

A Quantitative Survey of Secondary Instrumental Music Educators' Perceptions of Undergraduate Preparation to Teach in Disparate Locales

by

Elise Michelle Naber-Allen

A dissertation proposal submitted to the Graduate Faculty of
Auburn University
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Auburn, Alabama
May 10, 2025

Keywords: music education, music teacher education, work environment, teaching contexts

Copyright 2025 by Elise Michelle Naber-Allen

Approved by

Nancy H. Barry, PhD, Chair, Professor of Music Education
Jane Kuehne, PhD, Co-Chair, Associate Professor of Music Education
Corey Spurlin, DMA, Professor of Music
Chih-husan Wang, PhD, Professor of Educational Research, Measurement, and Assessment
Khari Allen Lee, MM, Walt and Ginger Woltosz Endowed Professor of Practice

Abstract

Every community in the United States is different, from the smallest town to the largest city, and each locale offers unique rewards and challenges for instrumental music educators. However, novice instrumental music teachers are not always prepared for the specific needs of all communities. The purpose of this nationally-distributed quantitative research study was to examine secondary instrumental music educators' perceptions of their undergraduate preparation for teaching across disparate locales. Participants answered questions about their perceptions of preparation to teach in disparate locales during their undergraduate degree, and experiences they perceived to most impact their feelings of preparations. I looked for significant differences between band and orchestra directors, and differences between feelings of preparation and employment decisions.

This study employed a quantitative methodology through an anonymous online survey of secondary instrumental music educators who earned an undergraduate degree in music education or a Bachelor of Arts in music with a Master of Arts in teaching in the United States. Results showed that the participants felt most prepared to teach in a suburban area and generally valued the courses taken during their undergraduate degree. Most participants indicated that their feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales did not affect their employment decisions. However, the participants whose feelings of preparation did affect their job decisions were most likely to feel uncomfortable applying for or accepting a job in a city or rural area. Results of this study could inform the delivery and implementation of undergraduate music education curriculum.

Keywords: music education, music teacher education, work environment, teaching contexts

Acknowledgements

I would not have made it through this journey without the help of many individuals in my life who I would be remiss to not name here. First, thank you to my advisor, Dr. Barry, I appreciate your guidance from before day one to today. Dr. Kuehne, I appreciate you stepping in as a co-chair and providing extra support throughout this process. Thank you to the committee for helping me strengthen my document and my writing. I have grown as a researcher because of your expertise. I appreciate all my teachers who have helped me through my academic journey, this would not have been possible without you.

I have met many, now life-long, friends through this program who have made this journey possible. Thank you to each of you for your support through check-in texts, zoom calls, and occasional meet ups! I want to say a special thank you to Laura, Gordon, and Hana for always being there to support me along the way and make me laugh when I am stressed. Laura, you especially are one of my academic heroes and I appreciate you more than you know!

Thank you to my family. I am grateful for the support from all my family, Mom and Dad, Christopher and Emily, and Darryl and Helen. Most of all, I am thankful for Andrew. Without your help and support through encouraging words, taking on more responsibilities around the house, and even proofreading, I would not be here. Thank you for being my biggest cheerleader and helping me become the best version of myself. I love you. I am excited to start this next chapter of our lives as Dr. Naber-Allen and Dr. Allen.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Acknowledgements	3
List of Tables	9
Chapter 1 Introduction	10
Historical Context	10
Music Teacher Preparation	11
Music Teacher Program Constraints	12
Need for the Study	12
Goals	12
Purpose and Research Questions	13
Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations	16
Definition of Terms	17
Conclusion	18
Chapter 2 Literature Review	19
Brief History of Music Teacher Preparation	19
Current Music Teacher Preparation	20
Music Teacher Preparation	20
Identity Development	21
Teaching Music in Disparate Places	21
Rural Rewards	21
Rural Challenges	22
Urban Rewards	23

Urban Challenges	23
Preferences of Teaching Location.....	24
Feelings of Preparation.....	25
Successful Strategies Preparing Instrumental Music Educators.....	27
Fieldwork.....	28
Student Teaching.....	29
Preparing Students to Work in Disparate Locales	30
Program Alterations	30
Additional Field Experiences.....	30
Participant Recommendations.....	31
Strategies to Understand Disparate Locales	31
Place Consciousness.....	32
Immersion	32
Student Perspectives.....	33
Conclusion	33
Chapter 3 Methods and Procedures	34
Research Questions	34
Design and Approach	37
Setting and Sample.....	38
Instrumentation and Materials	39
Instrument Development	39
Survey Questions.....	40
Demographic Questions	40

Construct One- Educational Background	41
Construct Two- Feelings of Preparation.....	42
Construct Three- Employment Decisions.....	42
Construct Four- Variables of Preparation.....	42
Data Collection and Analysis	43
Research Question One	44
Research Question Two.....	45
Research Question Three.....	49
Research Question Four.....	50
Protection of Participants' Rights	50
Conclusion	53
Chapter 4 Results	54
Response Rate and Reliability	54
Participant Demographics.....	55
Research Question 1: What are secondary instrumental music educators' perceptions about the preparation they received from their undergraduate music education degree to teach in city, suburban, town, and rural locales?	58
Research Question 1.1: What components of their undergraduate music education degree do secondary instrumental music educators feel was most effective in preparing them to teach?	59
Research Question 1.2: What components of their undergraduate music education degree do secondary instrumental music educators feel was least effective in preparing them to teach?	61

Research Question 2: What experiences do secondary instrumental music educators perceive to be most effective in feeling prepared to teach in city, suburban, town, and rural locales?63

Research Question 2.1: Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators’ attitudes about their undergraduate music teacher preparation to teach in disparate locales based on their experiences as a k-12 student?65

Research Question 2.2: Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators’ attitudes about teaching in disparate locations based on the delivery of information about urban and rural music education during their undergraduate degree?.....67

Research Question 2.3: Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators’ feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the location of their field experiences, not including student teaching?69

Research Question 2.4: Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators’ feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the location of their student teaching?72

Research Question 2.5: Which of the following variables, experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, or student teaching, are the best predictors of secondary instrumental music educators’ feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, or rural locales?74

Research Question 3: Is there a significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors’ feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales?77

Research Question 3.1: Is there a significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the following variables, their experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, delivery of courses taken during their degree, field experiences, or student teaching?	78
Research Question 4: Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' employment decisions and their feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales?	79
Chapter 5 Discussion.....	83
Perceptions of Preparation to Teach in Disparate Locales	83
Effective Experiences in Feelings of Preparation.....	85
K-12 Experiences and Feelings of Preparation.....	86
Urban and Rural Course and Feelings of Preparation.....	86
Locale of Field Experiences and Feelings of Preparation	87
Student Teaching Locale and Feelings of Preparation.....	87
Predictors of Feelings of Preparation.....	88
Differences in Band and Orchestra Directors	90
Feelings of Preparation and Employment Decisions	91
Conclusion	92
Future Research.....	92
Potential Applications and Implications.....	93
References	94
Appendix A Qualtrics Survey.....	105

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Data Analysis Overview</i>	51
Table 2 <i>Participant Demographics by Gender and Ethnic Background</i>	55
Table 3 <i>Participant Demographics by State (N=489)</i>	56
Table 4 <i>Participant Demographics by Age and Years Teaching</i>	57
Table 5 <i>Participant Demographics by Education Earned, Large Ensemble, and Current Job</i>	58
Table 6 <i>Descriptive Statistics for Perceptions of Preparation to Teach in Disparate Locales</i>	59
Table 7 <i>Frequency of Topics-Most Effective</i>	61
Table 8 <i>Frequency of Themes- Least Effective</i>	63
Table 9 <i>Descriptive Statistics for Experiences Most Effective in Feeling Prepared</i>	64
Table 10 <i>Kruskal-Wallis Test for Feelings of Preparation Compared to High School Locale</i>	67
Table 11 <i>Pairwise Comparison of Feelings of Preparation and the Locale of High School</i>	67
Table 12 <i>Courses and Information About Urban and Rural Music Education</i>	68
Table 13 <i>Locales of Field Work</i>	70
Table 14 <i>Locales of Student Teaching</i>	72
Table 15 <i>Spearman Rho Correlations</i>	76
Table 16 <i>Descriptive Information About Participants' Employment Decisions</i>	80

Chapter 1

Introduction

Cities, suburbs, towns, and rural areas each possess unique rewards and challenges. Music teacher preparation programs work to develop preservice educators to teach in all areas, but not all graduates feel equally prepared to teach in every setting.

Historical Context

Calls for music teacher preparation reform exist as early as 1946 (Evenson, 1955; MENC Commission on Teacher Education, 1970; Van Bodegraven, 1946). Van Bodegraven (1946) suggested that a four-year music education preparatory program was too short to prepare teachers. Instead, he advocated for a five-year curriculum. Ten years later, Evenson (1955) recommended implementing curriculum with a focus on practical skills, such as including score study as part of the music theory curriculum.

In the late 1960s the Music Educators National Conference (MENC) created a Commission on Teacher Education (MENC Commission on Teacher Education, 1970) that later reported “increasing numbers of first-year music teachers are finding that there is an enormous disparity between the preparation for teaching and the practice of it” (p. 35). Thirty years later, Asmus (2000) and Binder (2001) called for reform advocating for program modernization and addressing effects of certification changes. Binder suggested curriculum modernization to help future music educators as they work in increasingly disparate settings. He wrote, “knowledge of subject matter is only one part of measuring success in teaching” (p. 3). Most recently, the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) published a Blueprint for Strengthening the Music Teacher Profession (2023) outlining struggles and strategies for updating music teacher preparation programs to serve the students of today. The Music Teacher Preparation Initiative

(MTPI), the group within NAFME responsible for the Blueprint, echoed many of the sentiments expressed by earlier scholars including curriculum relevance and degree program limitations.

Music Teacher Preparation

Music education professors have a limited amount of time to teach students the content they need to pass certification exams and enter the classroom. These constraints do not always leave them time to cover the nuances of working in different locales (Andersen & Denson, 2015; Fiese & DeCarbo, 1995; Isbell, 2005). Isbell (2005) noted differences in music educators' daily routines based on location. Anderson and Denson (2015) suggested collegiate music education professors had lost touch with the realities of teaching in some locales. Regarding music education students, Fiese and DeCarbo (1995) wrote:

While several felt musically prepared, they said their preservice education prepared them for teaching the “ideal” student and left them unprepared for the reality of urban schools, where most of the students do not conform to the ideal (p. 28).

I examined the course titles and bulletins of schools in the Southeastern Conference along with Florida State University, the University of North Texas, and San Jose State University to determine if teaching in disparate locales is currently a focus for music education programs in the United States. I discovered that none of the schools currently have a course specifically to teach undergraduates about urban and rural music education. I chose these universities as a snapshot of music education programs across the country, and they do not represent all institutions offering music education degrees. Professors may include information about teaching in disparate settings in other classes, but the surveyed schools do not currently offer this content in a specific course. Collecting data from working music educators is crucial to learning if this information was part of their undergraduate degree program.

Music Teacher Program Constraints

Institutions of higher education, state requirements, and licensing boards constrain music education curricula and how professors train the next generation of teachers. An article from the *Chronicle of Higher Education* detailing complex degree programs specifically mentions music education alongside engineering and business as degrees with prerequisites, high course requirements, and complex course sequences that students find difficult to navigate (McMurtrie, 2021). McMurtrie (2021) acknowledges convoluted degree programs can exacerbate a lack of diversity within a program due to the financial obligations of an extra semester or year to complete a degree. The NAFME Blueprint for Strengthening the Music Teacher Profession (2023) specifically calls on music education programs to address credit limitations for students. Given the current teacher shortage, it is imperative that music education programs prepare students to enter the workforce able to teach in any locale.

Need for the Study

Teacher preparation is well researched in music education. However, preparation for teaching in disparate locales is an unexplored area of music education research. Most of the existing literature is qualitative and only represents a specific population. A nation-wide quantitative study examining secondary instrumental music teachers' feelings of preparation to teach in various locales will begin closing this gap in the literature. While this study is not a panacea, the data gathered can serve as a first step in assessing preparation of music education students to teach in disparate communities.

Goals

The intent of this study is to gather knowledge about music educators' feelings concerning their preparedness to work in disparate locales. Many music education programs train

pre-service teachers to work in suburban settings. However, not all educators will teach in these areas. Results from this study can inform music teacher curriculum and train students to teach in disparate settings. This research line may ultimately support novice music teachers' feelings of preparation to teach in various locales.

Purpose and Research Questions

The purpose of this quantitative research study was to examine music educators' perceptions of their undergraduate preparation for teaching across disparate locales. I used definitions of locales from the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) for this study: city, suburban, town, and rural.

The following research questions guided this study.

1. RQ1: What are secondary instrumental music educators' perceptions about the preparation they received from their undergraduate music education degree to teach in city, suburban, town, and rural locales?

- 1.1: What components of their undergraduate music education degree do secondary instrumental music educators feel was most effective in preparing them to teach?
- 1.2: What components of their undergraduate music education degree do secondary instrumental music educators feel was least effective in preparing them to teach?

2. RQ2: What experiences do secondary instrumental music educators perceive to be most effective in feeling prepared to teach in city, suburban, town, and rural locales?

- 2.1 Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' attitudes about their undergraduate music teacher preparation to teach in disparate locales based on their experiences as a k-12 student?
 - Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales based on their experiences as a k-12 student.
- 2.2 Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' attitudes about teaching in disparate locations based on the delivery of information about urban and rural music education during their undergraduate degree?
 - Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales based on the delivery of information about urban and rural music education during their undergraduate degree.
- 2.3 Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the location of their field experiences, not including student teaching?
 - Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference in secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on their field experiences, not including student teaching.

- 2.4 Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the location of their student teaching?
 - Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the location of student teaching and between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales.
- 2.5 Which of the following variables, experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, or student teaching, are the best predictors of secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, or rural locales?
 - Null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, or student teaching to secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, or rural locales.

3. RQ3: Is there a significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales?

- Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales.

- 3.1 Is there a significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the following variables, their experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, delivery of courses taken during their degree, field experiences, or student teaching?
 - Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors to feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the following variables, their experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, delivery of courses taken during their degree, field experiences, or student teaching.

4. RQ4: Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' employment decisions and their feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales?

- Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' employment decisions and their feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales.

Assumptions, Limitations, and Delimitations

I assume that participants will answer the survey as truthfully as possible and will only take the survey if they meet stated criteria. Each survey section provided the definitions of locales along with a link where the participant can quickly identify their given locale according to the four categories. I also included a filtering question at the beginning to ask about participants' educational backgrounds.

Limitations of this study included self-reported data, accuracy of locale data, and sample size dependent upon voluntary response rate. Self-reported feelings of preparation may not accurately reflect the preparation the participant received, and participants may not accurately report locales within the survey. I attempted to mitigate this by defining locales at the start of each section. I also provided a link to the National Center for Education Statistics website where the participant could verify the classification of the requested locale.

I delimited participants to secondary band and orchestra directors who have earned an undergraduate degree in music education or an undergraduate degree in music with a pathway to certification. I intentionally excluded participants with alternative teacher certification because they did not have the type of undergraduate experience under examination. I included participants who earned a Bachelor of Arts in music with a Master of Arts in teaching because Bachelor of Arts in music when combined with a Master of Arts in teaching includes undergraduate courses in teacher preparation. Participants answered a filtering question to determine if they meet the criteria. I distributed the survey to a national audience via the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) survey distribution services and I promoted the survey on social media.

Definition of Terms

- City: Within an urbanized area with a population of 100,000 or more (NCES).
- Field Experiences: Early and ongoing practice opportunities to apply content and pedagogical knowledge in P-12 settings to progressively develop and demonstrate their knowledge, skills, and dispositions (CAEP).
- Locale: A general geographic classification that describes the type of area where a school is located (NCES).

- Rural: Located outside an urbanized area with a population of 49,999 or less (NCES).
- Secondary School: A school intermediate between elementary school and college (Merriam-Webster).
- Student Teaching: Extensive and substantive clinical practice in P-12 schools for candidates preparing to teach (CAEP).
- Suburban: Outside a Principal City with a population of 100,000 or more (NCES).
- Town: Located between 10 and 35 miles from an urbanized area with a population between 50,000-99,999 (NCES).

Conclusion

Undergraduate music education curriculum and its effectiveness preparing students to teach in disparate areas needs further examination. I surveyed secondary instrumental music educators from across the country gathering information about their backgrounds and feelings of preparation to teach in different areas after receiving an undergraduate degree in music education. The next chapter of this document contains information about music teacher education, teaching in disparate locales, preferences of undergraduate music education students and their feelings of preparation, and suggestions for improvement based on current research. Chapter 3 covers the methodology, data collection measures, and how I interpreted the data to answer the research questions. Chapter 4 contains the results of the survey and subsequent data analysis. Finally, in Chapter 5, I compare the results to existing studies. This study can provide information to inform best practices for preparing music education students to teach in disparate locales.

