

**Music Teachers' Perceptions of Undergraduate Music Education Curricula:
A Quantitative Survey of Current Music Teachers**

by

Natalie Erin Smith

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

Auburn, Alabama
May 6, 2023

Keywords: undergraduate music education, curriculum development,
reform, 21st-century teaching, quantitative

Copyright 2023 by Natalie Erin Smith

Approved by

Nancy Barry, Chair, Professor of Music Education

Richard Good, Professor of Music

Jane Kuehne, Associate Professor of Music Education

David T. Marshall, Assistant Professor of Educational Research Methodology and Analysis

Dr. Chih-hsuan Wang, Professor of Educational Research Methodology and Analysis

Abstract

This dissertation examined current music teachers' perceptions of their undergraduate music education program. I gathered data through an online survey completed by current K-12 music teachers. I recruited participants through the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) State Associations, my personal contacts, and social media. A total of 270 music teachers completed the survey. I employed quantitative methods in the survey through data derived from Likert-scale items and three hand-coded open-ended list questions.

I gathered information needed for this study using the web-based survey generator, Qualtrics. I divided the survey into five sections based on the four music competencies necessary for music teachers as listed by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), with an additional section based on field experience and other areas of 21st-century teaching. These include: (a) Conducting and Musical Leadership; (b) Arranging; (c) Functional Performance (including instrumental, keyboard, and vocal performance); (d) Analysis/History/Literature (NASM 2022); and field experience/21st-century teaching.

I addressed the following research questions:

1. What are current music teachers' perceptions of how well their undergraduate music education programs prepared them to teach each of the music competencies in the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) handbook?
2. What are current music teachers' perceptions of how well their undergraduate music education program prepared them to teach 21st-century music concepts?
3. What are current music teachers' perceptions of the amount of field experience during their undergraduate career?

4. What concepts/curricular areas do current music teachers feel were most and least valuable to their success in teaching music?
5. Which demographic variables, if any, have significantly different responses to survey construct items?

I analyzed data through quantitative methods including descriptive, frequencies and percentages, inferential statistics, *t*-test, and ANOVA. Descriptive statistics revealed participants overall felt somewhat unprepared to prepared in each of the construct areas based on their undergraduate music education preparation program. Participants felt skills methods (instrumental, vocal, etc.), conducting, and level methods (elementary, secondary) were of most value to their career in teaching music. General education courses (i.e., math, science, foreign language, etc.), skills methods, and music history were listed as the least valued courses to participants' success in teaching. Courses participants felt would be beneficial to be added or expanded within the undergraduate music education curriculum include classroom management, modern music technology, instrument repair, and more. There were significant differences in participants' responses to the area of conducting, and to the area of functional performance based on participants' preparation type. Significant differences were also found in responses to the arranging construct, based on years of teaching experience.

Recommendations for future research include replicating this study with a larger and more diverse population. Researchers could also explore specific curricular items as opposed to the broad study of all curriculum, or other music degrees. This study could be adjusted for music teacher educator participants, or undergraduate music education major participants.

The results of this study could inform undergraduate music education institution administrators and professors of ways they can reform their program to better prepare preservice music teachers.

Keywords: undergraduate music education, music teacher preparation, teacher perception, curriculum, 21st-century teaching, quantitative, survey

Acknowledgments

While my name is the one on the document, this could not have been possible without my wonderful support system. I would first like to thank my committee for all their work in helping me get this document to point of pride. Thank you to my chair, Dr. Nancy Barry for your detailed work and guidance. Thank you to Dr. Jane Kuehne for your encouragement and insightful comments helping me take this document to the next level in ways I would not have thought of myself. Thank you to Dr. David Marshall for going above and beyond from the first class I had with you outside in the Arboretum! I will forever be grateful for every opportunity you have given me/trusted me with, and the countless hours you spent with me either in the library or with a cinnamon roll and coffee at The Bean. Thank you to Dr. Richard Good for trusting me with far more opportunities than I ever could have imagined having in my three years at Auburn. I feel so well-prepared for so many positions out of just my experience here in the music department, and I am eternally grateful. Thank you for convincing me to take this step, even though I battled back initially! I feel so fortunate to have completed my doctoral studies under someone who has been an inspiration to me for the past ten years, from the very day I decided (or really admitted..) I wanted to pursue music. Thank you to Dr. Chih-hsuan Wang for helping put the finishing touches on this document, and for making a course I was very nervous about (Design II) so approachable and actually quite fun! Thank you to all of you for helping me, someone with little to no research background before coming to Auburn, strive to the point of feeling comfortable and excited about research.

There are far too many people to list that deserve thanks, but thank you to my family, friends, and professors for your constant support, love, laughs, and insight. I would like to especially thank my parents for supporting this crazy child who wanted to play piano, flute,

softball, horseriding, and so much more.. Thank you for pushing me to be my best, believing in me, and making sure I believed in myself. Thank you for supporting my dreams no matter how abstract and far reaching they have been. We've made it. Time to push it even more.

I would also like to specifically thank every teacher, professor, mentor, etc., who has helped me to get here. You have inspired me and helped me to come this far, and still be striving for more. Thank you to my past, present, and future students. You are and will continue to be the reason for it all.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	2
Acknowledgments	5
List of Tables	11
Chapter One: Introduction.....	13
Introduction.....	13
Need for the Study	14
Statement of Purpose	16
Assumptions.....	17
Delimitations.....	17
Limitations	18
Research Questions.....	18
Definition of Terms	20
Chapter Two: Review of Related Literature	23
Curriculum Policy.....	23
Current Research on Perception of Undergraduate Music Education Curriculum.....	25
21 st Century Curriculum	31
<i>Diversity</i>	31
<i>Technology</i>	32
<i>Education</i>	34

<i>Disability</i>	35
<i>Musicianship</i>	37
<i>Field Experience</i>	40
Curriculum Change	41
Chapter Three: Methodology	45
Research Design	46
Population and Sample	47
Instrument Development.....	48
Reliability and Validity.....	52
Data Collection	53
Data Analysis	54
Chapter Four: Results	59
Response Rate and Reliability	59
Participant Demographics.....	60
<i>General Demographics</i>	60
<i>Educational Demographics</i>	62
<i>Teaching Demographics</i>	65
Research Question 1	68
1.1	68
1.2	70
1.3.....	71

1.4.....	72
Research Question 2	73
2.1.....	74
2.2.....	75
Research Question 3	75
Research Question 4	77
4.1.....	77
4.2.....	78
4.3.....	80
Research Question 5	82
<i>Undergraduate Institution Type</i>	82
<i>Undergraduate Region</i>	83
<i>Teaching Region</i>	84
<i>Undergraduate Preparation Type</i>	85
<i>Highest Degree Achieved</i>	86
<i>Years Taught</i>	87
Summary.....	88
Chapter Five: Discussion.....	90
Preparedness to Teach NASM Music Competencies	91
Most and Least Valuable Courses	93
Additional Courses Desired.....	95

Differences in Responses Among Demographics	96
Closing and Recommendations	98
Future Research Implications	99
Closing	100
References	102
Appendix A: Invitation Email	111
Appendix B: Reminder Email #1	112
Appendix C: Reminder Email #2	113
Appendix D. Social Media Invitation to Participate	114
Appendix E. Social Media Survey Distribution	115
Appendix F: Information Letter	116
Appendix G: Survey Instrument.....	117

List of Tables

Table 1 <i>Pilot Study Reliability Test.</i>	52
Table 2 <i>Data Analysis Overview.</i>	56
Table 3 <i>Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for Likert Scales.</i>	60
Table 4 <i>Participant Demographics.</i>	61
Table 5 <i>NAfME (2023) Federal State Association Regions.</i>	63
Table 6 <i>Educational Demographics.</i>	64
Table 7 <i>Teaching Demographics.</i>	67
Table 8 <i>Descriptive Statistics for Percieved Preparedness in Conducting.</i>	69
Table 9 <i>Descriptive Statistics for Percieved Preparedness in Musical Leadership.</i>	70
Table 10 <i>Descriptive Statistics for Percieved Preparedness in Arranging.</i>	71
Table 11 <i>Descriptive Statistics for Percieved Preparedness in Functional Performance.</i>	72
Table 12 <i>Descriptive Statistics for Percieved Preparedness in Analysis/History/Literature.</i>	73
Table 13 <i>Descriptive Statistics Coursework Offered.</i>	74
Table 14 <i>Descriptive Statistics Field Experience</i>	76
Table 15 <i>Frequencies of Most Valuable Undergraduate Courses.</i>	78
Table 16 <i>Frequences of Least Valuable Undergraduate Courses.</i>	79
Table 17 <i>Frequencies of Desired Courses.</i>	80
Table 18 <i>Summary of ANOVA Undergraduate Insitution Type.</i>	83
Table 19 <i>Summary of ANOVA Undergraduate Region.</i>	84
Table 20 <i>Summary of ANOVA Teaching Region.</i>	85
Table 21 <i>Summary of T-Test Preparation Type</i>	86
Table 22 <i>Summary of T-Test Highest Degree.</i>	87

Table 23 *Summary of T-Test Years Taught*88

Chapter One

Introduction

Music Education is an ever-developing field and therefore needs an ever-developing curriculum. Researchers agree program evaluation of undergraduate music education is important to music education as a whole (Colwell, 1985; Conway, 2002; Leglar, 1993; Lehman, 1992). Researchers have studied policy and curriculum of K-12 public-school music education programs, but rarely at the university level. Some literature suggests a need for additional research on curricular reform based on other topics such as policy inclusion (Hunter, 2011), developing identity (La’Roy, 1983), and musical experiences (Welch, 2019), but there is a gap in identifying what is missing from these programs (Toscher, 2020). Curriculum reform often ensues fear in administrators and educators (Kladder, 2020), but is a necessary step for programs to remain current in the field of music education.

Patricia Shehan Campbell, President (at the time) of the College Music Society (CMS) developed The Task Force on the Undergraduate Music Major (TFUMM) in 2013. TFUMM met over 18 months to create proposals for evolving undergraduate preparation of music majors, while they “considered graduates’ potential for successful participation and leadership in contemporary and evolving musical cultures” (Sarath et al., 2014, p. iii). Despite their efforts and repeated calls for change to undergraduate music education, institutions have been resistant to change (Sarath et al., 2014). Institutions resisting change and evolution in undergraduate music education programs could have detrimental effects:

TFUMM has concluded that without fundamental change, traditional music departments, schools, and conservatories could face declining enrollments if sophisticated high school

students were to seek music career development outside the often-rarefied environment and curricula characteristic of America's colleges and universities. (Sarath et al., p. iii)

TFUMM asked many questions to help heighten the need for curriculum reform, two of which prompt the need for additional research in music education curriculum:

1. What does it mean to be an educated, reflective musician in the 21st century?
2. Why, after over 50 years of appeals for reform, have we not witnessed more substantive curricular change in music? (Sarath et al., 2014, p. 9)

Many researchers and educators have asked similar questions given the evolution of music and teaching, yet music education curricula have not experienced any large-scale action. Researching and gathering data from current music teachers is necessary to elevate this conversation of TFUMM, music researchers, and music educators from a discussion to action. The data on undergraduate music education curriculum gathered in this study are directly from music teachers, to add validity to this discussion, and form it into action.

Need for the Study

Asmus, editor of the *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, stated, "As a profession, we have not done an adequate job of studying our own professional realm—the training of future music educators" reasoning, "The field of music education is dramatically different than it was when the music teacher preparation programs were originally conceived in the last century" (2000, p. 5). There is very little undergraduate music education program evaluation literature from this century, and even less from the perspective of a teacher or undergraduate student.

