- Watson, S. (2011). *Using technology to unlock musical creativity*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Weber, S., & Mitchell, C. (1995). *That's funny, you don't look like a teacher! Interrogating images and identity in popular culture*. London, UK: Falmer Press.
- Webster, P. (2009). Children as creative thinkers in music: Focus on composition. In S. Hallam, I. Cross, & M. Thaut (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of music psychology* (pp. 421-428). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Wenger, E. (1998). *Communities of practice: Learning, meaning, and identity*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Wenger, E. (2002). *Cultivating communities of practice: A guide to managing knowledge*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.
- West, C. L. (2014). Preparing middle school music teachers to teach jazz. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 23(2), 64-78. doi:10.1177/1057083713487077
- Williams, D. A. (2007). What are music educators doing and how well are we doing it? *Music Educators Journal*, 94(1), 18-23. doi:10.1177/002743210709400105
- Williams, D. A. (2011a). The elephant in the room. *Music Educators Journal*, 98(1), 51-57. doi:10.1177/0027432111415538
- Williams, D. A. (2014). Another perspective: The iPad is a REAL musical instrument. *Music Educators Journal*, 101(1), 93-98. doi:10.1177/0027432114540476
- Williams, D., & Webster, P. (2008). *Experiencing music technology*. New York, NY: Schirmer.

- Williams, D. B. (2011b). The non-traditional music student in secondary schools of the United States: Engaging non-participant students in creative music activities through technology. *Journal of Music, Technology, and Education*, 4(2+3), 131-147. doi:10.1386/jmte/4.2-3.131_1
- Wolfgang, R. E. (1990). *Early field experiences in music education: A study of teacher role socialization* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses database. (UMI No. 9117573)
- Woodford, P. G. (2002). The social construction of music teacher identity in undergraduate music education majors. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning* (pp. 675-694). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Woodward, R. S. (2013). *Shaping perceptions of musical identity: An ethnography of non-music majors' experiences in an undergraduate music course focused on cultivating creativity* (Doctoral dissertation). Available from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database. (UMI No. 3592850)
- Woody, R. H. (2007). Popular music in school: Remixing the issues. *Music Educators Journal*, 93(4), 32-37. doi:10.1177/002743210709300415
- Woody, R. H. (2012). Playing by ear: Foundation or frill? *Music Educators Journal*, 99(2), 82-88. doi:10.1177/0027432112459199
- Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Zeichner, K. M., & Liston, D. P. (1996). *Reflective teaching: An introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.