Chapter 2

Literature Review

I examined literature related to preparation of instrumental music educators to teach in disparate locales. First, the review covered a brief overview of the history of music teacher education, then examined current music teacher preparation, and finally, provided an overview of teaching music in different locales. Literature about current music teacher preparation also contained a comparison of philosophies and areas of focus in contemporary programs. Additionally, the examination of teaching music in disparate locales included information about the unique rewards and challenges of teaching in rural and urban communities. The review also covers preferences of music education students and studies about pre-service and novice teachers' feelings of preparation. Finally, I included suggestions for improving music teacher preparation and how to prepare students to teach in disparate locales.

When searching for literature on this topic, I looked for information about “music teacher preparation,” “rural teacher preparation,” “urban teacher preparation,” “rural education,” “urban education,” “rural music education,” and “urban music education”. The literature review examined the ways instrumental music educators are prepared to teach in different areas including city, suburban, town, and rural communities. Despite existing literature about feelings of preparation following an undergraduate music education degree and strategies for preparing students to teach in disparate areas, there is a lack of literature concerning secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in various locales.

Brief History of Music Teacher Preparation

During the 19th century, teacher certification involved a yearly repeated certification test which later evolved into training programs lasting a year or longer (Colwell, 1985). Specialized

tertiary music institutions, such as the New England Conservatory, began in the mid-19th century. Academic standards for music existed in the days of the Puritans, but the federal Department of Superintendents codified four goals for music in public education in 1928. While those goals were broad, the establishment of curricular objectives served as the foundation for current standards of program evaluation. Every 10 years, the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) evaluates music teacher preparation programs for evidence of meeting or exceeding their standards.

Current Music Teacher Preparation

Music Teacher Preparation

Today, state licensure exams and NASM requirements provide guidelines for music teacher preparation programs, however, curricula vary based on the program. Individual higher education institutions uniquely configure their secondary instrumental courses (Austin, 2006). Some respondents in Austin's 2006 study cited concerns over credit hour reductions affecting music training, specifically skills on secondary instruments. Most participants in a study by Conway (2002) identified secondary instrument courses as the least valuable part of their education. Later in a study conducted by Conway et al. (2007), participants did not remember content learned in such classes but relied on notebooks they created to assist in their teaching.

Music teacher educators hold a variety of philosophies about how to prepare future teachers. Abramo (2016) recommended a set of core practices for instrumental music educators including:

rehearsing large ensembles, facilitating small groups, providing student feedback to improve practice in a variety of ways, engaging students in creative musical thinking,

problem-solving, and inquiry, incorporate students' musical and cultural identities into the classroom, select appropriate repertoire and materials. (p.12)

Meanwhile, Leonhard (1985) argued that an ideal redesigned music education curriculum would reflect learning theory and instructional practice so that all courses are engaging and include standards and objectives.

Identity Development

Students in a music teacher preparation program continue developing their teacher identity over the course of their undergraduate degree. Parker and Powell (2014) found participants were in different stages of identity development during their university experiences. The participant's experiences in music school interacted with earlier musical influences and experiences in creating additional identities. Haston and Russell (2012) found peers of undergraduate music education majors had an impact on their experiences and development as a teacher.

Teaching Music in Disparate Places

Rural Rewards

Teaching in a rural school comes with rewards including community support and sustained relationships with students (Azano & Stewart, 2015; Barter, 2008; Bates, 2011; Causby & Foster, 2022; Hunt, 2009; McCracken & Miller, 1988; Starrett et al., 2021; VanDeusen, 2016). Barter (2008) wrote, "rural areas have unique qualities... and a unique symbiotic relationship between schools and communities, which makes them different than urban centers" (p. 469). VanDeusen (2016) studied a rural town in the Midwest with a successful music program where the director recognized the community engagement of the program brought immense community support. After interviewing stakeholders in both urban and rural schools, Hunt (2009) found rural

school educators and the community members expect more community involvement. Causby and Foster (2022) interviewed a successful band director in rural North Carolina who had positive relationships with the people of the area and made sure the band participated in the life of the community.

Building relationships with students is another reward when working in rural schools (Bates, 2011; Hunt, 2009; Starrett et al., 2021). The sense of community helps to foster authentic relationships with students in a way that non-rural teachers do not experience (Starrett et al., 2021). Additionally, the relationships a music teacher develops in a rural area can positively affect the teacher's quality of life (Bates, 2011). The ability to work with students from elementary through high school is also an advantage of rural schools (Hunt, 2009).

Rural Challenges

Each school is unique, but based on existing research, we can make some generalizations about students who attend rural schools. Statistically, rural areas experience poverty at a higher level with more than half of the students receiving free or reduced-price lunch (Logan & Burdick-Will, 2017). Rural schools are likely to lack diversity, and their populations are mostly White or Caucasian (Logan & Burdick-Will, 2017; McCracken & Miller, 1988). Schools often adopt the responsibilities of social programs in their rural communities (Mathis, 2003).

Rural schools tend to lack the same access to technology as their suburban and urban counterparts (Hash, 2021; Mathis, 2003). Furthermore, they are also at a disadvantage for funding because the low population density affects the tax base. Due to financial concerns, some states have made a case for trying to consolidate smaller school districts, but the money saved is negligible (Mathis, 2003).

All schools, including those in rural areas, experience difficulties recruiting and retaining quality teachers. Rural schools often struggle with teacher recruitment and retention (Eppley, 2009; Mathis, 2003). Salaries can be lower due to the reduced tax base, but the jobs are often in a location with a lower cost of living (Mathis, 2003). Teacher retention, including preservation of music teachers, is a challenge in rural schools (Hunt, 2009; Mathis, 2003; Robinson & Russell, 2021).

Instrumental ensembles in rural areas may face a higher expectation to perform at community events than their suburban and urban counterparts (Hunt, 2009). Music educators may feel their involvement at community events is directly linked to the support they receive from the community. Instrumental music educators in rural areas experience a demanding schedule balancing job requirements and community expectations.

Urban Rewards

Instrumental music educators in urban areas experience their own unique rewards (Fitzpatrick, 2008; Hunt, 2009). Fitzpatrick (2008) found participants defined success in their workplaces as personal and musical progress from students. Respondents to Fitzpatrick's survey also reported moderately high levels of job satisfaction. Hunt (2009) found urban instrumental music educators felt well supported financially and emotionally by their school administration.

Urban Challenges

Urban instrumental music educators experience challenges in their positions as well (Doyle, 2012; Fitzpatrick, 2008; Hunt, 2009). Urban instrumental music educators reported needing more funding for instrument purchases and repairs (Fitzpatrick, 2008). Fitzpatrick (2008) found the principals held freedom to distribute funds leading to unequal distribution among the public schools in Chicago. Additionally, Fitzpatrick (2008) reported respondents

desired increased administrative support. Urban instrumental music educators work with students who require more financial support. Consequently, teachers working with students in low income areas receive less professional support than their peers working in higher socioeconomic areas (Doyle, 2012). Urban music educators held a belief that teaching in an urban school requires special skills such as caring for students' lives outside the classroom and finding creative solutions to problems (Fitzpatrick, 2008). Urban music educators reported the No Child Left Behind legislation of the early 2000s impacted their class time with students due to tutoring for tested subjects happening concurrently with ensemble rehearsals (Hunt, 2009).

Preferences of Teaching Location

Preservice music teachers typically want to teach in schools resembling those they attended in their own K-12 education (Kelly, 2003; Robinson, 2012). Music education students indicated a preference to teach in suburban areas over urban, rural, or private schools (Kelly, 2003; Robinson, 2012). Kelly (2003) found music education students wanted to teach in large schools. However, Doyle (2012) found music educators reported not accepting a job in an urban area because of feelings of discomfort teaching in a diverse setting. Even more, Kelly (2003) found music education students preferred to teach in a school with student minorities of 50% instead of 95% or 5%. The results also noted preparation programs need to show students culturally diverse populations to ready them for a job in a diverse area.

Preservice music educators reported perceiving school administration, parental and community support, and program sustainability as the most important factors when considering where to accept a position (Robinson, 2012). Similarly, Madsen and Hancock (2002) found administrative support was an important consideration for accepting a job in an urban location.

The participants also expressed concern over lack of respect within the school and the use of music as a utility within the school community (Madsen & Hancock, 2002).

Feelings of Preparation

Over the years, studies examining feelings of preparation in music education students exhibited a variety of views (Ballantyne & Packer, 2004; Ballantyne, 2006; Ballantyne, 2007; Bauer & Berg, 2001; Conway et al., 2007; DeLorenzo, 1992; Doyle, 2012; Legette & McCord, 2014-2015; Roulston et al., 2007; Schmdit, 2010; Sorenson, 2011). Ballantyne and Packer (2004) found students were satisfied with their coursework. However, in a study by Conway et al. (2007) students did not remember the information taught in their methods courses. Many studies found music education students had difficulty after college connecting their academic preparation to their realities as teachers (Ballantyne, 2006; Ballantyne, 2007; Bauer & Berg, 2001; Doyle, 2012; Sorenson, 2011).

Reflecting on their preparation, some music educators found their undergraduate educations insufficient (Ballantyne & Packer, 2004; Conway et al., 2007). One group stated that they had a broad understanding of pedagogical knowledge and skills at the end of their degree program but wanted an emphasis on specific pedagogical content knowledge and skills (Ballantyne & Parker, 2004). The same participants desired additional training on professional knowledge and skills. However, in a different study examining secondary instrumental methods, the participants requested the course include information about different techniques for teaching beginning band, high school band, and teaching instrumental techniques in a large group setting (Conway et al., 2007). The participants also reported not remembering the specifics of what they learned in the instrumental methods course, but they felt comfortable teaching instrumental music. One participant shared that they felt the true goal of techniques courses should be to help

shape the teachers to “learn to think as creative, independent problem solvers who are adept at finding and using resources” (p.44).

Some music educators experienced a disconnect from what they learned in their undergraduate degree and their daily life in the classroom (Ballantyne, 2006; Ballantyne, 2007; Bauer & Berg, 2001; Doyle, 2012; Sorenson, 2021). Doyle (2012) found that educators felt their undergraduate preparation focused on ideal circumstances instead of preparing them for the real world. Even student teaching situations can feel disconnected from a first job (Sorenson, 2021). Ballantyne (2007) found novice educators felt there should be clear links between education theory and the music classroom to provide contextualization. Music education majors experienced a disconnect between the educational theory taught in their general education courses and their music education courses (Ballantyne, 2006). Bauer and Berg (2001) found participants did not identify connections between the content of their undergraduate coursework and their realities as teachers. These experiences of disconnect can lead to praxis shock, creating a situation where it may be difficult for new teachers to use what they learned in their undergraduate degree due to specific challenges in their first job (Ballantyne, 2006).

Novice teachers experienced rewards and challenges they did not predict in their undergraduate degree (Legette & McCord, 2014-2015; Roulston et al., 2007). Legette and McCord (2014-2015) found participants were anticipating difficulty working with large numbers of students, scheduling constraints, maintaining energy, classroom management, meeting high expectations, teaching with inadequate or no resources, and deciding what to teach. Difficulties experienced by first year teachers were related to curricular aspects, aggressive behaviors from students, and completing paperwork (Roulston et al., 2007). Participants discussed needing

professional development in the areas of developing skills, teaching more advanced students, personal organization, and more effective teaching.

The literature does not always present preservice preparation and the first years of teaching in a negative light (DeLorenzo, 1992; Roulston et al., 2007; Schmidt, 2010).

Participants in Roulston et al.'s (2007) study reported that the rewards of the job include loving music and teaching music to students. Many music educators valued their coursework and in retrospect felt comfortable with the teaching skills and responsibilities of their jobs (DeLorenzo, 1992; Schmidt, 2010).

Successful Strategies Preparing Instrumental Music Educators

Many scholars of rural education suggested implementing place-based education (Azano & Stewart, 2015; Burton & Johnson, 2010; Corbett, 2009; Corbett, 2016; Martignetti et al., 2013; Prest, 2013; Spring, 2013; Starrett et al., 2021; White & Reid, 2008). Place-based education requires teachers to “explore the connection between school and the surrounding community” (Burton & Johnson, 2010, p. 383). Teacher preparation programs needed to form relationships with rural educators so students could begin to learn place-conscious practices before entering the classroom (Burton & Johnson, 2010). Place-based education in a music classroom resembles getting to know the community you teach and adapting the curriculum to best fit the learners in your classroom.

Future music educators desired contextualization of the materials and techniques they were learning in their programs (Ballantyne, 2007; Denis, 2023; Parr, 1999). Similarly, Conway (2012) found educators needed the opportunity to experience field work in a variety of settings because experience was one of the best ways to form meaning. Field work in various settings can help create place-consciousness in students and preparing them for diverse work experiences.

Contextualization can take various forms in different courses, but several studies found that it is vital for helping preservice teachers become accustomed to their future careers (Ballantyne, 2006; Conway et al., 2007; Denis, 2019; Denis, 2023). A secondary instrumental method course paired observations with instrumental techniques and undergraduate students had a PhD Buddy who met with them after observations to debrief (Conway et al., 2007). Students reported this experience provided clarity and contextualized what they saw in observations. Similarly, interviews with novice Texas instrumental music educators found participants valued positive contextualization with their teaching experiences (Denis, 2019). Novice music educators felt contextualization helped them retain the course materials and increased their motivation (Denis, 2023). Additionally, Ballantyne (2006) found music educators who valued contextualized courses focused on content linking music and development. Music education courses focused on contextualization will help the material remain with the music education students into their first years of teaching and help them as novice teachers.

Fieldwork

Fieldwork opportunities throughout the music education degree can provide the context students crave (Bartolome, 2017; Brophy, 2002; Conway, 2002; Halston & Russell, 2012). Brophy (2002) cited an ideal balance in their degree program would be a 50-50 split between fieldwork and coursework. Similarly, Bartolome (2017) found fieldwork experiences did transfer into students' first years of teaching and therefore recommended embedding fieldwork into courses in the music education degree to assist with the transition into the profession. Moreover, Conway (2002) found weekly internships helped students feel prepared for the workforce. After fieldwork experiences participants noted improvements in their general pedagogical knowledge,

assuming educator roles in small ensembles, making connections between teaching and learning, and developing confidence in their teacher identity (Halston & Russell, 2012).

Student Teaching

Student teaching is typically the longest example of fieldwork experience, often lasting a semester and is usually the final course prior to graduation for a music education degree. Student teaching is a valuable experience in the transition from student to teacher (Brophy, 2002; Conway, 2002; Legette & McCord, 2014-2015; Schmidt, 2010). Music education students ranked student teaching as the most important experience in preparing them to teach (Conway, 2002; Legette & McCord, 2014-2015). It helps build confidence among preservice music educators, helping alleviate concerns about failures and shortcomings (Killian et al., 2013).

One of the responsibilities of faculty members and mentor teachers is providing context for the materials learned in their courses (Bauer & Berg, 2001; DeLorenzo, 1992; Legette & McCord, 2014-2015). Participants related to Legette and McCord (2014-2015) that relationships with colleagues in the field, administrative support, and mentor teachers were the most helpful variables in making the transition from preservice to in-service teacher. Bauer and Berg (2001) found respondents ranked the influence of music education faculty low for preservice teachers. Instead, preservice teachers ranked colleagues, applied teachers, their cooperating teacher in student teaching, and collegiate conductors as highly influential. DeLorenzo (1992) found experienced colleagues and mentor teachers gave the most assistance to music educators as they transitioned from student to teacher.

Preparing Students to Work in Disparate Locales

Program Alterations

Music teacher education must evolve with society and grow with the needs of the changing experiences of students. Universities have some choice in their curriculum despite some fixed elements due to degree requirements (Beall, 1985). Updating teacher education programs to reflect the needs of undergraduate students is not easy, but some programs share ideas from integrating fieldwork early in the degree to implementing five-year programs (Colwell, 1985; Doyle, 2012; Leonhard, 1985; Schmidt, 2010; Stokking et al., 2003). As early as the late twentieth century researchers considered utilizing a five-year program for music education majors (Colwell, 1985; Leonhard, 1985). Such an approach would allow students to take more courses, including courses in contemporary music and jazz, to assist in preparation and allowing time to develop musicianship. Additional courses in popular music, jazz, and culturally relevant music will assist future teachers in the classroom (Doyle, 2012).

Additional Field Experiences

Additional field experiences starting earlier in the degree program can build confidence in student educators (Schmidt, 2010; Stokking et al., 2003). An experimental program in Sweden gave preservice teachers the opportunity to spend time in real classrooms (Stokking et al., 2003). Elementary teachers had full classroom responsibilities and secondary educators taught multiple lessons independently. The licensed teachers started out in the classroom with the novice educator and slowly extricated themselves while providing guidance.

Along with field experiences, Denis (2023) recommended helping students develop reflective practices. He asserted that when students are teachers, reflective practices will assist them in problem-solving in their own classroom. Additionally, reflective practices can help

teachers be open to changes. Field experiences earlier in the degree program combined with reflective practices may build confidence and enhance problem-solving skills in students before entering the classroom.

Participant Recommendations

Participants in music teacher preparation studies provided recommendations for what they think would help future music educators during the teacher preparation process. Some participants requested more coverage of pedagogical skills, such as implementing music curriculum, and assessing student skills (Ballantyne, 2006; Denis, 2019). Participants also wanted more training in classroom management and non-instructional aspects of teaching (Denis, 2019; Legette & McCord, 2014-2015). Ballantyne (2006) found participants wanted more exposure to resources for their classroom, coursework to specifically help in the first few years, and wished to learn how to specifically plan for music.