Hourigan and Scheib (2009) stated the need for further research on this topic:

Additional research is needed into the perceptions of undergraduates on the value of particular skills, the usefulness of coursework and fieldwork, and the role of extra-

curricular experiences in music teacher education. Further research into the intellectual development of undergraduate music students is also needed. In particular, research into how music teacher education programs foster stages of intellectual development would enhance knowledge as to how undergraduates develop a relativistic outlook on the broader field of education. This may require curriculum revisions to include curricular, co-curricular, and extracurricular experiences. (p. 60)

The need for program evaluation and possible curricular reform in education is perhaps even more prevalent in light of the COVID-19 pandemic. We have seen more changes than ever before and had to adjust in ways we never anticipated during the last three years. This pandemic came as a surprise, pressing teachers and administrators to work together envisioning this new way of learning. Technology is one aspect that became extremely important, as it was the only mode of learning for many schools for quite some time. These changes, along with other developments in the world of music and education, demonstrate the need to find new, efficient, and effective ways of teaching. University curriculum policies and professors can implement these changes at the collegiate level to better prepare preservice teachers.

The literature demonstrates that curricular change supports a new direction for music teaching/learning and growth (Kladder, 2020) but there is not much literature on what types of reform would be beneficial. Research identified urban teaching (Languess, 2018) and identifying what children need (Schmidt, 2005) as common areas teachers felt unprepared for as they began their careers. Outside of the sources cited in this dissertation, much of this research was written before this century and therefore does not contain necessary contemporary aspects of teaching.

This dissertation differs from other studies by using the National Association of Schools of Music competencies as constructs in the survey. The study most directly aligned with this dissertation is Groulx (2016), who reported the following limitation:

One limitation of this study was that participants were asked to rate the value of courses they took, yet there may have been a great deal of variability in the way those courses were taught. For example, introduction to music education may vary considerably, given the wide scope of content and methods and the inclusion or lack of a field experience component. To address this, future research may involve participants rating the value of various music education competencies listed by NASM instead of rating course titles. (p. 22)

Forsythe et al. (2007) also stated this need nine years earlier, “It is assumed that competencies described in the standards are embedded in curricular offerings, yet verification of this notion has not been confirmed through research” (p. 21). The goal of this study was to bridge this gap by gathering data from 21st-century music teachers’ perception of their undergraduate music education program based on the NASM competencies and other 21st-century music and educational teaching skills as found in the 2014 update to the National Coalition for Core Arts Standards (NCCAS) music standards, the literature, and experience teaching at the K-12 and collegiate levels.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine current music teachers’ perceptions of their undergraduate music education program and to gather data on how music programs can better prepare music teachers for 21st-century teaching. I gathered these data through a survey completed by current K-12 music teachers. The survey employed mostly quantitative methods,

with three open-ended questions at the end of the survey. This dissertation will add to the literature by utilizing the NASM music competencies and other 21st-century teaching skills as constructs within the survey. Forsythe et al., (2007) stated:

No study of the opinions of music teacher educators concerning the standards has ever been undertaken. Thus, it is not known if the NASM standards influence the curriculum of teacher education or whether music teacher educators even agree that the competencies listed are important to successful music teaching. Undoubtedly, the NASM standards have been developed with input from music teacher educators over the years, yet no research has been conducted on this issue. (p. 20)

This study will address the lack of research on the influence of the NASM standards and competencies by surveying current music teachers on their perceived preparedness of the NASM competencies.

Assumptions

I assumed all participants met the criteria of being current K-12 music teachers. The survey was fixed on the assumptions of anonymity, as no personal data were shared in any dissemination of this work. I assumed participants read all survey questions carefully and thoroughly, and responded honestly to the best of their ability.

Delimitations

I delimited the sample to individuals who were either currently employed as K-12 music teachers or had been within the last three years. I recruited initial participants through various professional musical organizations including the state music educator associations and the National Association for Music Education. I recruited additional participants through emails to

music administrators at various universities with which I have connections, individuals in my network, and professional pages on social media platforms including Facebook and Instagram.

Limitations

There were various limitations from collecting data through surveys. One limitation was technical difficulty causing individuals to not receive or be able to complete the survey, or the email invite going to a spam folder because of being out of the individual's network. I employed a combination of convenience sampling and snowball sampling to reach as many participants as possible using a listserv, my network, and social media. This limited participants only to those who either received the email through networking, were members of their state's music education association and saw the call for the survey, or received the link through a friend or colleague. Barriers that could have limited findings include individuals who did not wish to participate, ignored the email, or did not want to spend time on an additional task.

Nonprobability sampling methods such as the ones used for this study run the risk of low participation rates since it relies on volunteers to participate and can exclude large numbers of potential participants (Dillman et al., 2014). I attempted to avoid these limitations as much as possible by keeping the survey brief and easily accessible, using state music organizations to reach the largest number of individuals, sending reminder emails to those who received the invite via my network, and multiple posts on social media.

Research Questions

The following research questions guided this study:

1. RQ1: What are current music teachers' perceptions of how well their undergraduate music education programs prepared them to teach each of the music competencies in the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) handbook?

- 1.1 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Conducting and Musical Leadership?
 - 1.2 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Arranging?
 - 1.3 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Functional Performance?
 - 1.4 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Analysis/History/Literature?
2. RQ2: What are current music teachers' perceptions of how well their undergraduate music education program prepared them to teach 21st-century music concepts?
 - 2.1 What are the main curricular current music teachers felt most prepared for in their first few years of teaching?
 - 2.2 What are the main curricular areas current music teachers felt least prepared for in their first few years of teaching?
3. RQ3: What are current music teachers' perceptions of the amount of field experience during their undergraduate career?
4. RQ4: What concepts/curricular areas do current music teachers feel were most and least valuable to their success in teaching music?
 - 4.1 What curricular area, if any, do current music teachers feel was not valuable to their success in teaching music?

4.2 What curricular area do current music teachers feel was most valuable to their success in teaching music?

4.3 What concepts were not taught as a part of the undergraduate curriculum that current music teachers felt would have been beneficial in undergraduate music education studies?

5. RQ5: Which demographic variables, if any, have significantly different responses to survey construct items?

The constructs used to measure these questions include the four music competencies as listed in the NASM handbook: 1) Conducting and Musical Leadership, 2) Arranging, 3) Functional Performance (including instrumental, keyboard, and vocal performance), and 4) Analysis/History/Literature (NASM 2022). I developed prompts within each of these constructs based on findings in my literature review from previous studies, as well as through my personal experience as a previous K-12 music teacher with an undergraduate degree in music education. These prompts included traditional aspects of music teaching, as well as aspects developing high importance in 21st-century music teaching, including preparation for urban/rural settings, classroom management, social-emotional learning, music technology, diversity, and non-traditional instruments and ensembles.

Definition of Terms

- Curriculum Reformation: “The process of making changes to the curriculum with the intent of making learning and teaching more meaningful and effective” (IGI Global, n.d.).
- Emotional Intelligence: “One’s ability to perceive emotion in self and others, understand emotions, integrate emotion in facilitating thought, and regulate emotions for personal growth” (McGinnis, 2018, p. 12).

- Ensembles: Musical performing groups; in a higher education setting, participation is required in a varied amount appropriate to the student's major to support a broader and deeper musical competence (NASM, 2022).
- Fieldwork or Field Experience: Observation and teaching experience outside of the institution required as a part of the teacher education program using sites that enable students to develop competencies consistent with the standards outlined by the National Association of Schools of Music, involving regular consultation between the student and music faculty supervisor (NASM, 2022).
- General Education Coursework: Required courses where students develop competencies of communication, critical thinking, mathematical skills for basic operation, historical and cultural knowledge/perspective, basic knowledge in social sciences, and sufficient research skills to locate, correlate, and apply information to specific projects (NASM, 2022).
- Musical Competencies: Expected areas for music education majors to develop a strong skill and knowledge base by their time of graduation, as listed by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). (NASM, 2022)
- Music Education/Methods Coursework: Courses required for students to learn and demonstrate skills in various teaching areas including elementary, secondary, and supplementary instruments primarily in the music content (NASM, 2022).
- Music Technology: An emerging content area with growing support from school administrators (Bannerman & O'Leary, 2021); coursework can be in the form of recording and engineering, production, audio equipment, music notation software, etc.

- Music Theory Coursework: Courses required for students to learn and demonstrate ability to “hear, identify, and work conceptually and analytically with the elements of music—rhythm, melody, harmony, and structure,” and “a basic understanding of compositional processes, aesthetic properties of style, and ways these shape and are shaped by artistic and cultural forces” (NASM, 2022, p. 195).
- Music History Coursework: Courses required for students to learn and demonstrate an “acquaintance with a wide selection of musical literature, the principal eras, genres, and cultural sources including, but not limited to jazz, popular, classical, and world music forms” (NASM, 2022, p. 195).
- Social-Emotional Learning: “an integral part of education and human development. SEL is the process through which all young people and adults acquire and apply the knowledge, skills, and attitudes to develop healthy identities, manage emotions and achieve personal and collective goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain supportive relationships, and make responsible and caring decisions.”
<https://casel.org/fundamentals-of-sel/>
- 21st Century Teaching: Defined by the National Education Association (NEA) as teaching the subject area with an emphasis on critical thinking, communication, collaboration, and creativity skills (2012). In music, this includes preparing teachers for areas such as technology, administration, non-traditional instruments/ensembles, diversity, and social social-emotional/classroom management.

Chapter Two

Review of Related Literature

Curriculum Policy

Limited literature exists on curriculum policy in university music education outside of the governing handbooks, though existing literature suggests a need for such research. This research includes the need for curricular reform for university music education programs. While studies demonstrate students are more concerned about policies at the local level for programs in which they will likely be teaching post-graduation (Burton et al., 2014), understanding the differences and successes of university policies nationally is a crucial step in reformation, and will provide tools to better prepare these future teachers.

The majority of teacher education institutions are members of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the principal governing body for teacher education (Forsythe et al., 2007). When it comes to more specialized areas, NCATE defers to the society for each specific discipline. The accrediting society for music is The National Association of Schools of Music (NASM). NASM establishes national standards for undergraduate and graduate degrees for music and music-related disciplines. The organization consists of approximately 637 accredited institutions including schools, conservatories, colleges, and universities to which NASM provides assistance and support (NASM, 2022). While each institution is responsible for developing and defining purposes specific to its undergraduate music program and degrees offered, NASM provides a baseline of what all areas must meet in terms of curriculum. This includes areas such as credit and time requirements, time on task, curricular proportions and competencies, forms of instruction, requirements and electives, individual program continuity, and residence (NASM, 2022).

The NASM 2021-2022 handbook stated the purpose of a professional degree as follows:

Students enrolled in professional undergraduate degrees in music are expected to develop the knowledge, skills, concepts, and sensitivities essential to the professional life of the musician. To fulfill various professional responsibilities, the musician must exhibit not only technical competence, but also broad knowledge of music and music literature, the ability to integrate musical knowledge and skills, sensitivity to musical styles, and an insight into the role of music in intellectual and cultural life. (p. 101).

The undergraduate music education institution is responsible for incorporating elements and experiences into the curriculum to help students achieve the skills stated above. Institutions can achieve this by providing sufficient lessons, classes, ensembles, repertory experiences, and evaluation procedures. The curriculum is to comprise of at least 50% music-specific content, 30-35% general studies, and 15-20% professional education (NASM, 2022).

Within the content stated above, NASM lists four overarching music competencies expected of students to achieve through the curriculum. These competencies include, 1) Conducting and Musical Leadership, 2) Arranging, 3) Functional Performance (including instrumental, keyboard, and vocal performance), and 4) Analysis/History/Literature (NASM 2022). There is flexibility within these competencies for institutions to prepare students for one or more areas of specialization including 1) General Music, 2) Vocal/Choral Music, and 3) Instrumental Music. Students are expected to develop skills and knowledge of content, methodologies, philosophies, technologies, and pedagogy of each of these areas and/or specializations through curriculum, materials, and experiences. Teaching competencies expected of students by the time of graduation include the ability to teach various age groups in a variety of settings with effective classroom and rehearsal management, an understanding of child

development as it relates to music, the ability to plan based on student needs and backgrounds, knowledge of current methods, the ability to assess the teaching situation to accept, adjust, or reject methods and materials, and the ability to assess the music program and students through objectives and procedures of the curriculum (NASM 2022).

Local public school and university partnerships are another important element of program effectiveness. NASM encourages community involvement to provide cultural opportunities for students. Hunter (2011) conducted a study of school-university partnerships as a means for the inclusion of policy studies in music teacher education. Using mixed methods including on-site visits, Hunter (2011) found the partnerships provided both music education students, as well as school music teachers with needed support. The study also suggested a need for future research addressing the effectiveness of policy inclusion in school-university partnerships.

NASM-accredited institutions undergo a comprehensive review every 10 years to ensure they are including all the above aspects in their offered degree programs. These reviews provide data on the extent to which the institution is preparing students for their careers, as well as current students' perspectives of the program. The reviews do not gather perspectives from alumni of the program who are currently in the field; therefore, conclusions cannot be made as to what extent the elements listed above are proving to be enough for students to feel prepared for entering the field. There is a need for more research to determine areas in which music education programs may be able to better serve preservice music teachers.

Current Research on Perception of Undergraduate Music Education Curriculum

A few researchers have studied current undergraduate students' perceptions of their music education program, as well as the perception of music teacher educators. Very few researchers have studied current music teachers' perceptions of their undergraduate program.

Each of these groups above, including undergraduate students, music teacher educators, and current music teachers agree there is at least some update needed in the undergraduate music education curriculum (Brophy, 1994; Conway 2002, 2012, 2022; Forsythe et. al, 2007; Groulx, 2016; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009). Studies from this century that gathered data from current (at the time) teachers' perception of their full degree program, rather than a specific aspect, were completed by Brophy in 2002, Groulx in 2016, and a series of studies by Conway in 2002, 2012, and 2022.

Brophy (2002) conducted a four-part survey of 237 music teacher respondents from 43 states. The two sections related to this dissertation include respondents' perceived preparation to teach the National Standards based on their undergraduate curriculum, and a series of open-ended questions that inquired reflection on respondents' undergraduate curriculum. The survey used the 1994 National Standards of Music for singing, playing instruments, improvisation and composition, reading and writing music, listening, interdisciplinary studies, and relating music to history and culture (Brophy, 2002). Participants answered "yes" or "no" to whether they felt prepared to teach each standard. Relating music to history and culture had the highest percentage with 65.68% of respondents feeling prepared to teach in that area, and improvisation and composition had the lowest percentage with a perceived preparedness of only 11.39% (Brophy, 2002). When asked in the open-ended questions which courses respondents felt best prepared them for their teaching assignment post-graduation, participants listed student teaching overall as the most useful, whereas they listed general education courses as the least useful (Brophy, 2002). The study found conflicting opinions about methods courses, with teachers of either 21 or more years of experience or 10 or fewer years of experience finding it to be the least useful, and teachers of 11-20 years of experience finding it to be the most useful (Brophy, 2002).

Groulx (2016) surveyed music educators from all 50 states and Washington D.C. ($N = 601$) on their perception of their undergraduate coursework. Participants rated courses on how applicable the content was to their professional careers in music education (Groulx, 2016). Groulx (2016) selected 20 courses based on typically required courses for an undergraduate music education program, including applied lessons, ensembles, music theory, aural theory, music history, piano skills, conducting, music education, elementary general methods, secondary general methods, choral methods, instrumental methods, technique courses in all instrumental areas, early field experience, student teaching, educational psychology, and other education courses. The survey found the least valuable courses to participants were introductory music education courses, string techniques, courses taught in the education department, and education psychology (Groulx, 2016). The courses participants reported as most valuable all related to musicianship and experience, including student teaching, ensembles, applied lessons, conducting, early field experiences, aural theory, and music theory (Groulx, 2016). The survey included three open-ended questions following course ratings, including an inquiry about which classes, subjects, or topics students wish they could have studied at their undergraduate institution. Six themes emerged from this question including “technical skills, effective teaching, administrative skills, engaging in schools, support for career specialization, and preparation for a broader range of careers” (Groulx, 2016, p. 21).

Groulx (2016) and Brophy (2002) align with the findings of three similar studies by Conway. Conway (2002) examined 14 beginning teachers’ perceptions of their undergraduate teacher preparation program at a Big Ten university. As opposed to the previous two studies, data for this study were strictly qualitative, collected through interviews, observations, teacher journals, researcher’s logs, and an open-ended end-of-year questionnaire. The interviews of the

teachers and end-of-year questionnaire asked questions relating to value of the participants' teacher preparation program. Participants agreed the most valuable areas of their teacher preparation program were student teaching, preservice fieldwork, and courses related to musicianship such as ensembles and applied lessons (Conway, 2002). Directly aligning with both Brophy (2002) and Groulx (2016), participants deemed teacher education courses to be the least valuable (Conway, 2002). One participant stated, "I'm sorry, but the classes in the College of Ed. were really a waste of time," another participant agreed stating, "I enjoyed some of the College of Education classes, but do I use any of that stuff?" (Conway, 2002). Despite fieldwork being of most value to participants, they reported the next least valuable aspect of their teacher preparation program was observations without context. One participant stated, "It seems like we did a lot of observing in the schools and I did not really know what I was supposed to be looking at" and "Preservice fieldwork is useful only if it is organized in a way that allows students to learn something specific from the context" (Conway, 2002, p. 29). This alludes to a need for reconstructing education courses to better benefit music education majors.

Conway's 2012 and 2022 studies followed up with the same participants; 12 out of 14 participated in the 2012 study, and 10 out of those 12 participated in the 2022 study. In these follow-up studies, Conway gathered data through participants' written reflections based on their previous responses, and interviews on how their views have changed given their added years of experience and work with student teachers, as well as changes in music education in general. Participants' reflections on their previous responses alluded to very little to no change in teacher education programs. Even with their increased years of experience and observation of student teachers, participants still felt student teaching and applied lessons were the most valuable to teacher preparation, and teacher education courses, observations without context, and some

instrument methods courses were the least valuable (2022). One participant, in reaction to the 2012 article, stated: “Overall, I’m blown away looking at the article from 20 years ago because things really haven’t changed, especially in regard to detracking (at least at my university)” (Conway, 2022, p. 10). Conway (2022) suggested detracking curricula to better prepare students for a variety of areas within music teaching and give them more of a choice in their path of study, rather than set them on a specific track. This suggestion was based on participants in all three studies reporting a need for “extended student teaching, better preparation for administrative duties, and better preparation for working with beginners” (p. 27). The Big Ten University (BTU) participants in the study graduated from experimented with detracking curricula, and there were mixed reactions. Participants’ main concern was having student teachers who were not as strong on their secondary instruments because they could choose not to take every methods course (Conway, 2022). Participants noted while expectations of teachers have changed, the preparation programs have not; Conway stated, “They needed their adaptive expertise to assist them in adjusting music program goals to meet changing community demographics, declining resources, new music classes, new technologies, and ever-changing characteristics of students” (2022, p. 11).

The above studies, despite being up to 20 years apart, all have very similar findings (Brophy, 2002; Conway, 2002, 2012, 2022; Groulx 2016; Hourigan and Scheib, 2009). These studies examined the perceptions of student teachers and found music courses such as ensembles, applied lessons, and methods were the most valuable, while music education and other education courses were the least valuable. Each of these studies also agreed that 21st-century skills such as communication, administration, and technology are necessary for teacher preparation programs for success in the classroom. In the studies which found method courses to be most and least

valuable, researchers explained though participants felt the concepts were among the most important, the way professors taught courses lacked relevance (Brophy, 2002; Conway, 2002). Researchers agreed this could be a reason ensembles are consistently rated highly valuable because ensemble directors use theory and aural skills in rehearsals, while modeling what many students within the ensemble hope to do in their careers (Conway, 2022; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009). Conway (2022) stated aligning goals between music and music education faculty could help the music education courses become more relevant:

Applied faculty and ensemble conductors are the most important role models for music education students. Thus, music teacher educators must work to foster relationships with applied faculty and ensemble conductors so that the entire department of music can share the dialogue regarding the music teacher education program. (p. 22)

A participant in Conway (2022) supported this thought, “I really learned everything I know about music from my studio teacher” (p. 28). The consensus across several studies is a lack of relevance to the field in the 21st century causes low ratings for music education courses (Brophy, 2022; Conway, 2002, 2012, 2022; Groulx, 2016; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009).

Conway explained, “The challenge for music teacher education, in this context, is to continue to advocate for change in the preservice curriculum in ways that will ensure a focus on growth, dignity, and equity” (2022, p. 11). Findings from the aforementioned studies, along with many changes and challenges in education within the past few years, present a need for more data on current music teacher perception of the undergraduate music education program. I reviewed additional findings from these studies below, organized by content area.

21st Century Curriculum

Education is an ever-changing field. In recent years the change has been rapid. Whether this is due to the COVID-19 pandemic, evolving technology, issues of diversity and equity, or any other societal change, collegiate educators and administrators must react to these changes to best prepare students for the field. Existing courses could address this change, but incorporating additional courses into the curriculum may be necessary to fully cover all aspects necessary in becoming a music teacher in the 21st century. According to the 2014 update to the National Coalition for Core Arts Standards, “Students need to have experience in creating, to be successful musicians and to be successful 21st-century citizens” (NAfME, 2018). The updates to the music standards focused on music literacy through students’ (grades K-12) ability to carry out three artistic processes of creating, performing, and responding (NAfME, 2018). These additions to the standards include areas such as technology, culture/diversity, and other areas of performance and education (NCCAS, 2014). The following sections do not exhaust, but rather introduce a few of the main areas found in the literature that could better prepare preservice music teachers if added to or reformed within the undergraduate music education curriculum, so they can better serve their future students based on the NCCAS standards.

Diversity

Music education scholars have presented a need for undergraduate music education students to have more diversity training during their undergraduate studies due to a population which is the most diverse in public school history (Robinson, 2017). Despite this, preservice teachers are lacking in intercultural background knowledge or experiences when they enter the classroom (Chou, 2007; Robinson, 2017). This causes teachers to enter the field without adequate skills to navigate different types of social and cultural environments (Robinson, 2016)

and leaves them not wanting to teach in environments of a different culture than the community in which they went to school (Kimpton, 2005). Urban and rural schools are affected by this more than others and have the highest vacancies (Kimpton, 2005). Bruenger (2010) suggested bringing in successful urban music teachers to discuss the challenges and rewards of urban teaching can help relieve such vacancies, so students do not go into this type of classroom unprepared.

The most common suggestion within the research about better preparing students for diverse classrooms is to incorporate field experiences in a variety of settings, such as urban and rural settings (Barry, 1996; Bruenger, 2010; Emmanuel, 2002; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009; Howard, 2014). Other areas that could help prepare students for a diverse classroom include world ensembles (Campbell, 2002; Howard et al., 2014; Robinson, 2017), deep reflection of cultural identities within coursework (Chou, 2007; Robinson, 2017), emphasizing cultural diversity in all coursework (Bruenger 2010), and diverse visiting artist programs (Howard et al., 2014). Robinson (2017) suggested while institutions should offer specific diversity courses, developing cultural competency should be present throughout all coursework. Similarly, Howard et al. (2014) stated, cultural awareness should be present in all areas of the music curriculum in way of instructional technique, repertoire, and curricular approaches.