Along with writing about what helped students feel prepared to enter the classroom, studies noted what did not help students in their journey to becoming teachers. Most commonly, participants noted that their courses on general education practices hosted by the college of education were not helpful (Ballantyne, 2006; Brophy, 2002; Conway, 2002; Conway, 2012). Participants noted field experiences without context were not helpful in their preparation (Schmidt, 2010). Roulston et al. (2007) noted that participants valued hands-on experience, but it was not necessarily helpful if it did not align with the type of school where they were employed during their first year of teaching.

Strategies to Understand Disparate Locales

Music education students may take jobs in different locales from where they grew up or attended school and need the ability to work with a diverse population (Hunt, 2009). There more

than one way to teach students how to work in diverse settings, but research provides useful suggestions (Barter, 2008; Bond & Russell, 2019; Burton & Johnson, 2010; Doyle, 2012; Hunt, 2009; Moffa & McHenry-Sorber, 2018; Roulston et al., 2007; Standley, 2002). Ideas include using place consciousness, immersion programs, and diversity courses (Bond & Russell, 2019; Burton & Johnson, 2010; Doyle, 2012; Standley, 2002).

Place Consciousness

Place consciousness is the idea that educators should understand the place they teach, the communities where they work, and the history of the students in their care. In the music classroom, place consciousness includes programming music that is authentic to the community and teaching the context around the music. In the context of rural communities, Barter (2008) suggests universities establish a theory of rural education and connect rural education to communities through research. Burton and Johnson (2010) agree with Barter (2008) and call for preparation programs to include rural experiences in their curriculum. The concepts of place consciousness are also relevant to urban areas as well (Doyle, 2012).

Immersion

Immersion experiences in a teacher preparation program can include student teaching or field work experiences in schools different from where the preservice teacher grew up or attended school. Immersion experiences can help preservice teachers feel more comfortable in areas that are less familiar (Doyle, 2012; Standley, 2002). Doyle (2012) found placing preservice teachers in urban environments helped them develop positive attitudes towards students in urban environments. Based on the results of a posttest, Standley (2002) found a diversity course and immersion experiences increased the comfortability of undergraduate music education students with diversity.

Student Perspectives

Undergraduate students come to their education from different place and experiences. Two studies focused specifically on undergraduate students from rural areas and the participants noticed that their teacher education programs held deficit views of rural areas (Burton & Johnson, 2010; Moffa & McHenry-Sorber, 2018). Two participants who grew up in rural areas and intended to teach in rural areas felt their teacher preparation program tailored instruction towards suburban and urban environments, particularly in practicum and student teaching placements (Burton & Johnson, 2010). In study by Moffa and McHenry-Sorber (2018) the participants noted practicum diversity would have benefitted not only them but their cohort members. Inclusion of information about all locales only benefits students in teacher preparation programs.

Conclusion

Many instrumental music educators accept positions in cities or rural areas despite receiving any direct instruction or intentional experiences equipping them to teach in those locales. Teaching music requires more knowledge than instructing students how to play instruments and running rehearsals. Without the skills to take on additional tasks such as community events and navigate community relations music teachers may feel distressed or under prepared. Based on available literature, we do not know what contributes to some educator's feelings of preparation to teach in disparate areas. A few studies offer suggestions to help, but there are none that outline an answer as to what aspects of an undergraduate degree help instrumental music educators feel prepared to teach in disparate areas. I sought to ameliorate this gap in the literature thorough this study using a nationally distributed survey.

Chapter 3

Methods and Procedures

This chapter contains information about the target population and sample, survey instrument, data collection, and analysis. I used an online Qualtrics survey to collect data for this descriptive study. The purpose of this quantitative research study was to examine music educators' perceptions of their undergraduate preparation for teaching across disparate locales.

Research Questions

The research questions guiding this study were:

1. RQ1: What are secondary instrumental music educators' perceptions about the preparation they received from their undergraduate music education degree to teach in city, suburban, town, and rural locales?
 - 1.1: What components of their undergraduate music education degree do secondary instrumental music educators feel was most effective in preparing them to teach?
 - 1.2: What components of their undergraduate music education degree do secondary instrumental music educators feel was least effective in preparing them to teach?
2. RQ2: What experiences do secondary instrumental music educators perceive to be most effective in feeling prepared to teach in city, suburban, town, and rural locales?
 - 2.1 Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' attitudes about their undergraduate music teacher preparation to teach in disparate locales based on their experiences as a k-12 student?

- Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales based on their experiences as a k-12 student.
- 2.2 Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' attitudes about teaching in disparate locations based on the delivery of information about urban and rural music education during their undergraduate degree?
 - Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales based on the delivery of information about urban and rural music education during their undergraduate degree.
- 2.3 Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the location of their field experiences, not including student teaching?
 - Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference in secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on their field experiences, not including student teaching.
- 2.4 Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the location of their student teaching?

- Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between the location of student teaching and between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales.
- 2.5 Which of the following variables, experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, or student teaching, are the best predictors of secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, or rural locales?
 - Null hypothesis: There is no significant relationship between experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, or student teaching to secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, or rural locales.

3. RQ3: Is there a significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales?

- Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales.
- 3.1 Is there a significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the following variables, their experiences prior to an

undergraduate degree in music education, delivery of courses taken during their degree, field experiences, or student teaching?

- Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors to feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the following variables, their experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, delivery of courses taken during their degree, field experiences, or student teaching.

4. RQ4: Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' employment decisions and their feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales?

- Null hypothesis: There is no significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' employment decisions and their feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales.

Design and Approach

This is primarily a descriptive study. A descriptive study, including survey research, examines a phenomenon as it occurs without interfering (Mertler, 2022, Chapter 7). Researchers can use data gathered from survey research to investigate relationships beyond the descriptive data. Additional significance testing will investigate if there was a statistically significant difference between variables including, experiences as a k-12 student, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences, student teaching, and participants' feelings of preparation for teaching across disparate locales.

Two open-ended questions required initial qualitative analysis. I hand coded the data by reading each response and then organized responses by key themes (Ravitch & Carl, 2021). During the qualitative portions of analysis, I employed validity measures: multiple coding and structured reflexivity process. After I initially coded the data, a colleague also coded the data and we compared our results (Ravitch & Carl, 2021). Throughout the process I practiced structured reflexivity processes including memos and dialogic engagement exercises (Ravitch & Carl, 2021).

Setting and Sample

The target population was secondary instrumental music educators in the United States with an undergraduate degree in music education or a Bachelor of Arts in music with a Master of Arts in teaching. I selected participants through probability sampling, voluntary response sampling, and snowball sampling. Probability sampling is a quantitative sampling procedure where each person in a population has an equal probability of selection (Ayiro, 2012). Voluntary response sampling is a nonprobability sampling design where participants who are willing and qualify to participate constitute the final sample (Murairwa, 2015). I employed voluntary response sampling by advertising the survey on social media, targeting groups for instrumental music educators. Snowball sampling is a nonprobability sampling procedure where current participants refer additional participants (Ayiro, 2012). I used snowball sampling in the social media advertisements, asking people to pass the survey along to secondary instrumental music educators in their networks.

The selected sample was secondary instrumental music educators in the United States who have a degree in music education and are members of NAFME or in an online community for instrumental music educators. I used survey distribution resources through the National

Association for Music Educators. NAFME provides survey assistance by sending vetted surveys out to up to 5,000 members with up to two selection criteria. I requested for NAFME to send the survey nationally to members who are secondary educators and selected either the band or orchestra division.

Instrumentation and Materials

The survey instrument was an anonymous Qualtrics survey, *Instrumental Music Educators' Perceptions of Preparation Following an Undergraduate Degree in Music Education* (Appendix A). A password protected Auburn Box account housed survey responses and subsequent data. The Qualtrics survey did not collect any identification of the participants, including their IP address.

Instrument Development

I developed the instrument during a course on survey methods using this study's research questions as a guide. After initial development, collegiate instrumental music educators and students enrolled in an undergraduate program in music education at a public liberal arts university in the Southeast participated in the pilot survey. I selected these populations for the pilot survey because they were not in the target population for the study. I emailed pilot participants the Qualtrics link and instructions. The pilot yielded twenty-six responses. The results showed a Cronbach's Alpha of .98 for 21 items, indicating a high level of internal reliability.

After piloting the survey, I employed the Delphi method (Eggers & Jones, 1998) asking the collegiate instrumental music educators who piloted the instrument, doctoral colleagues from a survey development course, and my doctoral advisor to provide feedback on the instrument.

Based on their comments, I clarified language and added definitions across each section of the instrument.

I used the NCES' four major locales, city, suburban, town, and rural as the categories of locales for this study. NCES additionally divides each major category into three subcategories, fringe, distant, and remote. I only used the major locales and condensed the definitions to include each sub category of the locale. The beginning of each survey section included instructions on how to determine a locale along with definitions. While in the survey participants could click a link to the NCES website to determine their locale.

Survey Questions

The survey included five sections: demographic questions, educational backgrounds, feelings of preparation, employment decisions, and variables of preparation. The survey had a total of 42 questions, including demographic questions. The first question was a consent question followed by a filtering question. The filtering question confirmed the participant has an undergraduate degree in music education or a Bachelor of Arts in music with a Master of Arts in teaching. There were seven demographic questions, nine multiple-choice questions, 21 Likert-type questions, two check all-that-apply questions, and three short-answer questions.

Demographic Questions

The seven demographic questions asked participants for information about their gender and racial identities as well as their teaching status. First, participants had the option to share their specific age by typing the number. Participants had the option to select their gender (including options for non-binary), identity preference, and they had the option to not answer. Participants could share their ethnic background including the option to write in or to select if they prefer not to say. Participants could type the number of years they have been teaching,

select their highest level of education earned, select the state where they are currently teaching from a drop-down menu, and identify which large instrumental ensemble they currently teach. Next, participants answered if they planned to continue teaching in their current locale. Skip logic sent those who selected “no” directly to a question about which locale they would prefer to work in. Likewise, those who selected “yes”, went directly to the next block of questions.

Construct One- Educational Background

The first question in this section was multiple-choice, and asked participants which location best describes where the participant completed most of their high school education. Responses to these questions provided descriptive data and served as an independent variable when answering research question two. The next question asked how participants classified the locale of their undergraduate music education program. This data provided descriptive information. Next, participants selected all the locations where they completed observations or practicums outside of student teaching. This data provided descriptive information and served as the independent variable for research question 2.3. Similarly, participants selected all the locations where they completed student teaching. I analyzed the data for descriptive statistics. The data also served as the independent variable for research question 2.4. Finally, in this construct, participants answered a multiple-choice question asking if they completed a specific course about urban and rural music education in their undergraduate degree. Participants who selected they did not have a specific course about urban and rural music education in their undergraduate degree next answered a question about the inclusion of information pertaining to urban and rural music education in other courses in their undergraduate degree. The data served as the independent variable for research question 2.2.

Construct Two- Feelings of Preparation

Participants answered a matrix question about how prepared they felt to teach in a variety of settings upon completion of their undergraduate degree in music education. The ratings were on a five-point scale where one is equal to strongly disagree and five is equal to strongly agree. The stem of the question read “After completing my undergraduate degree in music education, I felt prepared to teach in...” and then along the left side participants responded to the following locales: Any setting (city, suburban, town, rural), a city setting, a suburban setting, a town, or a rural setting. Participants rated their feelings of preparation for each setting. The results of these questions served as the dependent variables for research questions 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.4, three, and four. The data served as the independent variable for research question 2.5. I analyzed the data for descriptive statistics to answer research question 1.

Construct Three- Employment Decisions

The third construct contained questions about employment decisions of participants based on their feelings of preparation. The first question was a multiple-choice question asking if the participant has ever not applied for or not accepted a job in a locale because they did not feel prepared to teach in that setting. Participants either selected “yes,” which directed them to the next question, or “no,” which directed them to the next block of questions. Participants who responded “yes,” next answered a multiple-choice question asking for the specific locale where they not accept a job because of their feelings of preparation to teach in that setting.

Construct Four- Variables of Preparation

The fourth construct contained questions about the different variables that possibly impacted participants’ feelings of preparation. The first four questions of this construct were matrix questions where participants rated: experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate

degree, classes taken during the undergraduate degree, fieldwork (observations/practicums) in schools excluding student teaching during the undergraduate music education degree, and student teaching experience during the undergraduate degree. Participants rated these variables based on a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1=*extremely unprepared* to 5=*extremely prepared*. The first question asked participants to rate each of those variables as they pertained to teaching in a city. Next, the participants repeated the process for suburbs, towns, and rural locales. The answers from participants for each locale and each variable were the dependent variables for research questions 2.5 and 3.1. I analyzed the results of these questions using descriptive statistics to help answer research question 2.

The last three questions were open-ended, and participants typed their answers into a box. The first open-ended question asked which part of the participant's undergraduate degree program they felt best prepared them for their experiences in the classroom. The next question asked which parts of the participant's undergraduate degree program they felt was least helpful in preparing them for their experiences in the classroom. Each of these questions were hand coded and analyzed using qualitative analysis. Data from these questions answered research questions 1.1 and 1.2. The final question asked participants if they have any additional comments on the topic. I read these answers and they assisted in the discussion portion of the paper.

Data Collection and Analysis

Participants either clicked on a link in an email from NAFME or they clicked on a link or accessed the link through a QR code in a social media post to complete the survey. The link took participants to the survey instrument in Qualtrics. The survey took participants approximately ten minutes to finish.

Research Question One

The first research question asked how secondary instrumental music educators perceive the preparation they received from their undergraduate music education programs to teach in city, suburban, towns, and rural locales. Participants answered five 5-point Likert-style questions ranging from 1= *strongly disagree* to 5= *strongly agree* about their feelings of preparedness to teach in any setting (city, suburban, town, rural), a city setting, a suburban setting, a town setting, or a rural setting upon completion of their undergraduate degree in music education. I analyzed the data for each question using descriptive statistics including mean, median, mode, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum.

Research question 1.1 asked what parts of an undergraduate music education degree program secondary instrumental music educators perceived most effective in preparing them for their experiences in the classroom. Participants responded to an open-ended question asking what parts of an undergraduate music education degree program they perceived as best preparing them for their experiences in the classroom. I hand coded the data by reading each response and organized responses by key themes (Ravitch & Carl, 2021). After identifying key themes, I analyzed the data using frequency and percentage distribution.

Research question 1.2 asked what parts of an undergraduate music education degree program secondary music educators perceived as the least helpful in preparing for their experiences in the classroom. Participants responded to an open-ended question asking what parts of an undergraduate music education degree program they perceived as least helpful in preparing them for their experiences in the classroom. I hand coded the data by reading each response and organized responses by key themes (Ravitch & Carl, 2021). After identifying key themes, I analyzed the data using frequency and percentage distribution.

Research Question Two

The second research question asked about the experiences secondary instrumental music educators perceived as the most effective in feeling prepared to teach in city, suburban, town, and rural locales. Participants answered four, 5-point Likert-style questions rating how different experiences helped them feel prepared to teach in a variety of settings. Participants used four, 5-point Likert-style questions ranging from 1= *extremely unprepared* to 5= *extremely prepared* to rate their experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree, courses taken during their undergraduate degree, field work (observations/practicums) in schools excluding student teaching during the undergraduate music education degree, and their student teaching experience during the undergraduate music education degree. Participants repeated this process for each locale. I analyzed the data from each locale using descriptive statistics including mean, median, mode, standard deviation, and minimum and maximum.

Research question 2.1 asked if there was a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' attitudes about their undergraduate music teacher preparation to teach in disparate locales based on their experiences as a k-12 student. The null hypothesis was there is no significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales based on their experiences as a k-12 student. I analyzed the results from the Likert-style questions where participants rate how prepared they felt to teach in each locale following their undergraduate degree. After computing a Shapiro-Wilk test of normality, the feelings of preparation to teach in any setting, a city, suburban locales, a town, and rural locales was significant ($p < .001$) indicating the results were not normally distributed. Therefore, I used the non-parametric independent samples Kruskal-Wallis Test to compare the feelings of preparation to teach in various locales to the locales where participants attended most

of high school during their k-12 education. The independent variable was the locale where participants attended most of high school. The dependent variable was how prepared participants felt to teach in each locale. I ran this procedure four times, once for each locale.

Research question 2.2 asked if there was a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' attitudes about teaching in disparate locations based on the delivery of information about urban and rural music education during their undergraduate degree. The null hypothesis was there is no significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales based on the delivery of information about urban and rural music education during their undergraduate degree. I used two statistical procedures to answer this question.

The independent variable for the first procedure was if participants had a course in urban and rural music education in their undergraduate music education degree. The dependent variable was the feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales.

After computing a Shapiro-Wilk test of normality, the feelings of preparation to teach in any setting, a city, suburban locales, a town, and rural locales was significant ($p < .001$) indicating the results were not normally distributed. Accordingly, I used a non-parametric Mann-Whitney U Test to compare if there was a statistically significant difference between the implementation of an urban and rural course taken during an undergraduate degree and participants' feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales.