Technology

An increased need for technology training in education is prevalent in recent literature. Part of this is due to the enhanced necessity of technology in light of the COVID-19 pandemic, and part of it is simply due to living in an age of technology. Music technology is a rapidly growing content area within K-12 and university music programs that is also growing in support from school administrators (Abril & Gault, 2008; Bannerman & O’Leary, 2021; Dammers, 2012). The growing need for technology in the K-12 music classroom created a demand for

incorporating technology into music teacher education curricula. Bannerman and O’Leary (2021) stated music teacher educators can impact preservice teachers’ proficiency with knowledge of technology, as it is not an innate skill dependent on generation.

Two surveys completed five years apart by different investigators had similar findings regarding music technology in the undergraduate music education curriculum. Haning (2016) surveyed undergraduate music education majors ($N = 46$) at 10 different degree-granting institutions, and found only 63% of participants had taken a required technology course during their undergraduate degree program. A similar survey in 2021 by Bannerman and O’Leary of collegiate NAfME members ($N = 360$) indicated only 45% of participants were required to take a music technology course. Responses to the 2016 survey indicated the required technology courses were most commonly within the college/school/department of music with a focus on music notation software, sound mixing, and editing applications (Haning, 2016). Most participants in the 2021 survey rated themselves as beginners with music technology skills similar to those above such as creating music with technology, recording and editing audio, sharing music online, working with musical instrument digital interface, and least of all mixing and mastering audio (Bannerman & O’Leary, 2021).

Forty-three percent of participants in Haning’s 2016 survey indicated they did not feel that their technology courses effectively prepared them to use technology in their future classrooms, and they desired more technology instruction in their teacher preparation programs (Haning, 2016). The 2021 survey found the exact same percentage (43%) of participants felt knowledgeable about the use of technology in the music classroom (Bannerman & O’Leary). This equates to a lower percentage of participants who felt prepared to teach and use technology in the music classroom than in the 2016 study.

Many scholars suggested integrating music technology into all courses, in addition to a course specifically dedicated to music technology (Bannerman & O’Leary, 2021; Bauer, 2012; Dorfman, 2016; Groulx, 2016; Haning, 2016). Participants from the two surveys above agreed with this statement and believe it would be greatly beneficial for music teacher educators to discuss music technologies they may encounter in their future careers (Bannerman & O’Leary, 2021; Haning, 2016). Groulx (2016) found teachers felt they could benefit from learning concepts such as “amplification systems, recording equipment, music software, and web design” (p. 18), and suggested incorporating them into method courses. Bannerman and O’Leary (2021) suggested music teacher educators integrate music technology into the curriculum and provide field experiences where students can interact with and see effective technology use for students to feel more comfortable incorporating music technology into their future classrooms. Logsdon (2013) stated we live in a “technologically complex world,” where we must find ways to balance the “artistic growth of the individual learner with the creative demands of the larger society” (p. 52).

Education

Education has seen a great many challenges, which come with a need for either adding courses to the existing curriculum or structuring existing courses differently. Many researchers suggested music education faculty must make coursework more relevant and relational to students (Brophy, 2002; Conway, 2002; 2012; 2022; Groulx, 2016; Hibbard, 2017; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009; Pellegrino et al., 2017). Specifically, Hibbard (2017) suggested, “To further students’ integrated understanding of classroom relations, instructors in higher education are encouraged to help preservice teachers see classrooms through relational lenses such as presence, paying close attention to the relational triangle of teacher, student, and subject matter” (p. 188).

Two areas preservice teachers could benefit from having coursework or course content frequently mentioned in the literature include administration and classroom management. Student teacher respondents in Hourigan and Scheib (2009) felt they could benefit from learning how to more effectively manage and pace ensemble rehearsals, as well as hold students accountable. Participants from the same study also mentioned administrative tasks such as photocopying and learning effective communication skills and correspondence with parents, faculty, and students.

Participants in Conway (2022) noticed a significant increase in high trauma among students from the first study in 2002. Given this trauma, there is an increased need for learning concepts such as social-emotional learning and emotional intelligence in undergraduate music education programs. Studies show incorporating Emotional Intelligence into music education courses could help future teachers be better prepared to address situations such as self-management, social awareness, and relationship management in the classroom (McGinnis, 2018).

Disability

Very little current research exists on music teachers' perception of preparedness to teach students with disabilities in the music education classroom. The existent studies agreed more preparation and education on teaching students with disabilities is necessary (Grimsby, 2020; Salvador, 2010; VanWeelden & Whipple 2005, 2007, 2014). VanWeelden and Whipple (2014) surveyed music educators on their perception of their educational preparation for inclusive music teaching. Results of the survey indicated less than one-fourth of the teachers ($n = 244$) had completed a specific music course in special education or music for special populations during their undergraduate music education studies (VanWeelden & Whipple, 2014). Less than half of

the teachers who completed music-specific disability coursework got to apply what they learned in a practical field experience or participate in evaluation and assessment procedures for this population (VanWeelden & Whipple, 2014).

The majority of participants indicated they completed a course in child psychology or child development during their undergraduate studies, but many studies agree general courses do not give students the training they need to be successful in teaching students with disabilities in their discipline (Gfellar et. al., 1990; Grimsby, 2020; & Whipple, 2014). Gfellar et al. (1990) suggested while child psychology courses are often used in place of a disability course requirement, they do not prepare preservice teachers to teach students with disabilities and recommend discipline-specific coursework. Most of the participants who indicated they had completed music-specific coursework in VanWeelden and Whipple's (2014) survey responded they felt more prepared to work with students with disabilities than teachers who had only completed non-music disability or developmental coursework. Previous studies by VanWeelden and Whipple (2005, 2007) found similar results with the inclusion of field experiences and adaptive assessment procedures (VanWeelden & Whipple, 2014).

VanWeelden and Whipple (2014) yielded similar results to other studies, stating the average music educator receives little coursework designed specifically for teaching music to students with disabilities. Salvador (2010) stated many music educators feel unprepared to teach students with disabilities due to universities lacking music-specific preparatory courses on the subject. Grimsby (2020) conducted an instrumental case study examining three elementary music teachers' perceptions of the preparation they received to work with students with disabilities. Each of the three participants expressed they felt unprepared to work with students who have disabilities. They stated their frustration of not having a general understanding of their students'

disabilities, nor the teaching strategies to accommodate their disabilities (Grimsby, 2020). The participants felt lack of preparation from their undergraduate institutions was a contributing factor to the challenges they faced in teaching students with disabilities. None of the participants had any specific coursework in working with students with disabilities, stating other courses and workshops only briefly touched on the subject (Grimsby, 2020). The researcher suggested at least one music teacher educator on the faculty should have special education experience or extensive knowledge of working with students with disabilities, as well as a partnership with K-12 teachers who regularly teach students of this population (Grimsby, 2020).

Musicianship

According to Conway (2012), experienced music teachers identify developing musicianship to be among the most valuable aspects of their undergraduate studies. Conway (2012) suggested not only does careful consideration of a diverse music curriculum prepare preservice teachers in terms of knowledge and tools for teaching, but also plays an important role in shaping their teacher identity. This identity comes from having ample opportunities to develop their identity as a teacher and a performer (Conway, 2012). Elliott (1992) stated, “The greater the teacher’s musicianship, the more he can guide his students as they build their own musicianship” (p. 9), opposing those who have the perspective as stated by Kimpton (2005), that some professors see music education students as a lower priority with the assumption they do not need as high musical and academic abilities as their performance colleagues. This conflict of opposing views can often lead to frustration and confusion in positionality of music education majors. A participant in Conway (2022) viewed applied lessons as important not only for greater musicianship, but also to learn the “struggle,” as stated, “It’s about being a musician, of course,

and you need to be as good of a musician as you can possibly be, but you need to have that experience of struggle to be able to create empathy” (p. 5).

Taggart and Hill (2019) agreed music education majors must have high-performance ability, but suggested allowing music education students to broaden their musicianship by substituting some of their performance requirements with courses such as technology and arranging for various ensembles. Instrument repair is also an area found to be of great importance to music educators. Groulx (2016) suggested instrument repair could fit within instrument method courses or as a summer workshop if institutions are unable to offer it as a separate course. Music teachers and undergraduate music education students alike find great importance in learning how to play, teach, and repair a variety of instruments, but do not always find their method courses provide them the skills they desire (Conway, 2002; 2012; 2022; Groulx, 2016; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009). Participants of various studies have suggested that applied faculty who do not understand the pedagogy needed for K-12 classroom teaching often teach instrument method courses; one participant in Conway (2002) noted:

I need to know more about how to teach all the instruments. Just playing them is not enough. I wish instrument methods courses had focused more on repair. I spend a lot of my time doing repair, and I don't really know what I'm doing. Why are the BTU instrument classes taught by performance people? They don't really know what we need to know. (p. 29)

As 21st-century K-12 classrooms evolve, so must teacher preparation programs.

Researchers agree many music teacher education programs still focus primarily on concepts of the 19th-century European conservatory, rather than the evolving 21st century (Colley, 2009; Taggart & Hill, 2019). Music history and theory courses still tend to focus strongly on

Eurocentric classical music. While these are important foundations for music educators to have, they also need updated history and theory knowledge, such as world and popular music, to better serve their students (Taggart & Hill, 2019). Much literature states variety in instrumental skills, both in terms of traditional instrument method courses, as well as learning nontraditional instruments is important for preservice music teachers. The recent National Core Arts Standards emphasize the importance of musical scope and versatility in musical skills, including areas of secondary instruments and accompanying instruments such as ukulele and guitar (Taggart & Hill, 2019).

Just as classrooms are evolving, so is the world of music. Institutions may consider adding more variety of ensembles, history, and broader musicianship opportunities so music teacher education can evolve as well. Researchers agree on the necessity of an update to the music curriculum, but also the challenge of adding anything to the music education major's already packed course load (Conway, 2022; Groulx, 2016; Taggart & Hill, 2019). Taggart and Hill (2019) offered suggestions to help navigate this challenge:

Reconsidering traditional structures, imagining new pathways and paths of entry into music study, and reinvigorating the content of music education coursework all can help solve the musicianship conundrum currently faced by preservice and in-service teachers as well as music teacher educators. (p. 23)

The evolution of music and music classrooms in the 21st century presents a need for further research on recent teacher perceptions of undergraduate music education curricula. This study will gather information directly from the source of what could better prepare 21st-century music teachers.

Field Experience

Field experience within the undergraduate music education degree is where students get the most realistic training for their future careers. It is a requirement that all institutions have field experience aspects, but the amount varies (NASM, 2022). Many researchers have found student teaching is of most value to pre-service music teachers (Brophy, 2002; Conway, 2002, 2012, 2022; Groulx, 2016). Participants in various studies have reported early fieldwork experiences are important to feel prepared for student teaching (Hourigan & Scheib, 2009), but field experience prior to student teaching without context is not useful (Conway, 2002). Brophy (2002) uncovered most music educator participants defined a 50/50 balance of field experience and coursework to be the most ideal, suggesting an increase in fieldwork (p. 6). Some current music teachers feel an increase in fieldwork is necessary given some professors have a heavier focus on research and are too far removed from the realities of teaching (Groulx, 2016). In support of the findings of Brophy (2002) and Conway (2002; 2012; 2022), Groulx (2016) recommended incorporating contextual field experiences into coursework through instructors introducing concepts and developing it through peer teaching before taking those concepts into practice in schools.

Researchers and cooperating teachers agree more diverse fieldwork is necessary for 21st-century teaching (Baugh & Conway, 2021). Conway (2022) stated:

I am at a loss to suggest ways to fix these issues, but future researchers may want to continue to explore fieldwork models with varied goals and in diverse settings.

Researchers may also want to explore how to engage P-12 educators in understanding all the challenges of fieldwork to see whether better collaborations between P-12 educators and teacher educators can result in more successful field experiences. (p. 7)

The above statement is a reaction to every participant in the study agreeing that teacher preparation programs must provide students with fieldwork opportunities outside suburban settings. However, one participant who was a current music teacher educator stated the problem of students not having time in their schedules for any additional fieldwork or courses (Conway, 2022). Through an extensive review of literature on student teaching, Baumgartner (2020) suggested research focused on how concepts are taught during internship could aid in resolving these challenges. Music teacher educators added that many undergraduate music education programs have not found a successful sequence of coursework, fieldwork, and student teaching to aid in negating these issues (Conway, 2022). Such issues have been ongoing for years; according to Barry and Caravan (2020), we have much to discover on how field experiences can most efficiently support preservice teachers.

Curriculum Change

A few institutions have already attempted to study and incorporate some of the 21st listed above into the curriculum. Chua and Welch (2019) explored experiences that impact music teacher development. The researchers measured how both musical and non-musical experiences produce a music teacher. They sent a quantitative survey to primary and secondary music teachers in Singapore with various years of teaching experience, ranging from beginner teachers to ten-plus years of experience. Using a 5-point Likert scale, participants rated the positive impact various musical and non-musical experiences had on their lives. There was also an option for participants to offer additional qualitative responses. The impact of ‘Music experiences at university/college’ was in the middle of the various experiences presented to the 72 participants, with a mean of 3.25. ‘Music learning on my own’ was above collegiate learning, with a mean of 3.68. ‘Musical experiences at the university level’ not even being in the top five for positive

impact of music and teaching raises questions about what additional experiences could have a greater positive impact on future teachers if added to the curriculum.

Another goal of the above study was to gather data on what factors contribute to future music teachers developing their identity in the field. La’Roy (1983) found these factors included not only coursework, but also student and faculty interaction and the training environment. La’Roy (1983) also found music education undergraduate students had trouble defining their identity because it is such a loosely defined field with multiple options post-graduation. Participants completed a questionnaire and an interview which consisted of questions about their ideal collegiate music education curriculum. The qualitative results revealed many students felt there was a gap in various areas of instruction, which hurt their chances of securing and being successful in a job immediately following graduation (La’Roy, 1983).

A few researchers explored what is necessary in a music education degree to achieve a successful teaching career (Toscher, 2020). Toscher (2020) explored the definition of success and expectations of students, as well as their perception and faculty perception of the importance of various skills acquired in the program. Using a cross-sectional survey, Toscher (2020) found there was a gap between students’ perceived importance of skills, and their acquisition of those skills. The largest gap appeared in areas of sales/marketing, market/industry, financial, social media, and business planning (Toscher, 2020). There were no areas where students felt their acquisition of skills was higher than the importance of such skills; however, there was parity in areas of music theory and leadership. The results of this study produced data on additional coursework or curricular reform which could benefit higher-level music education.

Kladder (2020) investigated curricular change at two undergraduate music education programs in the United States. Kladder (2020) used mixed methods such as interviews,

curriculum rationale, and comparison of the two universities to conduct the study. There are limitations involved in this study, as both schools are in the Southern region; they are on opposite sides of the Southern region, but there is no Northern or Midwestern representation. The findings of this study stated after the curriculum reform, students felt much more prepared for entering the field of education after graduation in their own classrooms. The article stated, “fear was at the forefront of the curricular change” (Kladder, 2020, p. 154) which serves as a potential explanation of why more programs have not taken this initiative, even though there is significant payoff in the end.

Powell et al. (2020) spotlighted a few programs that implemented curriculum change. One program which began to enhance its curriculum was The University of Texas Rio Grande Valley, which took both culturally responsive and contemporary approaches. With a largely Hispanic enrollment, they added a Mariachi degree track with coursework in arranging, composition, pedagogy, and instrumental techniques for cultural instruments (Powell et al., 2020). Like a few of the other programs, they have also added a new degree in composition, a minor in technology, and a certificate in popular music with a focus on education rather than performance. University of Wisconsin-Parkside and Montclair State added courses involving popular music, as well as contemporary ensembles. Montclair State surveyed students asking for feedback on these additions, which returned overwhelmingly positive toward the course additions. Students even said their perspective on how they should teach music has changed (Powell et al., 2020).

Ithaca College, known for its strong music program, began a reform process in the spring of 2015 to redesign its degrees offered to meet 21st-century demands, and increase flexibility by providing opportunities for student choice. They added more contemporary courses to the

curriculum and also incorporated a program called FlexCore, which gave students the freedom to personalize their plan of study to fit their goals (Powell et al., 2020).

The existing literature states a need for current research on music teacher perception of their undergraduate music education preparation. Conway (2022) stated “it is fair to consider the preservice preparation of music teachers as a continued concern for the profession” (p. 1), yet there has not been consistent research on this topic from the current century. Literature exists on undergraduate perception of curriculum and music teacher educator perception of curriculum, but there is a gap in current literature on current music teacher perception of curriculum from this century. Additional research is needed to explore early music teacher perceptions of their undergraduate music education program. This dissertation will add to the literature by reaching a larger and more varied participant count through its quantitative nature, examining perception of current music teachers utilizing the NASM music competencies for validity in construct, examining perception on 21st century skills, and will survey current music teachers to gather current information on both the K-12 and University settings.

Chapter Three

Methodology

The purpose of this dissertation was to examine current music teachers' perceptions of their undergraduate music education curriculum in terms of how prepared they felt to teach the competencies as listed in the NASM handbook, as well as the evolving areas of 21st-century teaching. I developed the following research questions in alignment with the purpose of this study:

1. RQ1: What are current music teachers' perceptions of how well their undergraduate music education programs prepared them to teach each of the music competencies in the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) handbook?
 - 1.1 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Conducting and Musical Leadership?
 - 1.2 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Arranging?
 - 1.3 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Functional Performance?
 - 1.4 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Analysis/History/Literature?
2. RQ2: What are current music teachers' perceptions of how well their undergraduate music education programs prepared them to teach 21st-century music concepts?

- 2.1 What are the main curricular areas that current music teachers felt most prepared for in their first few years of teaching?
 - 2.2 What are the main curricular areas that current music teachers felt least prepared for in their first few years of teaching?
3. RQ3: What are current music teachers' perceptions of the amount of field experience during their undergraduate career?
4. RQ4: What concepts/curricular areas do current music teachers feel were most and least valuable to their success in teaching music?
 - 4.1 What curricular area do current music teachers feel were most valuable to their success in teaching music?
 - 4.2 What curricular area, if any, do current music teachers feel was not valuable to their success in teaching music?
 - 4.3 What concepts were not taught as a part of the undergraduate curriculum that current music teachers felt would have been beneficial in undergraduate music education studies?
5. RQ5: Which demographic variables, if any, have significantly different responses to survey construct items?

Research Design

One of my goals for this study was to reach music teacher participants from each of the 50 states and Washington, D.C.; I chose survey research to have the highest probability to reach this wide-ranged population (Dillman et al., 2014). The survey consisted of Likert scale items and only three open-ended questions to ensure a higher response rate. The quantitative nature of this survey allowed for exploring descriptive statistics and percentages, as well as comparing

responses using demographic variables. I also chose to include three open-ended prompts to allow participants to express their thoughts on any curricular aspect I may have neglected to include in the survey.

Population and Sample

The target population for this study was current music teachers from all U.S. 50 states. There were 6 states with no participation, so I grouped according to the National Association for Music Education (NAfME) federated state association regions for analysis purposes. I defined “current music teacher” for the purpose of this study as those currently employed as a K-12 music teacher. I recruited initial participants through social media. I posted to various organizational pages focused on music education including, but not limited to, band, choir, and elementary education. I also posted to my own personal pages, and alumni pages of music programs I attended. I followed up two weeks later with a second post to reach additional participants who may have not seen the initial post.

Following initial social media recruitment, I recruited additional participants through various professional musical organizations such as state’s Music Educator Association’s that are a part of the NAfME. I specifically contacted states in which I had little to no participation from, including Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Hawaii, Kansas, Indiana, Idaho, Iowa, Louisiana, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, West Virginia, Vermont, Wisconsin, and Wyoming. Most of these states music education association administrators were responsive and supportive in sharing the survey. I chose to recruit participants through these organizations, as NAfME is of the world’s

largest arts education organizations, and the only one to address all aspects of music education.

NAfME also supports the aims of this study:

Since 1907, NAFME has worked to ensure that every student has access to a well-balanced, comprehensive, and high-quality program of music instruction taught by qualified teachers. NAFME's activities and resources have been largely responsible for the establishment of music education as a profession, for the promotion and guidance of music study as an integral part of the school curriculum, and for the development of the National Standards for Arts Education. (National Association for Music Education, 2022a)

I employed snowball sampling by encouraging recipients of the email to forward the survey to anyone who fit the criteria for participation. NAFME estimates about 50% of all music educators in the U.S. are members of the organization (NAfME, 2022b). I employed convenience sampling to recruit additional participants who may not be within the 50% of NAFME state music education associations music administrators at various universities where I have connections, through my personal and professional network, and through professional pages on social media platforms. I employed snowball sampling by encouraging my contacts to share the survey with qualifying individuals, and through individuals sharing the survey on social media.

Instrument Development

I created an original survey instrument entitled "Music Teacher Perception of Undergraduate Music Education Curricula" hosted on the Qualtrics online platform. I divided the survey into five sections based on the constructs: (a) Conducting and Musical Leadership; (b) Arranging, (c) Functional Performance (including instrumental, keyboard, and vocal

performance), (d) Analysis/History/Literature (NASM 2022), and (e) Field Experience/21st-century teaching, plus three open-ended questions to gain insight into what teachers are feeling in their first few years of teaching music following their undergraduate pre-service training. A brief demographics section concluded the survey.

A construct is the measured subject matter, in this case through survey items (Dew, 2008). The constructs used to measure these questions include the four competencies as listed in the NASM handbook: (a) Conducting and Musical Leadership, (b) Arranging, (c) Functional Performance (including instrumental, keyboard, and vocal performance), and (d) Analysis/History/Literature (NASM 2022), and areas of 21st-century teaching. I developed prompts within each of these constructs based on the 2014 update to the music section of NCCAS, findings in my literature review from previous studies, and my personal experience as a previous K-12 music teacher who graduated with my undergraduate music education degree within the past five years. These prompts include traditional aspects of music teaching, as well as aspects developing high importance in 21st-century music teaching including preparation for urban/rural settings, classroom management, social-emotional learning, music technology, culture and diversity, and non-traditional instruments and ensembles.

I measured the constructs through a set of prompts in which participants responded to six-point Likert scales ranging from 1 = *very unprepared*, to 6 = *very prepared*. The first construct consisted of 20 prompts, the second consisted of eight prompts, the third consisted of 15 prompts, and the fourth consisted of 11 prompts. Following the NASM constructs were six prompts in a category labeled “Other 21st Century Teaching Concepts and Field Experience” in which participants responded to a six-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *strongly disagree*, to 6 = *strongly agree*. Three open-ended questions followed the Likert scale items to give the

participants a chance to list any items which I may have not included in the survey. The survey concluded with 14 demographic questions to provide an additional area of exploration through the participants' state of residence, area of specialty, type of school currently teaching at, type of institution graduated from, and years of experience, as well as standard demographic questions of gender and ethnicity. See Appendix E for a documented copy of the survey instrument.

The purpose of the first construct, "Conducting and Musical Leadership" was to gather data on the participants' perceived preparedness for the classroom in terms of ensembles, classroom management, various music techniques, and administration that come with music teaching. For example, the first question of this construct asks participants to rate their perception of their undergraduate preparation in "Conducting a large ensemble (i.e., band, choir, orchestra, etc.)."

The purpose of the second construct, "Arranging" was to measure music teachers' perceived preparedness to arrange music for various levels, compose music, and use music notation software. The first question of this construct asks participants to rate their perception of their undergraduate preparation in "Use of music notation software (i.e., Finale, Sibelius, MuseScore, etc.)."

The purpose of the third construct, "Functional Performance" was to measure participants' perceived preparedness in both performing and teaching traditional and non-traditional classroom instruments. The first question of this construct asks participants to rate their perception of their undergraduate preparation to "Perform solo on my primary instrument (including voice)."