The independent variable for the second procedure was if participants' professors included information about urban and rural music education in courses outside of a specific course for urban and rural music education. The dependent variable is the feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales. Similarly, to the first procedure, the data for

the dependent variable were not normally distributed so I used a non-parametric Mann-Whitney U Test to examine if there was a statistically significant difference between the variables.

Research question 2.3 asked if there was a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the location of their field experiences, not including student teaching. The null hypothesis was there is no significant difference in secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on their field experiences, not including student teaching. The independent variable was the locale where participants completed their field experiences. The dependent variable was participants' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales. After testing the normality of the dependent variable, it was not normally distributed. Therefore, I used a non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis Test to determine if there was a statistically significant difference between the locale of field experiences, not including student teaching and feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales. I ran this procedure four times, once for each locale.

Research question 2.4 asked if there was a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the location of their student teaching. The null hypothesis was the location of student teaching has no significant difference on secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales. The independent variable was the locale where participants completed their student teaching. The dependent variable was participants' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales. I used a non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis Test to determine if there was a statistically

significant difference between the locale of student teaching and feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales. I ran this procedure four times, once for each locale.

Research question 2.5 asked which of the following variables: experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, or student teaching, are the best predictors of secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, or rural locales. The null hypothesis was there is no significant relationship between experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, or student teaching to secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, or rural locales.

A non-parametric Spearman's *rho* was the most appropriate test because the data for the dependent variable were not normally distributed. The independent variables were experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree in music education, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, and student teaching. I analyzed the data four different times, once for each locale. Each analysis used the same independent variables, but the dependent variable changed each time to reflect the locale. The dependent variable for the first analysis was the feelings of preparation to teach in a city. The dependent variable for the second analysis was the feelings of preparation to teach in a suburban locale. The dependent variable for the third analysis was the feelings of preparation to teach in a town. The dependent variable for the fourth analysis was the feelings of preparation to teach in a rural locale.

Research Question Three

Research question 3 asked if there was a significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales. The null hypothesis was there is no significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales. The independent variable was the type of large ensemble the participants teach. The dependent variable was the feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales. The data for the dependent variable were not normally distributed so I used a non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis Test to determine if there was a significant difference between the groups.

Research question 3.1 asked if there was a significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the following variables: Their experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, delivery of courses taken during their degree, field experiences, or student teaching. The null hypothesis was there is no significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors to feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the following variables: their experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, delivery of courses taken during their degree, field experiences, or student teaching. I ran a Chi Square on each variable, however, all but one run of the procedure yielded results with at least one cell having an expected count less than 5. Therefore, I ran a Fischer's Exact Test to identify significant differences between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on different variables.

Research Question Four

Research question 4 asked if there was a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' employment decisions and their feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales. The null hypothesis was there is no significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' employment decisions and their feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales. The data for the dependent variable were not normally distributed so I used a non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis Test to test for a significant difference. The independent variables for the first Kruskal-Wallis was the locale of the job not applied for or accepted. The dependent variable for the second Kruskal-Wallis was the feelings of preparation to teaching in cities, suburbs, towns, or rural locales. The independent variable was the locale of their current job. The dependent variable for the third Kruskal-Wallis was the feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales. The independent variable for the third Kruskal-Wallis was the locale of the participants desired job.

I used descriptive statistics including mean, median, mode, standard deviation, minimum, and maximum to report where the participants currently teach, if the participants would like to move to another job in the future, and the locale where the participants would like to teach. I reported descriptive statistics about if participants have ever not applied to or accepted a job in a certain locale because they did not feel prepared to teach there and the locale of the job not applied to or accepted.

Protection of Participants' Rights

Prior to distribution, the study received approval from the Auburn University Institutional Review Board (IRB). The survey did not collect any identification data from the participants and

they remained anonymous throughout the process. I set up the survey in Qualtrics so it did not collect any personal identifying data, including the IP address used while taking the survey. A password protected Auburn Box account housed the responses and subsequent data. Participants may stop the survey at any time. Participants did not receive any tangible incentive for completing the survey, but may have experienced personal satisfaction from helping the profession.

Table 1

Data Analysis Overview

Research Question	Data From Survey Qs	Data Level(s)	Data Analysis Procedures
RQ1: What are secondary instrumental music educators' perceptions about the preparation they received from their undergraduate music education degree to teach in city, suburban, town, and rural locales?	Question: 4.1	Ordinal or Scale	Descriptive (Mean, Median, Mode, SD, Min, and Max)
1.1 What components of their undergraduate music education degree do secondary instrumental music educators feel was most effective in preparing them to teach?	Question: 6.5	Nominal	Qualitative Hand Coding Descriptive (frequency)
1.2 What components of their undergraduate music education degree do secondary instrumental music educators feel was least effective in preparing them to teach?	Question: 6.6	Nominal	Qualitative Hand Coding Descriptive (frequency)
RQ2: What experiences do secondary instrumental music educators perceive to be most effective in feeling prepared to teach in city, suburban, town, and rural locales?	Questions: 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4	Ordinal or Scale	Descriptive (Mean, Median, Mode, SD, Min, and Max)
2.1 Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' attitudes about their undergraduate music teacher preparation to teach in disparate locales based on their experiences as a k-12 student?	Questions: 3.1, 4.1 IV: Locale of most of high school DV: feelings of preparation	IV: Nominal (3.1) DV: Ordinal or Scale (4.1)	Kruskal-Wallis
2.2 Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' attitudes about teaching in disparate locations based on the delivery of information about	Questions: 3.5, 4.1 IV: Course in urban and rural music education	IV: Nominal (3.5, 3.6) DV: Ordinal or Scale (4.1)	Mann-Whitney U

urban and rural music education during their undergraduate degree?	DV: feelings of preparation IV: information about urban and rural in music education courses DV: feelings of preparation		
2.3 Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the location of their field experiences, not including student teaching?	Questions: 3.3, 4.1 IV: location of field experiences DV: feelings of preparation	IV: Nominal (3.3) DV: Ordinal or Scale (4.1)	Descriptive (Mean, Median, Mode, SD, Min, and Max) Kruskal-Wallis
2.4 Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the location of their student teaching?	Questions: 3.4, 4.1 IV: location of student teaching DV: feelings of preparation	IV: Nominal (3.4) DV: Ordinal or Scale (4.1)	Descriptive (Mean, Median, Mode, SD, Min, and Max) Kruskal-Wallis
2.5 Which of the following variables, experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, or student teaching, are the best predictors of secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, or rural locales?	Questions: 4.1, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4 IV: prior experiences, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, student teaching DV: feelings of preparation to teach in the locale	Ordinal or Scale	Spearman's <i>rho</i>
RQ3: Is there a significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales?	Questions: 2.7; 4.1 IV: subject taught DV: feelings of preparation	IV: Nominal (2.7) DV: Ordinal or Scale (4.1)	Kruskal-Wallis
3.1 Is there a significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the following variables, their experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, delivery of courses taken during their degree, field experiences, or student teaching?	Questions: 2.7; 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4 IV: subject taught DV: variables influencing feelings of preparation (prior experiences, courses taken, field work, student teaching)	IV: Nominal (2.7) DV: Ordinal or Scale (6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4)	Chi Square on each variable Fischer's Exact Test
RQ4: Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' employment decisions and their	Questions: 2.8-2.10, 4.1, 5.1, 5.2	IV: Nominal (2.8-2.10; 5.1, 5.2)	Descriptive (Mean, Median, Mode, SD, Min, and Max)

feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales?	IV: locale of job not applied for or accepted DV: feelings of preparation IV: locale of current job DV: feelings of preparation IV: locale of desired job DV: feelings of preparation	DV: Ordinal or Scale (4.1)	Kruskal-Wallis
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------	----------------

Conclusion

I conducted an anonymous online survey of secondary instrumental music educators across the United States to gather information about their backgrounds and feelings of preparation to teach in different areas after receiving an undergraduate degree in music education. Using participants' responses, I examined the data for information relating to participants' self-reported feelings of preparation to teach in city, suburban, town, or rural locales. Conceivably, with this knowledge, undergraduate music education programs can best prepare their students to apply for and accept jobs in any locale. Furthermore, better preparation may reduce teacher attrition, particularly in city and rural schools. Hopefully, this study will provide information to aid in changes needed to assist in providing high quality music education for students across the country.

Chapter 4

Results

The purpose of this nationally distributed quantitative research study was to examine secondary instrumental music educators' perceptions of their undergraduate preparation for teaching across disparate locales. I collected data through an anonymous online survey distributed through NAFME survey assistance and social media. I posted the survey to my personal Facebook and Instagram pages along with posting the survey to a total of 10 Facebook groups. I collected a total of 710 responses through Qualtrics, and a total of 489 of those responses were useable for the survey. The usable response rate was 68.83%.

Response Rate and Reliability

Out of the 710 responses, two participants did not consent to the survey and 71 did not pass the filtering question. Four hundred eighty-nine of the remaining 623 respondents completed at least 76% of the survey. While some suggest keeping all the responses regardless of the completion amount, I felt keeping responses that were less than 76% would increase the likelihood of a Type II error (Brick & Kalton, 1996). While it is difficult to determine the exact figure for secondary instrumental music educators in the United States, NAFME distributed the survey to 5,000 secondary instrumental music educators. The sample size for a confidence level of 95% with a population size of 5,000 is 357.

I conducted the Cronbach's alpha coefficient for each Likert scale used in the survey to measure internal consistency. Each of the five constructs in the survey produced an acceptable alpha coefficient of at least .70. The Cronbach's alpha for each scale ranged from .780 to .914.

Participant Demographics

Participants answered questions about their gender, ethnic background, age, number of years teaching, the state they currently teach in, and the highest level of education they have earned. Most participants identified as male ($n = 238$, 48.7%), followed by female ($n = 216$, 44.2%), and three participants identified as non-binary (0.6%). The most frequently reported ethnic background was Caucasian/White ($n = 409$, 88.6%), followed by Hispanic ($n = 24$, 4.9%), and African American/Black ($n = 15$, 3.1%). Participants' ages ranged from 22-78. The largest percentage of participants fell within the 30-39 years age range ($n = 140$, 28.6%).

Participants reported years of teaching ranging from 1 to 50 years, with the majority ($n = 256$, 52.40%) teaching 15 years or fewer. Participants responded from 48 states and two territories. No respondents reported teaching in Hawaii or New Hampshire. The two states with the most responses were Texas ($n = 46$, 9.4%) and Georgia ($n = 38$, 7.8%). Participants most frequently reported holding a master's degree ($n = 210$, 42.9%) followed by those with a bachelor's degree ($n = 127$, 26.0%).

Most participants ($n = 360$, 73.6%) indicated band as the primary large ensemble they teach. The largest number of participants responded they currently teach in a rural locale ($n = 173$, 35.40%), followed by suburban ($n = 151$, 30.9%). Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7 contain summaries of participant demographics.

Table 2

Participant Demographics by Gender and Ethnic Background

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	Percent
Gender		
Male	238	48.7
Female	216	44.2
Non-Binary	3	0.6
Self-Describe		
Female	3	0.6
Male	1	0.2

Transgender Woman	1	0.2
Unknown	1	0.3
Prefer not to say	3	0.6
Total	466	95.3
Missing System	23	4.7
<hr/>		
Ethnic Background		
African American/Black	15	3.1
Asian American	6	1.2
Caucasian/White	409	83.6
Hispanic	24	4.9
Other, Please Specify	7	1.4
Black and Hispanic	1	0.2
Mexican	1	0.2
Mixed Race; AA/Cauc	1	0.2
Mixed. Native American and White	1	0.2
Native Hawaiian	1	0.2
Pacific Islander	1	0.2
Prefer not to say	6	1.2
Total	467	95.5
Missing	22	4.5

Table 3

Participant Demographics by State (N=489)

Current State Teaching	<i>n</i>	Percent
Alabama	13	2.7
Alaska	1	0.2
Arizona	12	2.5
Arkansas	4	0.8
California	20	4.1
Colorado	9	1.8
Connecticut	11	2.2
Delaware	1	0.2
Florida	17	3.5
Georgia	38	7.8
Idaho	6	1.2
Illinois	18	3.7
Indiana	4	0.8
Iowa	5	1.0
Kansas	7	1.4
Kentucky	8	1.6
Louisiana	5	1.0
Maine	2	0.4
Maryland	9	1.8
Massachusetts	7	1.4
Michigan	12	2.5
Minnesota	11	2.2
Mississippi	4	0.8
Missouri	8	1.6
Montana	5	1.0
Nebraska	10	2.0
Nevada	2	0.4

New Jersey	7	1.4
New Mexico	1	0.2
New York	26	5.3
North Carolina	15	3.1
North Dakota	3	0.6
Ohio	17	3.5
Oklahoma	4	0.8
Oregon	4	0.8
Pennsylvania	18	3.7
Rhode Island	1	0.2
South Carolina	9	1.8
South Dakota	3	0.6
Tennessee	13	2.7
Texas	46	9.4
Utah	3	0.6
Vermont	2	0.4
Virginia	14	2.9
Washington	14	2.9
West Virginia	2	0.4
Wisconsin	9	1.8
Wyoming	3	0.6
Washington D.C.	1	0.3
Puerto Rico	1	0.3
Total	465	95.1
Missing	24	4.9

Table 4

Participant Demographics by Age and Years Teaching

	<i>n</i>	Percent
Age Range		
21-29	94	19.2
30-39	140	28.6
40-49	111	22.7
50-59	51	10.4
60-69	31	6.4
70-78	6	1.2
Total	433	88.5
Missing	56	11.5
Current Years Teaching		
1-5	85	17.4
6-10	92	18.8
11-15	79	16.2
16-20	59	12.1
21-25	51	10.4
26-30	50	10.2
31-35	23	4.7
36-40	9	1.8
41-45	13	2.7
46-50	2	0.4
Total	463	94.7
Missing	26	5.3

Table 5

Participant Demographics by Highest Level of Education Earned, Large Instrumental Ensemble, and Locale of Current Job

	<i>n</i>	Percent
Highest Level of Education Earned		
Bachelor's	127	26.0
Master's	210	42.9
Education Specialist or Master's +30	61	12.5
Some Doctoral Work	38	7.8
Doctorate	30	6.1
Total	466	95.3
Missing	23	4.7
Large Instrumental Ensemble		
Band Only	360	73.6
Orchestra Only	54	11.0
Band and Orchestra	46	9.4
Total	460	94.1
Missing	29	5.9
Locale of Current Job		
City	105	21.5
Suburban	151	30.9
Town	57	11.7
Rural	173	35.4
Total	486	99.4
Missing	3	0.6

Research Question 1: What are secondary instrumental music educators' perceptions about the preparation they received from their undergraduate music education degree to teach in city, suburban, town, and rural locales?

Participants answered a series of five-point Likert-style questions, 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*, about their feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales after completing their undergraduate degree in music education. Overall, participants somewhat agreed they felt prepared to teach in each setting. However, they felt most prepared to teach in suburban ($M = 4.27$, $SD = 0.91$) and town ($M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.93$) settings. Table 6 contains a summary of responses.

Table 6*Descriptive Statistics for Perceptions of Preparation to Teach in City, Suburban, Town, and**Rural Locales*

	<i>N</i>	Min	Max	Mean	Mode	Std. Deviation
After completing my undergraduate degree in music education, I felt prepared to teach in...						
Any setting (city, suburban, town, rural)	489	1	5	3.56	4	1.10
A city setting	486	1	5	3.51	4	1.24
A suburban setting	486	1	5	4.27	5	0.91
A town setting	486	1	5	4.13	4	0.93
A rural setting	487	1	5	3.46	4	1.29

Research Question 1.1: What components of their undergraduate music education degree do secondary instrumental music educators feel was most effective in preparing them to teach?

Participants answered a free response question about the part of their undergraduate degree program they felt was most helpful in preparing them to teach. Three main codes emerged: courses, fieldwork experiences, and student teaching. Secondary themes included performing, interactions, and teaching outside of the university. Participants may have made grammatical errors when answering the free response questions. Quotes reflect the responses as typed by the participant including any grammatical errors. Participants wrote about their perceptions of their preparation, which may or may not accurately reflect the preparation their undergraduate program provided.

Participants wrote about a variety of courses, with methods or pedagogy courses, music education classes, core music classes, and non-music classes reported most frequently. One

participant wrote, “Method classes on how to teach beginner brass, woodwind, and percussion was information that was most valuable. It’s so important to learn all the instrument in or to gain confidence to teach them.” Another participant shared about the delivery of course materials, “The courses I took with professors who had actually worked in the classroom for a number of years. They had practical experience to share, and those experiences help to forge my thought about how to approach teaching.” Overall, participants’ responses reflect coursework impacting their feelings of preparation in a positive manner.

The second most mentioned topic was fieldwork, or work in schools outside of student teaching. One participant noted the sequencing of the work was valuable, “that classroom experience of observing before being responsible for the classroom was valuable.” Another participant wrote, “The fieldwork was the most effective because I could communicate with the current teacher on how they handle the class.” A few participants commented on the amount of time they had in classrooms from an early stage, “Where I attended college we began to enter the classroom our first year as practicum students, so we had a LOT of student interaction.” These participants’ responses provide context to their feelings on fieldwork.