The purpose of the fourth construct, "Analysis/ History/ Literature" was to measure participants' perceived preparedness to discuss, utilize, and teach various areas of music history

and theory at a variety of levels. The first question of this construct asks participants to rate their perception of their undergraduate preparation to “utilize, discuss, or teach traditional Western/European music history.”

I included the fifth section to gather data on whether certain aspects were present in participants’ undergraduate program, that do not necessarily fit into the NASM music competencies, but are present in the literature as areas individuals would like to be a part of the undergraduate music education curriculum. These areas included keeping content current, field experiences, music technology, diversity, and classroom management. The first question of this construct asks participants to rate their agreement in their undergraduate music education program’s providing of “Adequate *contextual* field experience and/or observations prior to student teaching.”

I included three open-ended questions following the Likert items to gather data on if participants felt any areas of their curriculum were most and least valuable for teaching, as well as any areas which were not present in their undergraduate curriculum, but would have been beneficial to their preparation for the music classroom. These questions are in list format for ease of both responding and analyzing. For example, the first open-ended question is, “Please list one – three courses or concepts required as a part of your undergraduate degree program you feel were most valuable to your success as a music teacher.”

After completing the survey, I conducted three cognitive interviews with individuals outside my target population to identify any possible areas of confusion, and assess validity through content and responses processes (Peterson et al., 2017). I made a few minor changes following the cognitive interviews including adding question of writing drill for marching band, breaking up diversity questions, and adjusting question organization.

Following the cognitive interviews, I conducted a pilot study to gather expert opinion on the relevance of survey items to the topic, and the usability of the survey. I emailed the survey as a pilot study to individuals within my network including graduate students, music professors, and K-12 music educators who did not fit within the desired population for this study ($N = 58$).

Reliability and Validity

I assessed face and content validity through the Delphi method by fellow doctoral scholars and experts in the field of music education, as well as survey research (Dillman, 2014). Through this original assessment of the survey, I added a sixth point to the Likert scale, revised questions for clarity, corrected accidental errors, removed unrelated demographic questions, and rearranged questions for a cleaner flow of the survey. The constructs for this survey are the music competencies as developed by NASM (2022) to serve as a framework for developing and evaluating teacher preparation programs, and 21st-century aspects of teaching as stated in the literature and NCAAS standards, therefore establishing construct validity.

Using the results from the pilot study ($N = 58$), I tested reliability for subscales using Cronbach’s alpha considering above .7 as acceptable and above .8 as good (Privitera & Ahlgrim-Dezell, 2018). Only one subscale produced an alpha below .7. See Table 1 below for a summary of the results:

Table 1.

Pilot Study Reliability Test

Subscale	Items Included	Cronbach’s α
Directing Ensembles	Q1_1-11	.91
Teaching	Q1_12, Q2_1-2	.612
SEL	Q2_3-6	.904
Arranging	Q3 (all)	.921
Functional Performance	Q4 (all)	.822
Literature	Q5_6-8	.816

A potential threat to internal validity is the use of an original survey instrument with most items soliciting a closed-ended response. The Likert scales limited participants just to the six options per prompt, which may not completely describe their views and experiences (Dillman et al., 2014). I reduced this threat by including six scale point items in the Likert to allow for higher reliability (Chomeya, 2010) and avoid a “neutral” option that does not gather many usable data. I also included three open-ended questions following the close-ended prompts to give individuals the opportunity to expand on their perceived perception of their undergraduate music education degree.

Survey research poses threats to external validity through a potential lack of generalizability since receiving a response from every individual fitting the criteria for participation is impractical. Low response rates can limit the population validity, a sub-type of external validity (Privitera & Ahlgrim-Delzell, 2019). I reduced this threat by distributing this survey through many different channels, including through state associations that are a part of the largest platform in music education (NAfME). This is a volunteer, self-report survey, which could threaten internal and external validity. I reduced this threat by encouraging participants to be honest and keeping all survey responses anonymous. There is also a risk of potential bias, as those with strong opinions may be more likely to respond. I reduced this bias by sending the survey to a wide variety of participants, and encouraging all who are eligible to respond regardless of their perception of their undergraduate music education program.

Data Collection

After concluding expert analysis in the pilot study, making suggested adjustments to the survey, and gaining IRB approval, I began distributing the survey. I sent an invitation email to individuals in my network who qualify for the study, as well as collegiate music administrators

in my network who agreed to distribute the survey among alumni of their respective institutions. Once participants received the invite, they had two weeks to complete the survey. As recommended by Dillman et al. (2014), I sent a follow-up email to increase response rate one week following the initial email, and a reminder two days before the survey was due. The survey is anonymous, and I therefore have no way of knowing who completed it, so I included a message in the follow-up emails thanking any individuals who may have already completed the survey. I utilized a similar distribution process through social media. I posted the Qualtrics link to the survey on my personal Facebook and Instagram pages, as well as posted it on music educator groups on Facebook (See Appendix F). I reposted the survey one week following the original post, and again two days before the survey was due.

The informed consent form for the survey displayed when individuals clicked on the Qualtrics link, giving them the option to click “next” to proceed with the survey after reading the letter indicating their consent, or opt out by closing their browser. Participants had the option to close their browser at any point within the survey if they no longer wished to continue. There was no compensation awarded to participants for completing this survey, so all responses were by participants who volunteered their time and expertise. I withdrew responses from any individuals who did not meet a 50% completed rate and excluded their data from analysis.

Data Analysis

I downloaded data from Qualtrics, and imported it into International Business Machines (IBM) Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 28 for analysis. I first analyzed the demographic questions to describe the sample using descriptive statistics of frequencies and percentages. I initially analyzed all survey responses, apart from the open-ended responses, using frequencies and percentages to determine the overall perceived preparedness through their

undergraduate music education curriculum in terms of the constructs listed in the survey. I formatted the three open-ended items as a text-entry list for ease of coding. I hand-coded responses from the three questions into a quantitative format using open coding to find common themes. I copied all responses into Microsoft Excel and closely examined them for similarities and differences (Saldaña, 2016) using open-coding. I then combined like-items and calculated frequencies and percentages to determine what the main areas participants felt would have been beneficial in their preservice training, and what concepts out of their training were the most and least valuable to their careers. I ran nonparametric tests to check for any data that could violate the assumptions of parametric statistical tests (Privitera & Ahlgrim-Dezell, 2019). Following descriptive analysis, I checked data to assure assumptions for parametric procedures were met, and then used inferential statistics to generalize participant responses to the larger population of music educators (Privitera & Ahlgrim-Dezell, 2019).

I ran Cronbach's alphas and factor analysis to combine survey items relating to the same construct into a scale to improve statistical power. I attempted to answer RQ1 (What are current music teachers' perceptions of how well their undergraduate music education programs prepared them to teach each of the music competencies in the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) handbook?) and its sub-questions using frequencies and percentages. I then elaborated on the results using inferential statistics.

I used a similar process for RQ2 (What are current music teachers' perceptions of how well their undergraduate music education program prepared them to teach 21st-century music concepts?) and its sub-questions, except I kept responses to each prompt individualized, rather than grouped by construct.

I ran frequencies and percentages in attempt to answer RQ3 (What are current music teachers' perceptions of the amount of field experience during their undergraduate career?) using inferential statistics on the individual prompt regarding field experience.

After I hand-coded the open-ended responses, I attempted to answer RQ4 (What concepts/curricular areas do current music teachers feel were most and least helpful to their success in teaching music?) and the sub-question (What concepts were not taught as a part of the undergraduate curriculum that current music teachers felt would have been beneficial in undergraduate music education studies?) using frequencies and percentages, and inferential statistics.

I ran several multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA) and one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) to examine demographic effects on participant responses. For example, I tested if there was a significant difference in perception of preparedness in construct 1 (Conducting and Musical Leadership) between individuals who attended undergraduate institutions in the Northeast region in comparison to the Southeast region. I then attempted to answer RQ5 (Are there any significant differences in responses to survey questions based on participants' demographic variables?) through appropriate post hoc analyses to determine any significant differences among groupings (Privitera & Ahlgrim-Delzell, 2019). See Table 1 below for a summary of research question to survey item pairings, and data analysis procedures.

Table 2.

Data Analysis Overview

	Research Question	Survey Items	Analysis
1	What are current music teachers' perceptions of how well their undergraduate music education programs prepared them to teach each of the music competencies in the	Q1-6	Descriptives

Research Question	Survey Items	Analysis
National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) handbook?		
1.1 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Conducting and Musical Leadership?	Q1-2	Descriptives
1.2 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Arranging?	Q3	Descriptives
1.3 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Functional Performance?	Q4	Descriptives
1.4 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Analysis/History/Literature?	Q5	Descriptives
2.1 What are the main curricular areas that current music teachers felt most prepared for in their first few years of teaching?	Q1-6	Descriptives
2.2 What are the main curricular areas that current music teachers felt least prepared for in their first few years of teaching?	Q1-6	Descriptives
3 What are current music teachers' perceptions of the amount of field experience during their undergraduate career?	Q6	Descriptives
4 What concepts/curricular areas do current music teachers feel were most and least valuable to their success in teaching music?	L1-2	Frequencies Percentages
4.1 What curricular area do current music teachers feel was most valuable in their success in teaching music?	L1	Frequencies Percentages
4.2 What curricular area, if any, do current music teachers feel was unvaluable to their success in teaching music?	L2	Frequencies Percentages
4.3 What concepts were not taught as a part of the undergraduate curriculum that current music teachers felt would have been beneficial in undergraduate music education studies?	L3	Frequencies Percentages

	Research Question	Survey Items	Analysis
5	Which demographic variables, if any, have significantly different responses to survey construct items?	D1-1Q1-6, L1-3	<i>t</i> -test ANOVA

This study was built using a pragmatic approach to collect practical and usable data. The data will demonstrate current music teachers' perception of their undergraduate music education degree program in the areas of Conducting and Musical Leadership, Arranging, Functional Performance (including instrumental, keyboard, and vocal performance), Analysis/History/Literature, and other areas of 21st century teaching. I hope data collected can give undergraduate music education administrators and instructors a greater understanding of how institutions could better prepare future music teachers.

Chapter Four

Results

The purpose of this research was to discover current teachers' perceptions of their undergraduate music education degree, and to compare the impact of various demographic variables on their perception of preparedness for teaching music. Data were collected through anonymous online survey responses from current K-12 music teachers across the country. I posted to a total of 10 social media pages on Facebook, and to my personal Facebook page and Instagram (See Appendix E). A total of 32 emails were sent to state music education associations who had little to no participation following initial social media recruitment. All email and social media recipients were encouraged to share the survey link to others who fit the criteria for participation. A total of 321 responses were collected through Qualtrics, and a total of 270 of those responses were usable for the study. Due using snowball sampling, a valid response rate could not be calculated. The usable rate was 84.11%.

Response Rate and Reliability

I recruited current K-12 music teachers for participation in this study. The original survey instrument received a total of 321 responses. Three participants did not respond to the consent after reading the information letter. Twenty-seven responded "No" to the initial screening question (Are you currently employed as a K-12 music teacher in the United States, or have been within the last 3 years?) which redirected them to the end of the survey since they did not fit the criteria for participation. I removed those who did not complete at least 50% of the survey from the remaining responses. This yielded a total of 270 usable responses, resulting in a usable rate of 84.11%.

I calculated Cronbach's alpha coefficient for each Likert scale used in the survey to measure internal consistency among the constructs, as well as calculated the Cronbach's alpha if any item were deleted to measure internal consistency among each statement. Each of the six scales used in the survey produced an acceptable alpha coefficient of at least .70. No items would have significantly increased the alpha coefficient if removed. See Table 3 for a summary of Cronbach's alpha coefficients for each of the scales used in the survey.