Student teaching was the third most noted topic, and some participants wrote a little bit about their experiences. One participant shared, “student teaching in different locales for a realistic viewpoint” was most helpful for their preparation. Another participant wrote, “student teaching- I wish I had more opportunities in front of a classroom before I stepped into my first role.” Many participants ($n = 129$) felt student teaching was the most effective part of their undergraduate music education.

Table 7*Frequency of Topics-Most Effective Preparation*

	<i>n</i>	%
Courses	152	33.3
Methods or Pedagogy	86	
Music Education Classes	58	
Core Music Classes	14	
Non-Music Classes	11	
Fieldwork Experiences	135	29.5
Student Teaching	129	28.2
Performing	17	3.7
Interactions	16	3.5
Teaching Outside University	8	1.8

Research Question 1.2: What components of their undergraduate music education degree do secondary instrumental music educators feel was least effective in preparing them to teach?

Participants answered a free-response question asking which part of their undergraduate music education degree they felt was the least helpful in preparing them to teach. Participants may have made grammatical errors when answering the free response questions. Quotes reflect the responses as typed by the participant including any grammatical errors. Participants reflected upon their perceptions of preparation which may or may not accurately reflect the preparation they received in their undergraduate degree. Responses contained a variety of experiences including theory class, marching band, and peer teaching. Many of the responses to this question were like those in the previous question, revealing unique experiences by all participants. Three main themes emerged: music courses, courses outside of music, and lack of content or opportunity.

Music courses made up the bulk of responses about what music educators felt was the least effective in preparing them to teach. I used the sub-codes of core classes, music education

classes, and fieldwork or student teaching. Core classes consist of classes all music majors take, for example: Class piano, music history, music theory, and conducting. One participant wrote, “Classes such as music history, conducting, and private lesson were the least effective at preparing me. Although these classes are useful in preparing to be an educator they do not directly correlated to the administrative side of running an effective classroom.” Participants were most likely to feel core music courses did not prepare them to teach compared to additional music classes.

Many participants wrote about courses within the college of education as the least effective in preparing them for the classroom. One participant wrote, “Any classes officially associated with the Education department have been a waste of time even now with the experience that I have. With the exception of understanding sped [*sic*] laws, the education classes I have taken have not applied to the classroom.” Another participant shared, “My preparation to work with students with special needs was ineffective and I always felt at a disadvantage when serving those students.”

Additionally, participants wrote about either a course lacking in a content area they needed or an opportunity they felt they did not receive during their education. One participant wrote about their student teaching experience, “Student teaching experience is only valuable if the master teacher is willing to provide growth to the learner. We all know of cases where the master teacher uses the student as a means of doing their job rather than providing feedback or any kind of professional example.” One participant wrote about a lack of opportunity to see various locales, “Since I grew up and attended college in rural New Hampshire, there were no opportunities given to us to teach in a different kind of classroom.” These responses demonstrate the complexity of preparing music educators to enter the field.

Table 8*Frequency of Themes- Least Effective*

	<i>n</i>	%
Music Courses	142	40.2
Core Classes	82	
Music Education Classes	51	
Fieldwork/Student Teaching	5	
Courses Outside of Music	131	37.1
Lack of Content or Opportunity	80	22.7

Research Question 2: What experiences do secondary instrumental music educators perceive to be most effective in feeling prepared to teach in city, suburban, town, and rural locales?

Participants answered a series of 5-point Likert style questions, 1=*extremely unprepared* to 5=*extremely prepared*, about different experiences and their feelings of preparedness to teach in disparate locales. Participants rated experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree the lowest for each locale. The mode for each response was 4=*prepared*, except for experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree in a city, where the mode was 1=*extremely unprepared*. Overall, participants rated suburban locales the highest across each variable indicating high levels of comfort in suburban areas. See Table 11 for more information about experiences participants perceive most effective in feeling prepared to teach in city, suburban, town, and rural locales.

Table 9*Descriptive Statistics for Experiences Secondary Instrumental Music Educators Perceive Most**Effective in Feeling Prepared to Teach in Disparate Locales*

	<i>N</i>	Min	Max	Mode	Mean	Standard Deviation
Rate the following items based on how prepared they helped you feel to teach in a city.						
Experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree	397	1	5	1	2.64	1.34
Classes taken during an undergraduate degree	397	1	5	4	3.28	1.13
Fieldwork (observations/practicums) in schools excluding student teaching during the undergraduate music education degree	397	1	5	4	3.38	1.17
Student teaching experience during the undergraduate music education degree	396	1	5	4	3.35	1.25
Rate the following items based on how prepared they helped you feel to teach in a suburban locale.						
Experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree	399	1	5	4	3.63	1.13
Classes taken during an undergraduate degree	399	1	5	4	3.93	0.92
Fieldwork (observations/practicums) in schools excluding student teaching during the undergraduate music education degree	399	1	5	4	4.02	0.88
Student teaching experience during the undergraduate music education degree	399	1	5	4	4.06	0.93
Rate the following items based on how prepared they helped you feel to teach in a town.						
Experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree	398	1	5	4	3.60	1.13
Classes taken during an undergraduate degree	398	1	5	4	3.91	0.88

Fieldwork (observations/practicums) in schools excluding student teaching during the undergraduate music education degree	389	1	5	4	3.93	0.91
Student teaching experience during the undergraduate music education degree	398	1	5	4	3.98	0.92
<hr/>						
Rate the following items based on how prepared they helped you feel to teach in a rural locale.						
<hr/>						
Experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree	399	1	5	4	3.04	1.41
Classes taken during an undergraduate degree	399	1	5	4	3.21	1.28
Fieldwork (observations/practicums) in schools excluding student teaching during the undergraduate music education degree	398	1	5	4	3.25	1.29
Student teaching experience during the undergraduate music education degree	398	1	5	4	3.30	1.36
<hr/>						

Research Question 2.1: Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' attitudes about their undergraduate music teacher preparation to teach in disparate locales based on their experiences as a k-12 student?

The null hypothesis for this question: there is no significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales based on their experiences as a k-12 student.

After computing a Shapiro-Wilk test of normality, the feelings of preparation to teach in any setting, a city, suburban locales, a town, and rural locales was significant ($p < .001$) indicating the responses were not normally distributed. Therefore, I used an independent samples Kruskal-Wallis test to compare the feelings of preparation to teach in various locales to the location where participants attended most of their high school years.

I used a Kruskal-Wallis test to compare participants' feelings of preparation to teach in any locale to the locale of the school where they attended most of high school during their k-12 education. There was no significant difference ($H(3) = 4.04, p = .257$) indicating the feelings of preparation to teach in any locale did not differ significantly based on the locale of where they attended most of high school. Due to no significant difference, I fail to reject the null hypothesis for feelings of preparation to teach in any locale. A significant difference was found comparing participants' feelings of preparation to teach in a city ($H(3) = 24.04, p < .001$), suburban locale ($H(3) = 15.18, p = .002$), a town ($H(3) = 16.72, p < .001$), and a rural locale ($H(3) = 46.89, p < .001$) with the locale of the school they attended for the majority of high school. Given the significant difference for cities, suburban locales, towns, and rural locales, I reject the null.

Pairwise comparisons showed participants who attended most of their high school years in a city had significantly higher feelings of preparation to teach in a city than those who attended high school in a suburban, town, and rural area. Additionally, pairwise comparisons showed participants who spent most of their high school years in a suburban area had significantly higher feelings of preparation to teach in a suburban area than those who attended high school in a rural area. There was no significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in a suburban area for participants who attended high school in a suburban area and those who attended high school in a city or town. A pairwise comparison revealed participants who attended most of their high school years in a city felt significantly less prepared to teach in a town than participants who attended high school in a suburban, town, and rural locale. Pairwise comparisons show participants who attended high school in a rural area felt significantly more prepared to teach in a rural area than those who attended most of high school in a town, suburban area, and a city.

Table 10

Independent-Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test for Feelings of Preparation to Teach in Disparate Locales Compared to High School Locale

	Significance	Decision
After completing my undergraduate degree in music education, I felt prepared to teach in...		
Any Locale	.257	Fail to reject the null hypothesis
A City	<.001	Reject the null hypothesis
A Suburban Locale	.002	Reject the null hypothesis
A Town	<.001	Reject the null hypothesis
A Rural Locale	<.001	Reject the null hypothesis

Table 11

Pairwise Comparison of Feelings of Preparation to Teach in Disparate Locales and the Locale of High School Attended

	City	Suburban	Town	Rural
	Average Rank	Average Rank	Average Rank	Average Rank
Feelings of Preparation to Teach in...				
City	301.88	250.01	225.07	212.85
Suburb	240.60	270.84	231.73	216.17
Town	193.84	241.95	259.87	264.19
Rural	197.26	219.06	238.32	310.03

Research Question 2.2: Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' attitudes about teaching in disparate locations based on the delivery of information about urban and rural music education during their undergraduate degree?

The null hypothesis for this question: there is no significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales based on the

delivery of information about urban and rural music education during their undergraduate degree.

Few participants (30, 6.1%) indicated having a course specifically about urban and rural music education in their undergraduate degree. However, 151 (30.9%) participants indicated despite not having a specific course about urban and rural music education during their undergraduate degree, their music education professors covered materials about urban and rural music education. See Table 12 for more information.

Table 12

Courses and Information About Urban and Rural Music Education in Undergraduate Courses

	<i>n</i>	Percent
Did your undergraduate music education program include a specific course about urban and rural music education?		
Yes	30	6.1
No	459	93.9
Total	489	100.0
Did your music education professors include information about teaching in urban and rural environments in music education courses outside of a specific course about urban and rural music education?		
Yes	151	30.9
No	308	63.0
Missing	30	6.1
Total	489	100.0

The mean scores were not normally distributed, so I did not use an independent-samples *t* test. Instead, I used a Mann-Whitney U Test to examine the difference in feelings of preparation to teach in a variety of settings and the inclusion of a course about urban and rural music education. There was no significant difference in feelings of preparation between those who took a course in urban and rural music education and those who did not when it came to teaching in any locale ($U = 6305.50, p = .407$), a city ($U = 6818.50, p = .976$), a suburban area ($U = 7548.50,$

$p = .296$), a town ($U = 7377.50$, $p = .433$), and a rural locale ($U = 6759.50$, $p = .895$). Given no significant difference between those who had a course in urban and rural music education and those who did not and their feelings of preparation to teach in any locale, I fail to reject the null hypothesis.

I used a Mann-Whitney U Test to examine the difference in feelings of preparation to teach in a variety of settings and the inclusion information about urban and rural music education in other music education courses. There was no significant difference between those whose professors included information about urban and rural music education in other courses and those who did not in feelings of preparation to teach in any locale ($U = 21749.50$, $p = .227$), a city ($U = 21349.50$, $p = .185$), a suburban area ($U = 20722.50$, $p = .055$), and a rural locale ($U = 21095.50$, $p = .118$). Due to no significant difference, I failed to reject the null hypothesis. There was a significant difference in participants' feelings of preparation to teach in a town.

Participants who received information about teaching in an urban and rural environment felt significantly more prepared (M place = 250.50; $U = 19705.00$; $p = .006$) to teach in a town than those who did not (M place = 217.61). Since there was a significant difference, I will reject the null hypothesis.

Research Question 2.3: Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the location of their field experiences, not including student teaching?

The null hypothesis for this question: there is no significant difference in secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on their field experiences, not including student teaching.

Participants completed field work in many combinations of locales. One locale or combination of locales was not a predominant majority. City was the single locale with the highest frequency ($n = 52$, 10.6%). The combination of city and suburban was the most frequently selected ($n = 75$, 15.3%). See Table 13 for more information about where participants completed their field work.

Table 13

Locales of Field Work

	<i>N</i>	%
City	52	10.6
Suburban	37	7.6
Town	37	7.6
Rural	33	6.7
City, Suburban	75	15.3
City, Town	6	1.2
City, Rural	8	1.6
Suburban, Town	36	7.4
Suburban, Rural	9	1.8
Town, Rural	59	12.1
City, Suburban, Town	37	7.6
City, Suburban, Rural	13	2.7
City, Town, Rural	9	1.8
Suburban, Town, Rural	27	5.5
City, Suburban, Town, Rural	51	10.4
Total	489	100.0

After computing a Shapiro-Wilk test of normality, the feelings of preparation to teach in any setting, were significant ($p < .001$) indicating they were not normally distributed. Therefore, I used a non-parametric independent sample Kruskal-Wallis test to compare the feelings of preparation to teach in various locales to the locations where participants completed observations or practicums outside of student teaching. Participants answered a check-all-that-apply question for the locale of their student teaching which allowed for fifteen possible combinations. There were significant differences in groups for feelings of preparation to teach in any locale ($H(14) =$

25.435, $p = .031$), a city ($H(14) = 56.32, p < .001$), a suburban locale ($H(14) = 34.99, p < .001$), and rural locales ($H(14) = 41.98, p < .001$). There was no significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in a town ($H(14) = 16.99, p = .257$) based on the locales of completed observations or practicums outside of student teaching. Despite a significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in any locale and the locale of completed fieldwork, pairwise comparisons revealed no significant difference.

Participants who completed fieldwork in a city felt the most prepared to teach in a city locale upon completion of their undergraduate degree. Respondents who completed fieldwork in suburban and town locales felt significantly less prepared to teach in a city than those who completed fieldwork in city and suburban locales. There was a significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in a city between participants who completed field work in a city and a rural area, town and rural locales compared to city and suburban locales, suburban, town, and rural locales compared to city locales, and town and city locales.

Participants who completed their fieldwork in a rural locale reported feeling significantly less prepared to teach in a suburban area compared to those who completed their fieldwork in city, suburban, and rural locales. Pairwise comparison did not find any other significant differences in feelings of preparation to teach in a suburban locale based on fieldwork locales.

Participants who completed fieldwork in a rural locale had the highest average rank of feelings of preparation to teach in a rural locale. Pairwise comparisons showed a significant difference between participants who completed fieldwork in a rural area and a city and suburban locale. There was also a significant difference between participants who completed fieldwork in both a town and rural area and those who completed it in a city and suburban area, suburban and town, and city, suburban, and town locales.

Research Question 2.4: Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the location of their student teaching?

The null hypothesis for this question: there is no significant difference between the location of student teaching and between secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales.

Participants completed student teaching in many locales and combinations of locales. Participants were most likely to student teach in a suburban locale ($n = 137, 28.0\%$). Cities were the second most frequently reported locale for student teaching ($n = 84, 17.2\%$). See Table 14 for more information about where participants completed their student teaching.

Table 14
Locales of Student Teaching

	<i>N</i>	%
City	84	17.2
Suburban	137	28.0
Town	74	15.1
Rural	72	14.7
City, Suburban	37	7.6
City, Town	6	1.2
City, Rural	7	1.4
Suburban, Town	17	3.5
Suburban, Rural	9	1.8
Town, Rural	30	6.1
City, Suburban, Town	6	1.2
City, Suburban, Rural	1	0.2
City, Town, Rural	1	0.2
Suburban, Town, Rural	3	0.6
Total	484	99.0
Missing	5	1.0
Total	489	100.0

The Shapiro-Wilk test of normality revealed a significant result ($p < .001$) for feelings of preparation to teach in any setting, indicating the results were not normally distributed.

Therefore, I used a non-parametric independent samples Kruskal-Wallis test to compare the feelings of preparation to teach in different locales to the locations where participants completed student teaching. There was not a significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in any locale ($H(13) = 16.58, p = .219$) and towns ($H(13) = 16.02, p = .248$) based on the locales of student teaching. Because there is no significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in any locale and towns based on the locales of student teaching, I fail to reject the null for those locales.

There was a significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in cities ($H(13) = 41.99, p < .001$), suburbs ($H(13) = 41.13, p < .001$), and rural locales ($H(13) = 30.50, p = .004$) based on the locales of student teaching. Since there was a significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, and rural locales compared to the locales of student teaching, I reject the null for those locales. Pairwise comparisons showed participants who completed their student teaching in a city had a significantly higher average rank feeling of preparation to teach in a city than those who completed their student teaching in a rural locale and a town. Additionally, there was a significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in a city between participants who completed student teaching in a city and suburban locale and those in a rural area. Participants who completed their student teaching in a suburban locale reported feeling significantly more prepared to teach in a suburban locale than those who completed their student teaching in a rural or town locale. Conversely, participants who completed their student teaching in a suburban locale reported feeling significantly less prepared to teach in a rural locale than those who completed their student teaching in a rural locale.

Research Question 2.5: Which of the following variables, experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, or student teaching, are the best predictors of secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, or rural locales?

The null hypothesis for this question: there is no significant relationship between experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, or student teaching to secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, or rural locales.

The Shapiro-Wilk test of normality was significant ($p < .001$) for feelings of preparation to teach in any locale, city, suburban, town, or rural area indicating the results were not normally distributed. Therefore, instead of using a regression, I used a non-parametric Spearman's *rho* test to answer research question 2.5. The Spearman's *rho* test indicated significant relationships between experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, and student teaching to secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, town, or rural locales so I reject the null hypothesis.

I used a Spearman *rho* correlation coefficient to calculate the relationship between participants' feelings of preparation to teach in a city setting and the following variables: experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, and student teaching to find the best predictors or feelings of preparation. There was a positive correlation for

experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree ($\rho (393) = .461, p < .001$), courses taken during an undergraduate degree ($\rho (393) = .608, p < .001$), fieldwork ($\rho (393) = .564, p < .001$), and student teaching ($\rho (392) = .532, p < .001$) indicating a significant relationship between the variables.

I used a Spearman ρ correlation coefficient to calculate the relationship between participants' feelings of preparation to teach in a suburban setting and the following variables: experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, and student teaching to find the best predictors of feelings of preparation. There was a positive correlation for experiences prior to an undergraduate degree ($\rho (393) = .301, p < .001$), courses taken during an undergraduate degree ($\rho (393) = .457, p < .001$), fieldwork ($\rho (393) = .446, p < .001$) and student teaching ($\rho (392) = .474, p < .001$) indicating a significant relationship between the variables.

I used a Spearman ρ correlation coefficient to calculate the relationship between participants' feelings of preparation to teach in a town setting and the following variables: experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, and student teaching to find the best predictors of feelings of preparation. There was a positive correlation for experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree ($\rho (392) = .336, p < .001$), courses taken during an undergraduate degree ($\rho (392) = .452, p < .001$), fieldwork ($\rho (392) = .458, p < .001$), and student teaching ($\rho (392) = .453, p < .001$) indicating a significant relationship between the variables.

I used a Spearman *rho* correlation coefficient to calculate the relationship between participants' feelings of preparation to teach in a town setting and the following variables: experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree, courses taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, field experiences not including student teaching, and student teaching to find the best predictors of feelings of preparation. There was a positive correlation for experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree ($\rho (394) = .513, p < .001$), courses taken during an undergraduate degree ($\rho (394) = .636, p < .001$), ($\rho (393) = .652, p < .001$), and student teaching ($\rho (393) = .603, p < .001$) indicating a significant relationship between the variables.

Table 15

Spearman Rank Order Correlations Between Experiences Before an Undergraduate Degree, Classes Taken During an Undergraduate Degree, Fieldwork Outside of Student Teaching, and Student Teaching and Feelings of Preparation to Teach in a City, Suburban, Town, and Rural Locales

	N	Correlation Coefficient
City		
Experiences Before Undergraduate Degree	395	.46*
Classes During Undergraduate Degree	395	.61*
Fieldwork	395	.56*
Student Teaching	395	.53*
Suburban		
Experiences Before Undergraduate Degree	395	.30*
Classes During Undergraduate Degree	395	.46*
Fieldwork	395	.45*
Student Teaching	395	.47*
Town		
Experiences Before Undergraduate Degree	394	.34*
Classes During Undergraduate Degree	394	.45*
Fieldwork	394	.46*
Student Teaching	394	.45*

Rural		
Experiences Before Undergraduate Degree	396	.51*
Classes During Undergraduate Degree	396	.64*
Fieldwork	395	.65*
Student Teaching	395	.60*

Note: *Correlation is significant at the <.001 level

Research Question 3: Is there a significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales?

The null hypothesis for this question: there is no significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales.

The Shapiro-Wilk test of normality was significant ($p < .001$) for feelings of preparation to teach in any locale, city, suburban, town, and rural indicating the results were not normally distributed. Instead of using an ANOVA, I used a non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test to answer research question 3.

I conducted a non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test comparing the large ensemble taught by the participant and their feelings of preparation to teach in various locales. There was no significant difference for any locale ($H(2) = 4.92, p = .085$), cities ($H(2) = 1.68, p = .432$), suburban locales ($H(2) = 5.52, p = .063$), and towns ($H(2) = 2.16, p = .339$) indicating the feelings of preparation to teach in those locales do not differ significantly based on the large ensemble the participant teaches. Therefore, I fail to reject the null hypothesis. However, there was a significant difference among feelings of preparation to teach in rural areas ($H(2) = 6.17, p = .046$). Follow-up pairwise comparisons indicated participants who only teach band felt more

prepared to teach in a rural area than participants who only teach orchestra. Since there was a significant difference for rural areas, I reject the null.

Research Question 3.1: Is there a significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the following variables, their experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, delivery of courses taken during their degree, field experiences, or student teaching?

The null hypothesis for this question: there is no significant difference between secondary band and orchestra directors to feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the following variables, their experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, delivery of courses taken during their degree, field experiences, or student teaching.

I used crosstabs to run chi squares to determine if there was a significant difference between the type of large ensemble the participant primarily directs and their feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on the following variable: Their experiences prior to an undergraduate degree in music education, delivery of courses taken during their degree, field experiences, or student teaching. Due to the small number of participants only teaching orchestra ($n = 54$) and those teaching both band and orchestra ($n = 46$) all but one run of the procedure yielded results with at least one cell having an expected count less than five. The one test with all cells having at least an expected count of 5 revealed no statistically significant interaction between the type of large ensemble taught by the participant and the amount student teaching impacted their feelings of preparation to teach in a rural locale.

I used the Fisher's Exact Test to further examine significant differences between the type of large ensemble and the influences of different experiences' impact on feelings of preparation to teach in various locales. Fischer's Exact Test revealed a significant interaction ($p = .015$) between classes taken during the undergraduate degree and feelings of preparation to teach in a city and the large ensemble the participant primarily teaches. The rest of the procedures yielded results that were not statistically significant. These results lead me to fail to reject the null hypothesis.

Research Question 4: Is there a significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' employment decisions and their feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales?

The null hypothesis for this question: there is no significant difference between secondary instrumental music educators' employment decisions and their feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales.

I used descriptive statistics to learn more about secondary instrumental music educators' employment decisions. The highest number of respondents taught in a rural area ($n = 173$, 35.4%). Many participants ($n = 428$, 87.5%) planned to teach in their current locale for the near future. Participants who indicated they plan to teach in a different locale mostly want to teach in a suburban area ($n = 30$, 50.8%). Most participants ($n = 338$, 69.1%) reported never having an issue with applying for or accepting a job based on their feelings of preparation to teach in a specific locale. However, of the participants whose feelings of preparation have caused them to not accept or apply for certain jobs were most likely to not apply for or accept jobs in a city ($n = 73$, 48.3%) or a rural area ($n = 59$, 30.1%). See Table 16 for more information about participants employment decisions.

Table 16*Descriptive Information About Participants' Employment Decisions*

	<i>N</i>	Percent
Which location best describes your current teaching position?		
City	105	21.5
Suburban	151	30.9
Town	57	11.7
Rural	173	35.4
Total	486	99.4
Missing	3	0.6
Do you plan to continue teaching in your current locale for the near future?		
Yes	428	87.5
No	58	11.9
Total	486	99.4
Missing	3	0.6
Which location best describes the type of area you would like to teach in?		
City	10	16.9
Suburban	30	50.8
Town	11	18.6
Rural	8	13.6
Total	59	100.0
Have you ever not applied for or not accepted a job in a locale because you did not feel prepared to teach in that setting?		
Yes	151	30.9
No	338	69.1
Total	489	100.0
Which locale did you not apply for or accept a job in because of your feeling preparation to teach in that setting?		
City	73	48.3
Suburban	13	8.6
Town	4	2.6
Rural	59	30.1
Total	149	98.7
Missing	2	0.3

The Shapiro-Wilk test of normality was significant ($p < .001$) for feelings of preparation to teach in any locale, city, suburban, town, and rural, indicating results were not normally distributed. Therefore, I used the non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test to answer research question four.

I used a non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test to compare feelings of preparation to teach in any setting and the locale of the participants current position. There was no significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in any setting ($H(3) = 2.87, p = .412$), a city ($H(3) = 6.17, p = .104$), a town ($H(3) = 5.05, p = .168$), and a rural locale ($H(3) = 4.51, p = .212$) and where participants are currently teaching. There was a significant difference ($H(3) = 16.34, p < .001$) in the feelings of preparation to teach in a suburban locale and where participants are currently teaching. Pairwise comparisons showed participants who currently teach in a suburban locale felt significantly more prepared to teach in a suburban area than those who currently teach in a rural locale and a town respectively.

I used a Kruskal-Wallis test to compare feelings of preparation to teach in any setting and the locale where participants not planning to stay in their current position would prefer to teach. There was a significant difference between those who felt prepared to teach in any locale ($H(3) = 8.06, p = .045$), a suburban locale ($H(3) = 14.407, p = .002$), and a town ($H(3) = 10.11, p = .018$) and the locale where they would prefer to teach. There was no significant difference between the locale where participants who are not planning to stay in their current position would prefer to teach and those who felt prepared to teach in a city ($H(3) = 6.29, p = .099$) and a rural locale ($H(3) = 1.98, p = .576$).

A pairwise comparison showed no significant differences between participants' feelings of preparation to teach in any area and the locale where they would like to teach if they are not

planning to stay in their current position. However, a pairwise comparison for feelings of preparation to teach in a suburban area showed participants who would like to teach in a suburban area felt significantly more prepared to teach in a suburban locale than a rural locale. Similarly, for the pairwise comparison for feelings of preparation to teach in a town showed participants who would like to teach in a town felt significantly more prepared to teach in a suburban locale than a rural locale.

I used a Kruskal-Wallis test to compare participants' feelings of preparation to teach in any setting to the locale where participants indicated they had not applied for nor accepted a position. There was a significant difference between participants feelings of preparation to teach in cities ($H(3) = 29.77, p < .001$), towns ($H(3) = 9.48, p = .024$), and rural ($H(3) = 15.29, p = .002$) and locales where they did not apply or accept a position. There was not a significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in any locale ($H(3) = 3.62, p = .305$) and suburban locales ($H(3) = 5.79, p = .122$).

A pairwise comparison of feelings of preparation to teach in a city and the locale participants had not applied for nor accepted revealed a significant difference between a city locale, average rank 57.18, and rural locales, average rank 96.63, indicating participants who felt the most prepared to teach in a city were most likely to not apply for or accept a position in a rural area. Likewise, a pairwise comparison of feelings of preparation to teach in a town and the locale where participants had not applied for nor accepted a job felt significantly more likely to accept a job in a rural locale than a city locale. Additionally, a pairwise comparison for feelings of preparation to teach in a rural area and the locale where participants had not applied for nor accepted a job showed participants were significantly more likely to not accept a position in a city than a rural locale.

Chapter 5

Discussion

The purpose of this nationally distributed quantitative research study was to examine secondary instrumental music educators' perceptions of their undergraduate preparation for teaching across disparate locales. Since this study examined the participants' perceptions of their preparation, there is a possibility their responses do not accurately reflect their preparation. In this section, I discuss the results of the study organized by research question and will compare results to previous research. Finally, this section will conclude with applications, implications, and opportunities for future research.

Perceptions of Preparation to Teach in Disparate Locales

Participants agreed that they felt prepared to teach in each setting; however, they indicated they felt most prepared to teach in suburban and town settings. The most reported response for each locale was 4=*Agree*, except for the suburban setting which was 5=*Strongly Agree*. Suburban ($M = 4.27, SD = .091$) and town ($M = 4.13, SD = 0.93$) settings had higher scores compared to city and rural settings indicating stronger feelings of preparation. Since suburban settings had the highest mean and mode, these responses aligned with previous studies where participants felt their undergraduate preparation focused on ideal circumstances (Burton & Johnson, 2010; Doyle, 2012). While these results suggest stronger feelings of preparation to teach in a suburban locale, overall, participants felt prepared to teach in any locale.

Participants answered a free response question about what they felt was most effective in preparing them to teach. Three main codes emerged: courses, fieldwork experiences, and student teaching. The secondary themes that emerged were performing, interactions, and teaching outside of the university. The literature supports two of the main codes, field work and student

teaching, as impactful elements of a music education degree (Bartolome, 2017; Brophy, 2002; Conway, 2002; Halston & Russell, 2012, Legette & McCord, 2014-2015; Schmidt, 2010). Participants in this study cited coursework as one of the most effective tools for preparation, aligning with findings in previous studies (Brophy, 2002; Conway, 2002; Conway, 2015). In contrast, a study by Conway et al. (2007) found that some participants cited their secondary instrument courses as one of the least effective elements in preparing them to enter the classroom. Previous studies suggest the participants' issues were not always with coursework itself but rather the delivery or lack of context (Ballantyne, 2006; Bauer & Berg, 2001). Just as Bauer and Berg (2001) reported, participants cited interactions with colleagues, applied teachers, cooperating teachers, and collegiate conductors as influential interactions assisting them in preparation to enter the classroom. These results imply the undergraduate degree and its main elements of coursework, field work, and student teaching are an important and necessary part of shaping music educators prior to their entry into the field.

Participants answered a free response question about what they felt was least effective in preparing them to teach. Three main codes emerged: music courses, courses outside of music, and lack of content or opportunity. Despite the high frequency of responses related to courses on the previous question, most of the responses about least effective courses were music courses. Most of the music courses respondents considered ineffective were primarily core classes not exclusive to the music education degree. Some participants used more detail to explain their choices. A whole subset of responses fell into the category of information that was either not covered or it was lacking information or substance. This category aligned with the previous research about participants feeling courses lacked context in regards to their professional lives (Ballantyne, 2006; Ballantyne, 2007; Bauer & Berg, 2001; Doyle, 2012; Sorenson, 2021). Also,

Ballantyne (2007) found educators craved contextualization in all their classes so they could see a direct link to their future classrooms. These results give an insight into which parts of a complex degree program may not be serving the students and could help reshape programs into a positive and more wholistic preparation experience.

Effective Experiences in Feelings of Preparation

Participants rated their preparedness using a 5-point Likert scale, 1= *extremely unprepared* to 5= *extremely prepared*, about different experiences and their feelings of preparedness to teach in disparate locales. Despite the locale, the participants rated experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree lowest, followed by courses taken in their undergraduate degree, then fieldwork outside of student teaching, and student teaching as the experience they perceived helped them feel most prepared to teach in the specified locale. These results indicate that music educators do not necessarily need to be from a certain area to feel prepared to teach in that locale.

Despite the locale, participants rated experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree the lowest. The most frequently reported response for experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree and feelings of preparation to teach in a city was 1= *extremely unprepared*. Only 80 (16.4%) of participants responded to attending most of their high school years in a city locale and previous research suggests music education students would prefer to teach in a school similar to the school they attended during their k-12 education (Kelly, 2003). This lack of prior experiences with a city locale may explain the low mode for that question. Each of the other locales reported a mode of 4= *prepared*.

The average responses for each category were the highest for a suburban locale, followed by town. This aligns with the responses for research question 1 where respondents reported

feeling most prepared to teach in either a suburban area or a town after completing their undergraduate degree. Overall, the responses for a city were higher than those for a rural locale except for experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree. These answers also align with research question 1 where feelings of preparation to teach in a city were higher than those of a rural locale. Doyle (2012) found music educators did not accept jobs in an urban area because of discomfort teaching in that area. Also, participants rated experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree higher for a rural area than a city. A high frequency ($n = 133$, 27.2%) of participants indicated they attended most of their high school years at a rural school, possibly influencing their level of comfort with a rural school (Kelly, 2003; Robinson, 2012).

K-12 Experiences and Feelings of Preparation

There was a significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in disparate cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales based on participants' experiences as a K-12 student. Supporting previous findings, participants generally felt the most prepared to teach in the locale where they attended most of high school, except for those who attended most of high school in a town (Kelly, 2003; Robinson, 2012). Music education professors can use this information to help students find opportunities to experience new locales during their undergraduate education. Doyle (2012) found diverse placements can help develop positive attitudes about teaching in disparate locales.

Urban and Rural Course and Feelings of Preparation

The undergraduate music education curriculum does not typically include a specific course about urban and rural music education. However, participants ($n = 151$, 30.9%) reported many music education professors are including information about teaching in urban and rural environments throughout the degree program. There was no significant difference in feelings of

preparation between participants who had a specific urban and rural course in their undergraduate degree and those who did not. Participants whose professors included information about urban and rural music education in other courses only showed a significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in a town, none of the other locales. Undergraduate music education curriculum can be complicated, and the addition of a new course could pose issues for many programs (Andersen & Denson, 2015; Fiese & DeCarbo, 1995; Isbell, 2005; NAFME, 2023). These findings directly contrast with Standley's (2002) positive results from a diversity course. Given the results of this study, it may not be advantageous for music education programs to add a course about urban and rural music education to the undergraduate curriculum.

Locale of Field Experiences and Feelings of Preparation

Fieldwork, which can consist of practicums or observations outside of student teaching, is one of existing literature's recommendations to prepare music educators to teach in disparate locales (Bartolome, 2017; Brophy, 2002; Conway, 2002; Doyle, 2012; Halston & Russell, 2012; Schmidt, 2010; Stokking et al., 2003). Participants' responses to this survey support the existing research. The data indicated a significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in any locale, a city, a suburb, and rural locales based on their fieldwork experiences. Music education programs can help build feelings of preparation in students by including fieldwork opportunities early and often into their preexisting courses (Bartolome, 2017; Brophy, 2002; Conway, 2002; Halston & Russell, 2012).

Student Teaching Locale and Feelings of Preparation

Student teaching, typically a semester-long, is one of the valuable experiences helping students transition into full-time teachers (Conway, 2002; Legette & McCord, 2014-2015). The data in this study had a significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs,

and rural locales based on the locale of where they completed their student teaching. Student teaching is an important aspect of a students' preparation, and music education faculty should intentionally place students in a locale that will prepare them to enter the field. These immersion experiences are a research-based way to help build feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales (Barter, 2008; Burton & Johnson, 2010; Doyle, 2012; Standley, 2002). Given the importance of the student teaching experience, music education professors must work diligently to place students in situations that will fully prepare them for the workforce. Students may benefit from placements in locales different from their fieldwork experiences and the locales where the student attended most of their high school years. Additionally, music education professors should work to match students with cooperating teachers who are prepared to provide a well-rounded student teaching experience.

Predictors of Feelings of Preparation

The results of the Spearman *rho* test revealed the best predictors of secondary instrumental music educators' feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales varied by each locale. These findings support the idea that each locale is unique (Barter, 2008). Additionally, each participant in the study brought their own lived experiences, impacting the differences in the feelings of preparation by locale. Previously, I wrote about inclusion of an urban and rural course not yielding statistically significant results. However, in this section participants often rated courses taken during an undergraduate degree as an impactful part of preparing them to teach in differing locales. The questions participants answered about factors aiding in feelings of preparation for each locale did not specifically ask about an urban and rural music education course, but rather coursework in a general sense. This distinction may account for differences in results from participants.

The best predictors of feelings of preparation to teach in a city, in order from the best predictor to the worst, are courses taken during an undergraduate degree, field work, student teaching, and experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree. These results align with the information in research question 2 about experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree. Additionally, in research questions 1.1 participants cited courses, fieldwork, and student teaching as three of the experiences helping them to feel prepared to teach.

The best predictors of feelings of preparation to teach in a suburban locale are student teaching, courses taken during an undergraduate degree, fieldwork, and experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree. Just under half of the participants in the survey completed at least a portion of their student teaching in a suburban locale. Student teaching is where many novice educators build confidence (Killian et al., 2013), and if they are student teaching in a suburban locale, it makes sense they will feel comfortable teaching in that environment post-undergraduate degree. Many music education program courses structure content to a suburban environment (Burton & Johnson, 2010). Given this knowledge, music education professors must carefully place students into suburban student teaching experiences.

The best predictors of feelings of preparation to teach in a town are fieldwork, courses taken during an undergraduate degree, student teaching, and experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree. There was only .01 difference in fieldwork and courses taken during an undergraduate degree and student teaching, which had the same result. These results were slightly different than the findings in research question 2 which ranked student teaching the highest. These results may mean participants completed more fieldwork in towns than student teaching.

The best predictors of feelings of preparation to teach in a rural locale are fieldwork, classes taken during an undergraduate degree in music education, student teaching, and experiences before beginning an undergraduate degree. More participants visited a rural locale for fieldwork ($n = 209$) than student teaching ($n = 127$) which may account for the difference in those two responses. However, attending a rural school for most of their high school years was the second highest response behind suburban among participants, and, of the four options it is the least likely to assist in feelings of preparation to teach in a rural locale.

Differences in Band and Orchestra Directors

Band and orchestra directors experienced no significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in cities, suburbs, and towns. However, there was a significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in rural locales. Suburban locales are most likely to support string programs in schools (Gillespie, Russell, & Hamann, 2014). Therefore, orchestra directors may have less opportunities to familiarize themselves with a rural area.

The small number of participants teaching orchestra only or band and orchestra led to difficulty in answering this research question. However, the one significant difference between groups was classes taken during the undergraduate degree and the feelings of preparation to teach in a city and the large ensemble the participant primarily teaches. As previously noted, orchestra programs do not exist as plentifully as band programs in all locales, and orchestra directors may not feel as comfortable in all locales due to lack of exposure (Gillespie, Russell, & Hamann, 2014). Additionally, due to the low number of orchestra respondents these results may not accurately reflect the differences in the two groups.

Feelings of Preparation and Employment Decisions

There was a significant difference between feelings of preparation to teach in a suburban locale and where participants were currently teaching. Specifically, there was a distinct difference between participants teaching in towns and rural locales and those in suburban locales. Therefore, participants teaching in towns and rural locales felt significantly less prepared to teach in a suburban locale than those currently teaching in suburban areas. Additionally, I compared the locale where participants who are not planning to stay in their current position would like to teach and participants' feelings of preparation to teach in each locale. This revealed a significant difference between participants who felt prepared to teach in any locale, a suburban locale, and a town. The participants who felt prepared to teach in a suburban and town locale were more likely to want to teach in a suburban locale than rural. The literature supports the preference to teach in a suburban area (Kelly, 2003).

Participants who indicated they had not applied for or not accepted a position due to feeling unprepared had a significant difference in feelings of preparation to teach in cities, towns, and rural locales. Pairwise comparisons showed a significant difference for each of those locales between city and rural locales, the two areas participants were most likely to not apply for nor accepted a job due to feeling unprepared.

Music educators are making decisions about their careers based on their feelings of preparation. Teaching in city and rural schools may have challenges causing the applicants to not apply for nor accept a job in these locales (Doyle, 2012; Eppley, 2009; Fitzpatrick, 2008; Hash, 2021; Hunt, 2009; Logan & Burdick-Will, 2017; Mathis, 2003; McCracken & Miller, 1988; Robinson & Russell, 2021). Whether teaching music in a city or suburban area, the musical

content is the same, but other factors seem to cause teachers to feel unprepared to work in certain areas.

Conclusion

The purpose of this nationally distributed quantitative research study was to examine secondary instrumental music educators' perceptions of their undergraduate preparation for teaching across disparate locales. Generally, participants felt prepared to teach in cities, suburbs, towns, and rural locales. Participants expressed feeling the most comfortable teaching in suburban areas and towns. Respondents ranked coursework, fieldwork, and student teaching as the most helpful aspects in preparing music educators to teach across disparate locales. The locale where the participant spent most of their high school years did not significantly impact feelings of preparation.

Future Research

While this study answered the research questions, there is still plenty to learn about effectively preparing undergraduate music education students for success in any classroom. I plan to continue this research line and delve into specifics for each locale. Music education continues to evolve with each generation, therefore the research of teacher preparation should continue as well. Future research could better recruit orchestra directors to gain further insight into differences between band and orchestra directors' feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales. Further research and longitudinal studies focusing in on specific locales could provide increased insight into music teacher preparation for disparate locales.

This study focused on identifying significant differences in feelings of preparation to teach in disparate locales. Now we know there are differences in feelings of preparation to teach across locales, and some experiences, namely fieldwork and student teaching, make a difference

in those feelings of preparation, it would be helpful to examine why some experiences are more impactful than others. Future research focused on why these differences exist and exploring nuances of perspectives could impact the preparation of music educators in a positive way.

Potential Applications and Implications

Data collected from this survey has the potential to inform music education professors preparing students to teach in disparate locales. If music teacher preparation programs expand upon their current methods, undergraduate music educators may feel better prepared to teach in any locale, expanding opportunities for new graduates. Consequently, application of the findings from this study could reduce teacher turnover in city and rural schools, providing stability for students enrolled in music programs in those locales. Results of this study may inform music teacher preparation programs, leading to more teachers who are prepared to deliver high-quality music education for students across the country, no matter their locale.

References

- Abramo, J. (2016). Developing core practices for an instrumental music education methods course. *Visions of Research in Music Education, 27*(2), 1-26.
<https://opencommons.uconn.edu/vrme/vol27/iss1/2>
- Andersen, S. A., & Denson, G. L. (2015). Preparing the successful urban music educator: The need for preservice and in-service development. *Music Educators Journal, 101*(4), 35-40.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0027432115573965>
- Asmus, E. (2000). The need for research in music teacher preparation. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 10*(1), 5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105708370000900202>
- Auburn University. (2024). Music education: Instrumental and vocal (CMCB).
https://bulletin.auburn.edu/undergraduate/collegeofeducation/curriculumandteaching/musiceducation-instrumentalandvocal_major/
- Austin, J. R. (2006). The teaching of secondary instruments a survey of instrumental music teachers education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education, 16*(1), 55-64.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/10570837060160010107>
- Ayiro, L. P. (2012). *A Functional Approach to Educational Research Methods and Statistics: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Edwin Mellen Press.
- Azano, A. P., & Stewart, T. T. (2015). Exploring place and practicing justice: Preparing preservice teachers for success in rural schools. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 30*(9), 1-12.
- Ballantyne, J. & Packer, J. (2004). Effectiveness of preservice music teacher education programs: Perceptions of early-career music teachers. *Music Education Research, 6*(3), 299-312. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1461380042000281749>

- Ballantyne, J. (2006). Reconceptualizing preservice teacher education courses for teachers: The importance of pedagogical content knowledge and skills and professional knowledge and skills. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 26(1), 37-50.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/132103X060260010101>
- Ballantyne, J. (2006). What music teachers want: The emergence of a unified understanding of an ideal teacher education course. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, 31(1), 1-11.
<https://doi.org/10.14221/aje.2006v31n1.1>
- Ballantyne, J. (2007). Integration, contextualization and continuity: Three themes for the development of effective music teacher education programmes. *International Journal of Music Education*, 25(2), 119-136. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761407079955>
- Barter, B. (2008). Rural education: Learning to be rural teachers. *Journal of Workplace Learning*, 20(7-8), 468-479. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13665620810900292>
- Bates, V.C. (2011). Preparing rural music teacher: Reflection on “shared vision.” *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 20(2), 89-98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083710377722>
- Bartolome, S. J. (2017). Comparing field-teaching experiences. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 65(3), 264-286. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429417730043>
- Bauer, W. I., & Berg, M. H. (2001). Influences on instrumental music teaching. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 150, 53-66.
- Beall, G. H. (1985). Response. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* 81, 18-62.
- Bidner, S. (2001). Reform in music teacher preparation. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 10(2), 3-4. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10570837010100020101>

- Bond, V. L., & Russell, J. A. (2019). Music teacher educator perceptions of and engagement with culturally responsive education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 221(3), 7-28.
- Brick, J. M., & Kalton, G. (1996). Handling missing data in survey research. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 5(3), 215-238. <https://doi.org/10.1177/096228029600500302>
- Brophy, T. S. (2002). Teacher reflections on undergraduate music education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 12(1), 19-25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10570837020120010501>
- Burton, M. & Johnson, A. (2010). Where else would we teach? Portraits of two teachers in the rural south. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 61(4), 376-386.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487110372362>
- Causby, M., & Foster, C. S. (2022). Instrumental music education in rural North Carolina: A case study. *Qualitative Research in Music Education*, 4(1), 32-61.
<https://vpa.uncg.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/QRME-v4-il.pdf>
- Causby, M., & Foster, C. S. (2022). Instrumental music education in rural North Carolina: A descriptive study. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, (234), 63-88.
<https://doi.org/10.5406/21627223.234.04>
- Colwell, R. J. (1985). Program evaluation in music teacher education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* 81, 18-62.
- Conway, C. (2002). Perceptions of beginning teachers, their mentors, and administrators regarding preservice music teacher preparation. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 50(1), 20-36. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3345690>

Conway, C., Eros, J., Hourigan, R., & Stanley, A. M. (2007). Perceptions of beginning teachers regarding brass and woodwind instrument techniques classes in preservice education.

Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 173, 39-54.

Conway, C. M. (2012). Ten years later: Teachers reflect on “perceptions of beginning teachers, their mentors, and administrator regarding preservice music teacher preparation”. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 60*(3), 324-338.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429412453601>

Conway, C. (2015). The experiences of first-year music teachers: A literature review. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education, 33*(2), 65-72.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/8755123314547911>

Corbett, M. (2009). Rural schooling in modern modernity: Returning to the places I’ve been. *Journal of Research in Rural Education, 24*(7), 1-13.

Corbett, M. (2016). Music education and/in rural social space: Making space for musical diversity beyond the city. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education 15*(4). 12-29. <https://doi.org/10.22176/act15.4.12>

Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation. (n.d.). *Glossary*.

<https://caepnet.org/glossary>

DeLorenzo, L. C. (1992). The perceived problems of beginning music teachers. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 113*(3), 9-25.

Denis, J. M. (2019). Texas band directors’ perceptions of skills and knowledge necessary for successful teaching. *Contributions to Music Education, 44*, 19-38.

- Denis, J. (2023). Perceived preparedness to teach over time: A longitudinal case study of instrumental music teachers. *International Journal of Music Education*, 0(0), 1-14.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/02557614231204440>
- Doyle, J. (2012). Music teacher perceptions of issues and problems in urban elementary schools. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 194, 31-52.
<https://doi.org/10.5406/bulcouresmusedu.194.0031>
- Eggers, R. M., & Jones, C. M. (1998). Practical considerations for conducting Delphi studies: The oracle enters a new age. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 21(3), 53-66.
- Eppley, K. (2009). Rural schools and the high qualified teacher provision of *No Child Left Behind*: A critical policy analysis. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 24(4).
- Evenson, P. (1955). Are our colleges doing the job in instrumental music teacher preparation? *Music Educators Journal*, 41(4), 60-63. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3387936>
- Fiese, R. K., & DeCarbo, N. J. (1995). Urban music education: The teachers' perspective. *Music Educators Journal*, 81(6), 27-31. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3398779>
- Hunt, C. (2009). Perspectives on rural and urban music teaching: Developing contextual awareness in music education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 18(2), 34-47.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083708327613>
- Fitzpatrick, K. R. (2008). A mixed methods portrait of urban instrumental music teaching. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 59(3), 229-256.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429411414912>
- Florida State University College of Music. (2024). *Program of study- bachelor of music education- instrumental track (band)*. <https://music.fsu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2022/04/BME-Instrumental-Band-2024.pdf>

- Gillespie, R., Russell, J. A., & Hamann, D. L. (2014). String music educators' perceptions of the impact of new string programs on student outcomes, school music programs, and communities. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 62(2), 175-187.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429414531987>
- Haston, W. & Russell, J. A. (2012). Turning into teachers: Influences of authentic context learning experiences on occupational identity development of preservice music teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 59(4), 369-392.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429411414147>
- Isbell, D. (2005). Music education in rural areas: Keys to success. *Music Educators Journal*, 92(2), 30-34. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3400194>
- Kelly, S. N. (2003). The influence of selected cultural factors on the environmental teaching preference of undergraduate music education majors. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 12(2), 40-55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10570837030120020106>
- Killian, J. N., Dye, K. G., & Wayman, J. B. (2013). Music student teachers: Pre-student teaching concerns and post-student teaching perceptions over a 5-year period. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 61(1), 63-79. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429412474314>
- Legette, R. M., & McCord, D. H. (2014-2015). Pre-service music teachers perceptions of teaching and teacher training. *Contributions to Music Education*, 40, 163-176.
- Leonhard, C. (1985). Toward reform in music teacher education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 81, 10-17.
- Logan, J. R., & Burdick-Will, J. (2017). School segregation and disparities in the urban, suburban, and rural areas. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 674(1), 199-216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0002716217733936>

- Louisiana State University. (2024). *Music education, B.M.E.*. https://catalog.lsu.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=29&poid=12766
- Madsen, C. K., & Hancock, C. B. (2002). Support for music education: A case study of issues concerning teacher retention and attrition. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 50(1), 6-19. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3345689>
- Martignetti, F., Talbot, B. C., Claugh, M., Hawkins, T., & Niknafs, N. (2013). “You got to know us”: A hopeful model for music education in urban schools. *Visions of Research in Music Education*, 23(1). <http://www.rider.edu/~vrme>
- Mathis, W. J. (2003). Financial challenges, adequacy, and equity in rural schools and communities. *Journal of Education Finance*, 29(2). 119-136.
- McCracken, J., & Miller, C. (1988). Rural teachers’ perceptions of their schools and communities. *Research in Rural Education*, 5(2), 23-26. http://jrre.psu.edu/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/5-2_3.pdf
- McMurtrie, B. (2021, July 28). *Is your degree program too complicated?*. The Chronicle of Higher Education. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/is-your-degree-program-too-complicated>
- MENC Commission on Teacher Education. (1970). Teacher education in music. *Music Educators Journal*, 57(2), 33-48. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3392843>
- Merriam-Webster. (n.d.). Secondary school. In *Merriam-Webster.com dictionary*. Retrieved September 22, 2024 from <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/secondary%20school>
- Mertler, C. A. (2022). *Introduction to Educational Research* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.

- Mississippi State University. (2024). *Music*. <https://catalog.msstate.edu/undergraduate/collegesanddegreeprograms/collegeofartsandsciences/music/#coursestext>
- Moffa, E., & McHenry-Sorber, E. (2018). Learning to be rural: Lessons about being rural in teacher education programs. *The Rural Educator*, 39(1), 26-40.
<https://doi.org/10.35608/ruraled.v39i1.213>
- Murairwa, S. (2015). Voluntary sampling design. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Management and Social Sciences*, 4(2), 185-200.
<https://garph.co.uk/ijarmss/feb2015/18.pdf>
- National Association for Music Education. (2023). *A blueprint for strengthening the music teacher profession*. National Association for Music Education.
<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1sZtyAeCm4lSmR9zSnEusHJDxcfcgOGGd/view>
- National Center for Education Statistics. *NCES Locale Classifications and Criteria*. National Center for Education Statistics.
https://nces.ed.gov/programs/edge/docs/LOCALE_CLASSIFICATIONS.pdf
- Parker, E. C., & Powell, S. R. (2014). A phenomenological study of music education majors' identity development in methods courses outside their areas of focus. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 201(3), 23-41.
- Parr, C. N. (1999). Philosophy of music teacher preparation. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 7(1), 55-64.
- Prest, A. (2013). The importance of context, reflection, interaction, and consequence in rural music education practice. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 28(14), 1-13.
- Ravitch, S. M., & Carl, N. M. (2021). *Qualitative research: Bridging the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

- Robinson, N. R. (2012). Preservice music teachers' employment preferences: Consideration factors. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 60(3), 294-309.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429412454723>
- Robison, T., & Russell, J. A. (2021). Factors affecting rural music educators' career decisions. *Contributions to Music Education*, 46, 155–168.
- Roulston, K., Legette, R., & Womack, S. T. (2007). Beginning music teachers' perceptions of the transition from university to teaching in schools. *Music Education Research*, 7(1), 59-82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613800500042141>
- San Jose State University. (2024). *Music, music education-instrumental emphasis, BM (2024-2025)*. https://catalog.sjsu.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=10&pooid=9343&returnto=5291
- Schmidt, M. (2010). Learning from teaching experience: Dewey's theory and preservice teachers' learning. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 58(2), 131-146.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429410368723>
- Sorenson, R. (2021). "How can I get better?". *Contributions to Music Education*, 46, 224-244.
- Spring, J. (2013). Perspectives of a rural music educator: A narrative journey through 'Sense of Place'. *Rural Educator* 34(3), 27-37. <https://doi.org/10.35608/ruraledv34i3.397>
- Standley, J. M. (2002). Increasing prospective music educators' tolerance for student diversity. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 19(1), 27-32.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/875512330001900106>
- Starrett, A., Yow, J., Lotter, C., Irvin, M. J., & Adams, P. (2021). Teachers connecting with rural students and places: A mixed methods analysis. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 97, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2020.103231>

- Stokking, K., Leender, F., De Jong, J., & Van Tartwijk, J. (2003). From student to teacher: Reducing practice shock and early dropout in the teaching profession. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 26(3), 329-350. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0261976032000128175>
- Strange, M. (2011). Finding fairness for rural students. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 92(6), 8-15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0031721711109200603>
- University of Alabama. (2024). Music education, BSE (certification in instrumental music). <https://catalog.ua.edu/undergraduate/education/music/instrumental-education-bse/#requirementstext>
- University of Arkansas. (2024). *Catalog of studies*. <https://catalog.uark.edu/undergraduatecatalog/collegesandschools/jwilliamfulbrightcollegeofartsandsciences/mus/cmusc/#bminmusiceducationwithinstrumentalconcentrationtext>
- University of Florida. (2024). *Catalog*. https://catalog.ufl.edu/UGRD/colleges-schools/UGART/MUE_BMUE/MUE_BMUE03/#modelsemesterplanttext
- University of Georgia. (2024). *Music education-B. Mus.* <https://bulletin.uga.edu/MajorSpecific?MajorId=119>
- University of Kentucky. (2024). *Music education, B.M* http://catalogs.uky.edu/preview_program_catoid=14&poid=5909&returnto=778
- University of Mississippi. (2024). *Emphasis-music education*. <https://catalog.olemiss.edu/liberal-arts/music/bm-music/bm-mus-ed>
- University of Missouri. (2024). *Music-music education (MUS_EDUC)*. https://catalog.missouri.edu/courseofferings/mus_educ/

- University of North Texas. (2024). *Music education (specialization: instrumental-band/orchestra), BM*. http://catalog.unt.edu/preview_program.php?catoid=35&poid=16444&hl=music+education&returnto=search
- University of Oklahoma. (2024). *Course descriptions*. <https://ou-public.courseleaf.com/courses/#m822428>
- University of South Carolina. (2024). Major map: Music. http://sc.edu/about/offices_and_divisions/advising/documents/major_maps/2024-2025/2024_musc-bm-mued-instr-wind_map.pdf
- University of Tennessee. (2024). *Undergraduate catalog*. <https://admissions.utk.edu/why-ut/undergraduate-catalog/>
- University of Texas. (2024). *Degrees and programs*. <https://catalog.utexas.edu/undergraduate/fine-arts/degrees-and-programs/#text>
- Van Bodegraven, P. (1946). Problems in music teacher preparation. *Music Educators Journal*, 33(1), 28-29. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3388429>
- Vanderbilt University. (2024). *Academic catalog*. <https://www.vanderbilt.edu/catalogs/kuali/undergraduate-24-25.php#/content/66577a6007c565001c90c710>
- VanDeusen, A. (2016). “It really comes down to the community”: A case study of a rural school music program. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 15(4), 56-75. <https://doi.org/10.22176/act15.4.56>
- White, S. & Reid, J. (2008). Placing teachers? Sustaining rural schooling through place consciousness in teacher education. *Journal of Research in Rural Education*, 23(7), 1-11. <https://jrre.psu.edu/articles/23-7.pdf>

Appendix A

Qualtrics Survey

Instrumental Music Educators' Perceptions of Undergraduate Preparation to Teach in Disparate Locales

Start of Block: Introduction

Q1.1

“A Quantitative Survey of Secondary Instrumental Music Educators’ Perceptions of Undergraduate Preparation to Teach in Disparate Locales”

Student Investigator: Elise Naber Allen

Principal Investigator: Dr. Nancy Barry

You are invited to participate in a research study to examine music educators’ perceptions of their undergraduate preparation to teach across diverse locales. This study is being conducted by Elise Naber Allen under the direction of Dr. Nancy Barry in the Auburn University Department of Curriculum and Teaching. You are invited to participate because you are currently a secondary instrumental music educator in the United States who earned an undergraduate degree in music education or equivalent music degree with teaching precertification and masters in music education.

What will be involved if you participate? If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete a survey with 41 questions. Your total time commitment will be approximately 10 minutes.

Are there any risks or discomforts? There are no anticipated risks associated with the completion of the survey. Participants are not required to answer questions they do not wish to, and can end the survey at any point. To minimize any potential risks, the survey is entirely anonymous. Your IP address will not be recorded when you take this survey. Additionally, all data will be stored in a folder in the investigator’s password-protected Auburn University Box account, and only the investigator and supervisor will have access to the data.

Are there any benefits to yourself or others? There is no direct benefit to participation in the study. It is possible participants may find value in sharing their experiences in hopes to create a better future for music educators.

Will you receive compensation for participating? There will be no compensation for participating.

Are there any costs? There are no costs to you if you decide to participate in this study.

If you change your mind about participating, you can withdraw at any time during the study.

Your participation is completely voluntary. If you choose to withdraw, your data can be withdrawn as long as it is identifiable. Your decision about whether or not to participate or to stop participating will not jeopardize your future relations with Auburn University, the Department of Curriculum and Teaching or the College of Education.

Your privacy will be protected. Any information obtained in connection with this study will remain confidential. Information obtained through your participation may be used to fulfill an educational requirement, published in a professional journal, and/or presented at a professional conference.

If you have any questions about this study please contact Ms. Elise Naber Allen at ena0010@auburn.edu or Dr. Nancy Barry at nhb0002@auburn.edu.

If you have any questions about your right as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Research Compliance or the Institutional Review Board by phone at (334) 844-5966 or email at IRBadmin@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

Thank you for your time!

The Auburn University Institutional Review Board approved this document for use on _____ . Protocol #STUDY000000227.

Q1.2 Do you wish to continue to the survey?

- Yes- I wish to continue to the survey.
- No- I have changed my mind. I do not want to continue to the survey.

Skip To: End of Survey If Do you wish to continue to the survey? = No- I have changed my mind. I do not want to continue to the survey.

Q1.3 Have you earned an undergraduate degree in music education or a Bachelor of Arts in music with a Master of Arts in Teaching (BA+MAT)?

- Yes
- No

Skip To: End of Survey If Have you earned an undergraduate degree in music education or a Bachelor of Arts in music with a... = No

End of Block: Introduction

Start of Block: Demographic Questionnaire

Q2.1 What is your age? Type the number.

Q2.2 What is your gender?

- Male
- Female
- Non-Binary
- I identify as _____
- Prefer not to say.

Q2.3 What is your ethnic background?

- African American/Black
 - Asian American
 - Caucasian/White
 - Hispanic
 - Other, please specify _____
 - Prefer not to say
-

Q2.4 Including this current year, how many years have you been teaching? Type the number. For example, if you are in your first year, type the number "1".

Q2.5 What is your highest level of education earned?

- Bachelor
 - Master
 - Education Specialist or Master's + 30
 - Some doctoral work
 - Doctorate
-

Q2.6 What state do you currently teach in?

▼ Alabama ... Wyoming

Q2.7 Which large instrumental ensembles do you currently teach?

- Band Only
 - Orchestra Only
 - Band and Orchestra
-

For this study we are using the following definitions of City, Suburban, Town, and Rural to describe school locales.

Please answer each question to the best of your ability.

City: Within an urbanized area with a population of 100,000 or more.

Suburban: Outside of a Principal City with a population of 100,000 or more.

Town: Located between 10 and 35 miles from an urbanized area with a population between

50,000- 99,999.

Rural: Located outside an urbanized area with a population of 49,999 or less.

If you are unsure of which category your school belongs in and would like to lookup the locale please visit <https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/schoolsearch/> and look up your school.

Under "School Details" it will list the Locale. For the purposes of this study we are only using the locales City, Suburban, Town, and Rural.

Q2.8 Which location best describes your current teaching position?

- City
 - Suburban
 - Town
 - Rural
-

Q2.9 Do you plan to continue teaching in your current locale for the foreseeable future?

- Yes
- No

Skip To: Q2.10 If Do you plan to continue teaching in your current locale for the foreseeable future? = No

Skip To: End of Block If Do you plan to continue teaching in your current locale for the foreseeable future? = Yes

Q2.10 Which location best describes the type of area you would like to teach in?

- City
- Suburban
- Town
- Rural

End of Block: Demographic Questionnaire

Start of Block: Educational Background

The following questions relate to your educational background.

For this study we are using the following definitions of City, Suburban, Town, and Rural to describe school locales. Please answer each question to the best of your ability.

City: Within an urbanized area with a population of 100,000 or more.

Suburban: Outside of a Principal City with a population of 100,000 or more.

Town: Located between 10 and 35 miles from an urbanized area with a population between 50,000- 99,999.

Rural: Located outside an urbanized area with a population of 49,999 or less.

If you are unsure of which category your school belongs in and would like to lookup the locale please visit <https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/schoolsearch/> and look up your school. Under "School Details" it will list the Locale. For the purposes of this study we are only using the locales City, Suburban, Town, and Rural.

Q3.1 Which location best describes where you attended the majority of high school during your k-12 education?

- City
 - Suburban
 - Town
 - Rural
-

Q3.2 How would you classify the area where your undergraduate music education program was located? Select the best answer.

- City
- Suburban
- Town
- Rural

Q3.3 During your undergraduate degree, what types of schools did you visit to complete observations or practicums outside of student teaching? Check all that apply.

- City
 - Suburban
 - Town
 - Rural
-

Q3.4 During your undergraduate degree, in what types of school(s) did you complete your student teaching? Check all that apply.

- City
- Suburban
- Town
- Rural

Q3.5 Did your undergraduate music education program include a specific course about urban and rural music education?

- Yes
- No

Q3.5 Did your undergraduate music education program include a specific course about urban and rural music education?

- Yes
- No

Skip To: Q3.6 If Did your undergraduate music education program include a specific course about urban and rural mu... = No

Skip To: End of Block If Did your undergraduate music education program include a specific course about urban and rural mu... = Yes

End of Block: Educational Background

Start of Block: Feelings of Preparation

The following questions relate to your feelings of preparation to teach in a variety of settings upon completion of your undergraduate degree in music education.

Your rating should be on a 5-point scale where 1=strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree.

Please mark your response on the corresponding blocks.

For this study we are using the following definitions of City, Suburban, Town, and Rural to

describe school locales. Please answer each question to the best of your ability.

City: Within an urbanized area with a population of 100,000 or more.

Suburban: Outside of a Principal City with a population of 100,000 or more.

Town: Located between 10 and 35 miles from an urbanized area with a population between 50,000- 99,999.

Rural: Located outside an urbanized area with a population of 49,999 or less.

If you are unsure of which category your school belongs in and would like to lookup the locale please visit <https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/schoolsearch/> and look up your school. Under "School Details" it will list the Locale. For the purposes of this study we are only using the locales City, Suburban, Town, and Rural.

Q4.1 After completing my undergraduate degree in music education, I felt prepared to teach in...

	Strongly disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Strongly agree
Any setting (city, suburban, town, rural)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A city setting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A suburban setting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A town setting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
A rural setting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

End of Block: Feelings of Preparation

Start of Block: Employment Decisions

The following questions relate to your perception of preparation to teach in a variety of settings after completion of your undergraduate degree in music education.

For this study we are using the following definitions of City, Suburban, Town, and Rural to describe school locales. Please answer each question to the best of your ability.

City: Within an urbanized area with a population of 100,000 or more.

Suburban: Outside of a Principal City with a population of 100,000 or more.

Town: Located between 10 and 35 miles from an urbanized area with a population between 50,000- 99,999.

Rural: Located outside an urbanized area with a population of 49,999 or less.

If you are unsure of which category your school belongs in and would like to lookup the locale please visit <https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/schoolsearch/> and look up your school. Under "School Details" it will list the Locale. For the purposes of this study we are only using the locales City, Suburban, Town, and Rural.

Q5.1 Have you ever not applied for or not accepted a job in a locale because you did not feel prepared to teach in that setting?

Yes

No

Skip To: Q5.2 If Have you ever not applied for or not accepted a job in a locale because you did not feel prepared... = Yes

Skip To: End of Block If Have you ever not applied for or not accepted a job in a locale because you did not feel prepared... = No

Q5.2 Which locale did you not apply for or accept a job in because of your feelings of preparation to teach in that setting?

- City
- Suburban
- Town
- Rural

End of Block: Employment Decisions

Start of Block: Variables of Preparation

In this section, you will be presented with different variables that may have helped you to feel more or less prepared to teach in a variety of settings.

Rate the following factors based on how prepared they helped you to feel teaching in each setting from "extremely unprepared" to "extremely prepared".

For this study we are using the following definitions of City, Suburban, Town, and Rural to describe school locales.

Please answer each question to the best of your ability.

City: Within an urbanized area with a population of 100,000 or more.

Suburban: Outside of a Principal City with a population of 100,000 or more.

Town: Located between 10 and 35 miles from an urbanized area with a population between 50,000- 99,999.

Rural: Located outside an urbanized area with a population of 49,999 or less.

If you are unsure of which category your school belongs in and would like to lookup the locale please visit <https://nces.ed.gov/ccd/schoolsearch/> and look up your school. Under "School Details" it will list the Locale.

For the purposes of this study we are only using the locales City, Suburban, Town, and Rural

6.1 Rate the following items based on how prepared they helped you feel to teach in a **city**. A city is within an urbanized area with a population of 100,000 or more.

	Extremely unprepared	Somewhat unprepared	Neither prepared nor unprepared	Somewhat prepared	Extremely prepared
Experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Classes taken during the undergraduate degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fieldwork (observations/practicums) in schools excluding student teaching during the undergraduate music education degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student teaching experience during the undergraduate music education degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6.2 Rate the following items based on how prepared they helped you feel to teach in a **suburban** locale. A suburban locale is outside of a principal city with a population of 100,000 or more.

	Extremely unprepared	Somewhat unprepared	Neither prepared nor unprepared	Somewhat prepared	Extremely prepared
Experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Classes taken during the undergraduate degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fieldwork (observations/practicums) in schools excluding student teaching during the undergraduate music education degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student teaching experience during the undergraduate music education degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6.3 Rate the following items based on how prepared they helped you feel to teach in a **town**. A town is located between 10 and 35 miles from an urbanized area with a population between 50,000- 99,999.

	Extremely unprepared	Somewhat unprepared	Neither prepared nor unprepared	Somewhat prepared	Extremely prepared
Experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Classes taken during the undergraduate degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fieldwork (observations/practicums) in schools excluding student teaching during the undergraduate music education degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student teaching experience during the undergraduate music education degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Q6.4 Rate the following items based on how prepared they helped you feel to teach in a **rural** locale. A rural locale is located outside an urbanized area with a population of 49,999 or less.

	Extremely unprepared	Somewhat unprepared	Neither prepared nor unprepared	Somewhat prepared	Extremely prepared
Experiences prior to beginning an undergraduate degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Classes taken during the undergraduate degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Fieldwork (observations/practicums) in schools excluding student teaching during the undergraduate music education degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Student teaching experiences during the undergraduate music education degree	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Page Break

Q6.5 Thinking about your undergraduate music education degree program, what part of your undergraduate degree program do you feel **best** prepared you for your experiences in the classroom?

Q6.6 Thinking about your undergraduate music education degree program, what part of your undergraduate degree program do you feel was the **least helpful** in preparing you for your experiences in the classroom?

Q6.7 Do you have any additional comments about this survey or this topic? Feel free to type them below.

End of Block: Variables of Preparation