Table 3.

Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients for Likert Scales

Construct Scale	Scale Items	Cronbach's α
Preparedness Levels for Elements of Conducting and Musical Leadership (Conducting Focused)	12	.832
Preparedness Levels for Elements of Conducting and Musical Leadership (Musical Leadership Focused)	12	.925
Preparedness Levels for Elements of Arranging	9	.904
Preparedness Levels for Elements of Functional Performance	15	.853
Preparedness Levels for Elements of Analysis, History, and Literature	11	.834
Agreement Levels for Offered Coursework	7	.849

Participant Demographics

General Demographics

All participants in this study were current music teachers at either the elementary, middle, or high school level in the United States, or have been within the last three years. Out of the 270 responses, 147 participants (54.4%) identified as female, 112 participants (41.5%) identified as male, seven participants (2.6%) chose to self-describe (six nonbinary, one other), and four participants (1.5%) preferred not to say their identified gender. When asked to identify ethnicity/race, 14 participants (5.2%) identified as Asian, 11 participants (4.1%) identified as Black/African American, two participants (.7%) identified as Native American/American Indian/

Alaska Native, 221 (81.9%) identified as White/Caucasian, seven (2.6%) described as two or more races, four chose to self-describe (1.5%) including races of European-American, Indian subcontinent, Italian, and one unknown, five (1.9%) preferred not to say their race/ethnicity, and there was one (.4%) missing response. Participants' ages ranged from 20 to 75, with 58.6% of participants 40 years old or less, and 40.6% over 40 years of age. The remaining .8% included one missing response, and one participant who in their comments admittedly reported an inaccurate age. See Table 4 below for a summary of the above demographics.

Table 4.

Participant Demographics

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Gender		
Female	147	54.4
Male	112	41.5
Self-Describe		
Nonbinary	7	2.2
Unknown	1	.4
Prefer Not to Say	4	1.5
Ethnicity		
Asian	14	5.2
Black/African American	11	4.1
Native American/American Indian/Alaska Native	2	.7
White/Caucasian	221	81.9
Two or More Races	7	2.6
Self-Describe		
European-American	1	.4
Indian Subcontinent	1	.4
Italian	1	.4
Unknown	1	.4
Prefer not to Say	5	1.9
Missing	1	.4
Age		
20-40	175	58.6
40-75	93	40.6
Missing/Unknown	2	.8

Educational Demographics

Participants were asked to report their preparation for teaching music. Two-hundred and thirty-three participants (86.3%) reported their teacher preparation was through a traditional music education undergraduate program, 13 reported their preparation was through a performance undergraduate program, nine participants (3.3%) reported an alternative program, and 15 participants (5.6%) reported other, and listed their type of preparation. I recoded this into individuals who had traditional music education undergraduate preparation ($n=248$, 91.9%) and individuals who had non-traditional preparation ($n=22$, 8.1%) for analysis purposes. Individuals who reported *other* were included with the traditional music education statistic for analysis, as they described their preparation as an undergraduate in music education either with a double major in performance, theory, or other graduate degree. When participants were asked what type of music institution attended 119 (44.1%) reported they attended a department of music, 87 participants (32.2%) reported school of music, 59 (21.9%) reported college of music, four (1.5%) reported conservatory of music, and one response was missing. Participants reported the state where they completed their degree, but since 10 states were missing (Alaska, Arkansas, Delaware, Idaho, Iowa, Nebraska, Nevada, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Utah), responses were grouped by region according to the NAFME Federal State Associations regions (NAfME, 2023). See Table 5 for a breakdown of regions.

Table 5.*NAfME (2023) Federal State Association Regions*

Eastern	North Central	Northwest	Southern	Southwestern	Western
Connecticut	Illinois	Alaska	Alabama	Arkansas	Arizona
Delaware	Indiana	Idaho	Florida	Colorado	California
Maine	Iowa	Montana	Georgia	Kansas	Hawaii
Maryland	Michigan	Oregon	Kentucky	Missouri	Nevada
Massachusetts	Minnesota	Washington	Louisiana	New Mexico	Utah
New Hampshire	Nebraska	Wyoming	Mississippi	Oklahoma	
New Jersey	North Dakota		North Carolina	Texas	
New York	Ohio		South Carolina		
Pennsylvania	South Dakota		Tennessee		
Rhode Island	Wisconsin		Virginia		
Vermont			West Virginia		
Washington D.C.					

One-hundred and twenty participants (44.4%) reported they attended an undergraduate institution in the Eastern region, 26 participants (9.6%) attended undergraduate in the North Central region, four participants (1.5%) attended undergraduate in the Northwest region, 73 participants (27%) attended undergraduate in the Southern region, 28 participants (10.4%) attended undergraduate in the Southwestern region, 13 participants (4.8%) attended undergraduate in the Western region, and six participants (2.2%) did not report where they attended undergraduate. Participants were asked about their primary instrument group studied in undergraduate. One-hundred and one participants (37.4%) reported Woodwind as their primary instrument group, 72 (26.7%) reported Brass, 18 (6.7%) reported Percussion, 16 (5.9%) reported Strings, 19 (7%) reported Piano, 43 (15.9%) reported Voice, and one (.4%) did not report their primary instrument group in their undergraduate studies. Participants were asked their highest degree attained. One-hundred and seventeen participants (43.3%) reported their highest degree attained was a Bachelor's degree, three participants (1.1%) reported an Advanced Certificate, 133 participants (49.3%) reported a Master's degree, five participants (1.9%) reported an

Education Specialist degree, and 12 participants (4.4%) reported a Doctorate as their highest degree attained. I re-grouped these categories into participants with only a Bachelor's degree ($n = 117, 43.3\%$), and participants with an advanced degree ($n = 153, 56.7\%$) for analysis purposes since this survey measured participants' perception strictly of their undergraduate experience.

See Table 6 for a summary of participant educational demographics.

Table 6.

Educational Demographics

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Teacher Preparation		
Traditional Music Education Undergraduate	248	91.9
Non-Traditional Preparation	22	8.1
Type of Music Institution Attended		
Department	119	44.1
School	87	32.2
College	59	21.9
Conservatory	4	1.5
Missing	1	.4
Undergraduate Institution Region		
Eastern	120	44.4
North Central	26	9.6
Northwest	4	1.5
Southern	73	27
Southwestern	28	10.4
Western	13	4.8
Missing	6	2.2
Primary Undergraduate Instrument Group		
Woodwind	101	37.4
Brass	72	26.7
Percussion	18	6.7
Strings	16	5.9
Piano	19	7
Voice	43	15.9
Missing	1	.4
Highest Degree Attained		
Bachelor's Degree	117	43.3
Advanced Degree	153	56.7

Teaching Demographics

Two-hundred and fifty-eight participants (95.6%) reported they were teaching full-time (40+ hours a week), and 12 participants (4.4%) reported they were teaching part-time (less than 40 hours a week). Participants were asked in what state they are currently teaching. Since there were six states missing (Arkansas, Delaware, Idaho, Nebraska, South Dakota, and Utah), data were grouped into the same NAFME Federal State Association regions as the undergraduate state data above. See Table 5. for a breakdown of states in each region. One—hundred and fifteen participants (42.6%) reported they were teaching in the Eastern region, 23 (8.5%) taught in the North Central region, six (2.2%) were teaching in the Northwest region, 81 (30%) were teaching in the Southern region, 28 (10.4%) were teaching in the Southwestern region, 16 (5.9%) were teaching in the Western region, and one participant did not report where they were teaching. Within these regions, participants were asked how they would classify the area in which they teach. Sixty-seven participants (24.8%) classified their area as urban, 54 (20%) classified their area as rural, 105 (38.9%) classified their area as suburban, and 44 participants (16.3%) classified their area as a small town. The majority of participants taught in a public school, but there were a handful of participants that taught in another type of school. Two-hundred and forty-four participants (90.4%) labeled their school as a traditional public school, 15 (5.6%) labeled their school as a private school, 10 (3.7%) labeled their school as a charter school, and one (.4%) labeled their school as a magnet school.

Participants were almost evenly split between levels in which they teach. Note that many participants taught multiple levels, and could check all that apply. One-hundred and sixteen participants (43%) reported they were teaching at the elementary level, 137 (50.7%) reported they were teaching at the middle school level, and 134 (49.6%) reported they were teaching at

the high school level. Similar to the level in which they were teaching, many participants taught multiple areas of music. One-hundred and seventy-six participants (65.2%) reported they were teaching instrumental music – band, 38 (14.1%) were teaching instrumental music – strings, 82 (30.4%) were teaching vocal music, and 136 (50.4%) were teaching general music. Participants had a wide range of music teaching experience. For analysis purposes, I grouped data into less than 10 years of teaching experience, 10 years or more of teaching experience. One-hundred and thirty-eight participants (51.1%) taught for less than 10 years, 130 (48.1%) taught for 10 or more years, and two (.7%) did not report their amount of teaching experience. Participants were asked whether or not they were professionally teaching prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. Two-hundred and nineteen participants (81.1%) reported they were teaching prior to the pandemic, 50 (18.5%) reported they were not teaching prior to the pandemic, and one did not report whether or not they were teaching prior to the pandemic. See Table 7 below for a summary of participant teaching demographics.

Table 7.*Teaching Demographics*

Characteristic	<i>n</i>	%
Employment Level		
Full-Time	258	95.6
Part-Time	12	4.4
School Region		
Eastern	115	42.6
North Central	23	8.5
Northwest	6	2.2
Southern	81	30
Southwestern	28	10.4
Western	16	5.9
Missing	1	.4
Area Classification		
Urban	67	24.8
Rural	54	20
Suburban	105	38.9
Small Town	44	16.3
School Type		
Traditional Public School	244	90.4
Private School	15	5.6
Charter	10	3.7
Magnet	1	.4
Teaching Level		
Elementary School	116	43
Middle School	137	50.7
High School	134	49.6
Area of Music		
Instrumental – Band	176	65.2
Instrumental – Strings	38	14.1
Vocal	82	30.4
General	136	50.4
Years Teaching Experience		
Less than 10	138	51.1
10 or More	130	48.1
Teaching Prior to COVID-19 Pandemic		
Yes	219	81.1
No	50	18.5

Research Question 1

What are current music teachers' perceptions of how well their undergraduate music education programs prepared them to teach each of the music competencies in the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) handbook?

I used descriptive statistics to answer the first research question, measuring music teachers' perceived preparedness of various aspects of music teaching that relate to the music competencies required of undergraduate music education institutions as listed by NASM. Participants were asked to report how well they believed their undergraduate institution prepared them to use/teach elements relating to each of the four NASM Music Competencies: Conducting and Musical Leadership, Arranging, Functional Performance, and Analysis/History/Literature. Participants rated their level of preparedness with several statements regarding specific elements of music teaching pertaining to the NASM music competencies using a six-point Likert scale (1 = *very unprepared*, 6 = *very prepared*). I calculated a subscale mean for each statement to serve as the overall mean for each construct.

1.1 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Conducting and Musical Leadership?

Participants reported a moderate level of preparedness for most statements of conducting and ensemble teaching. Participants expressed the highest level of preparedness for "Listening in an ensemble or individually" ($M = 4.98$, $SD = 1.03$) and the lowest level of preparedness for "Leading a nontraditional ensemble (e.g., rock band)" ($M = 2.50$, $SD = 1.37$). The subscale mean indicated participants generally felt between somewhat prepared and prepared in areas of conducting based on their undergraduate preparation ($M = 4.22$, $SD = 1.25$). See Table 8 for descriptive statistics for all statements regarding conducting and ensemble teaching preparation.

Table 8.*Descriptive Statistics for Perceived Preparedness in areas of Conducting and Musical**Leadership – Conducting Focused*

Statement	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Listening in an ensemble or individually	4.98	1.03
Rehearsal technique	4.96	1.03
Conducting a large ensemble (e.g., band, choir, orchestra, etc.)	4.93	1.12
Error detection in ensemble	4.88	1.13
Lesson Planning	4.70	1.25
Conducting a small or chamber ensemble	4.57	1.22
Programming music for performance	4.50	1.23
Teaching intonation	4.39	1.01
Leading a marching band	3.64	1.72
Conducting an ensemble outside my specialty (e.g., vocal conducting band)	3.49	1.36
Leading a jazz ensemble	3.08	1.47
Leading a nontraditional ensemble (e.g., rock band)	2.50	1.37
Subscale	4.22	1.25

Participants reported a low level of preparedness for most statements of musical leadership, including elements of classroom management and administration. Participants felt their undergraduate preparation prepared them most for “Communication with colleagues” ($M = 4.17$, $SD = 1.33$), and felt least prepared for “Teaching students with high levels of trauma” ($M = 2.37$, $SD = 1.24$). The subscale mean of all statements indicated participants generally felt between somewhat unprepared and somewhat prepared in areas of musical leadership including classroom management and administration based on their undergraduate preparation ($M = 3.08$, $SD = 1.41$). See Table 9 for descriptive statistics for all statements regarding musical leadership, classroom management, and administration preparation.

Table 9.*Descriptive Statistics for Perceived Preparedness in areas of Conducting and Musical**Leadership – Musical Leadership Focused*

Statement	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Communication with colleagues	4.17	1.33
Utilizing educational psychology (e.g., learning theories)	3.98	1.30
Communication with administration	3.96	1.90
Classroom Management	3.67	1.46
Communication with families	3.57	1.44
Administrative duties that come with teaching (e.g., handling a budget)	3.23	1.50
Teaching in a variety of settings (urban, rural, suburban)	3.20	1.46
Handling social-emotional aspects of teaching	3.16	1.31
Handling student disagreements or refusals to participate	2.91	1.31
Teaching students with adverse emotional needs	2.77	1.27
Teaching students with high levels of trauma	2.37	1.24
Subscale	3.08	1.41

1.2 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Arranging?

Participants reported a low to moderate level of preparedness from their undergraduate music education preparation in the area of arranging. Participants felt they were most prepared for “Use of music notation software (e.g., Finale)” ($M = 4.7, SD = 1.99$), and least prepared to “arrange for nontraditional ensemble (e.g., rock band)” ($M = 2.46, SD = 1.68$). The subscale mean of all statements indicated participants generally felt somewhat unprepared to somewhat prepared in the area of arranging based on their undergraduate music education preparation ($M = 3.55, SD = 1.86$). See Table 10 for descriptive statistics for all statements regarding arranging.

Table 10.*Descriptive Statistics for Perceived Preparedness in Areas of Arranging*

Statement	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Use music notation software (e.g., Finale)	4.67	1.99
Arrange for beginning ensemble (band/choir/orchestra)	4.41	1.83
Arrange for intermediate ensemble (band/choir/orchestra)	4.08	1.82
Compose ensemble literature or exercises	3.58	1.94
Arrange for advanced ensemble (band/choir/orchestra)	3.57	1.90
Arrange for athletic band (marching band, pep band)	3.26	1.90
Compose solo literature or exercises	3.09	1.81
Design marching band drill	2.89	1.89
Arrange for nontraditional ensemble (e.g., rock band)	2.46	1.68
Subscale	3.55	1.86

1.3 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Functional Performance?

Participants reported a wide range of preparedness in various areas of functional performance. Participants expressed their undergraduate program prepared them most to “Perform in an ensemble on my primary instrument (including voice)” ($M = 5.86$, $SD = 0.47$) and felt their undergraduate program prepared them least for “Instrument repair” ($M = 2.62$, $SD = 1.35$). The subscale mean of all statements indicated participants generally felt between somewhat prepared to prepared in the area of functional performance based on their undergraduate preparation ($M = 4.42$, $SD = 1.15$). See Table 11 for descriptive statistics for all statements regarding functional performance.

Table 11.*Descriptive Statistics for Perceived Preparedness in Areas of Functional Performance*

Statement	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Perform in an ensemble on my primary instrument (including voice)	5.86	0.47
Perform solo on my primary instrument (including voice)	5.73	0.64
Teach how to play my primary instrument (including voice)	5.52	0.88
Teach how to read music	5.10	1.08
Teach practice techniques	4.87	1.18
Teach beginning instrumental/voice lessons	4.80	1.15
Individual instrument/vocal pedagogy	4.75	1.08
Teach how to play instruments outside my primary area	4.53	1.21
Teach advanced instrumental/voice lessons	4.49	1.22
Perform on instruments outside my primary area	4.42	1.20
Teach performance technique for a variety of genres (e.g., Baroque)	4.27	1.32
Accompany solo instrument/ voice or ensemble, on piano	3.37	1.58
Musician health (mental and physical)	2.98	1.41
Teach nontraditional ensemble instruments (e.g., ukulele)	2.93	1.46
Instrument repair	2.62	1.35
Subscale	4.42	1.15

1.4 To what extent do current music teachers perceive their undergraduate music education curriculum prepared them in the area of Analysis/History/Literature?

Participants reported a moderate level of preparedness in the area of analysis, history, and literature. Participants felt their undergraduate program prepared them most to “Utilize, discuss, or teach important literature within your specialty area (e.g., band, choir, orchestra)” ($M = 4.89$, $SD = 1.05$) and least prepared them to “Utilize, discuss, or teach important literature outside your specialty area” ($M = 3.41$, $SD = 1.28$). The subscale mean of all statements indicated generally felt between somewhat prepared to prepared in the area of analysis, history, and literature, based on their undergraduate preparation program ($M = 4.15$, $SD = 1.29$). See Table 12 for descriptive statistics for all statements regarding analysis, history, and literature. Each prompt in this section began with “Utilize, discuss, or teach” except the last three.

Table 12.*Descriptive Statistics for Perceived Preparedness in Areas of Analysis/History/Literature*

Statement	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Basic music theory, functional for a K-12 classroom	4.94	1.07
Important literature within your specialty area (e.g., band, choir, orchestra)	4.89	1.05
Western/European music history	4.81	1.18
Analyze a large-scale ensemble piece for efficient rehearsal	4.77	1.16
Advanced music theory	4.41	1.35
Elementary general music	4.14	1.43
Popular music history	3.69	1.38
Teach music appreciation (middle or high school level)	3.66	1.54
Diverse literature	3.51	1.37
Music technology	3.43	1.42
Important literature outside your specialty area	3.41	1.28
Subscale	4.15	1.29

Research Question 2

What are current music teachers' perceptions of how well their undergraduate music education programs prepared them to teach 21st-century music concepts?

I used descriptive statistics to answer the second research question. Tables 8-12 above display participants feelings of preparedness for various aspect relating to 21st century teaching. In addition, participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with statements regarding whether their undergraduate institution offered courses on and/or included various concepts of 21st century curriculum. Participants responded to each statement on a six-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 6 = *strongly agree*). I calculated a subscale mean for each statement to serve as the overall mean for each construct.

Participants reported a low level of agreement with whether their undergraduate music education institution provided coursework or experience with the following areas of 21st century teaching. Participants agreed most that their institution provided them coursework or experience in “Keeping the classroom current in terms of musical content and curriculum” ($M = 3.97$, $SD =$

1.25), and agreed the least that their institution provided them coursework or experience in “Diversity (racial, cultural, gender, sexuality, religious)” ($M = 3.36, SD = 1.46$). The subscale mean of all statements indicated participants somewhat disagreed that their institution offered them coursework or experience in areas of 21st century teaching. See Table 13 below for descriptive statistics for statements regarding whether institutions included various 21st-century teaching concepts into their coursework. Each statement began with “My undergraduate music education institution offered coursework and/or included the following within the coursework:”.

Table 13.

Descriptive Statistics for Levels of Agreement Whether Institutions Offered Coursework or Experience in Various Areas of 21st-Century Teaching

Statement	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Keeping the classroom current in terms of musical content and curriculum	3.97	1.25
Music Technology	3.48	1.41
Classroom Management	3.45	1.42
Diversity (intellectual, physical, emotional)	3.44	1.41
Diversity (racial, cultural, gender, sexuality, religious)	3.36	1.46
Subscale	3.54	1.39

2.1 What are the main curricular areas that current music teachers felt most prepared for in their first few years of teaching?

Participants felt most prepared in the curricular area of functional performance ($M = 4.42, SD = 1.15$), followed closely by the area of conducting and musical leadership – conducting focused ($M = 4.22, SD = 1.25$). The curricular area of analysis, history, and literature fell in the middle of most prepared and least prepared ($M = 4.15, SD = 1.29$), but is still in the somewhat prepared range. Out of every statement in each of the curricular areas surveyed, participants felt their undergraduate institution prepared them most to “Perform in an ensemble on my primary instrument (including voice)” ($M = 5.86, SD = 0.47$) followed closely by “Perform solo on my

primary instrument (including voice)” ($M = 5.73, SD = 0.64$) and “Teach how to play my primary instrument (including voice)” ($M = 5.52, SD = 0.88$). The statements above were the only three out all curricular areas to have a mean score in the five-range prepared), and all came from the area of functional performance. There were no statements that had a mean score in the six-range (very prepared). See Tables 8-12 for descriptive statistics for participants perceived preparedness in each curricular area based on their undergraduate music education preparation.

2.2 What are the main curricular areas that current music teachers felt least prepared for in their first few years of teaching?

Participants felt least prepared in the area of conducting and musical leadership – musical leadership focused ($M = 3.08, SD = 1.41$) followed closely by the area of arranging ($M = 3.55, SD = 1.86$). Out of every statement in each of the curricular areas surveyed, participants felt their undergraduate institution prepared them least for “Teaching students with high levels of trauma” ($M = 2.37, SD = 1.24$) followed closely by “arrange for nontraditional ensemble (e.g., rock band)” ($M = 2.46, SD = 1.68$) and “Leading a nontraditional ensemble (e.g., rock band)” ($M = 2.50, SD = 1.37$). Participants reporting feeling unprepared (mean in the two-range) for six other specific concepts: “Instrument repair” ($M = 2.62, SD = 1.35$), “Teaching students with adverse emotional needs” ($M = 2.77, SD = 1.77$), “Design marching band drill” ($M = 2.89, SD = 1.89$), “Handling student disagreements or refusals to participate” ($M = 2.91, SD = 1.31$), “Teach nontraditional ensemble instruments (e.g., ukulele)” ($M = 2.93, SD = 1.46$), and “Teach musician health (mental and physical)” ($M = 2.98, SD = 1.41$).

Research Question 3

What are current music teachers’ perceptions of the amount of field experience during their undergraduate career?

I used descriptive statistics to answer the third research question. Participants responded to both statements on a six-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 6 = *strongly agree*) based on their field experience during their undergraduate studies. I calculated a subscale mean for each statement to serve as the overall mean for the construct.

Participants moderately agreed their undergraduate institution provided them enough field experience. Participants agreed most that they were provided “Adequate contextual (content taught/given before observation) field experience and/or observations prior to student teaching” ($M = 4.42, SD = 1.43$), and agreed just slightly less that they were provided with “Other outside experience to enhance coursework” ($M = 4.20, SD = 1.34$). Each statement began with “My undergraduate music education institution offered coursework and/or included the following within the coursework:”. The subscale mean for both statements indicated that participants somewhat agreed that they had adequate field experience in their undergraduate preparation program ($M = 4.31, SD = 1.34$).

Table 14.

Descriptive Statistics for Levels of Agreement Whether Institutions Offered Adequate Field Experience

Statement	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Adequate contextual (content taught/given before observation) field experience and/or observations prior to student teaching	4.42	1.43
Other outside experiences to enhance coursework	4.20	1.25
Subscale	4.31	1.34

Research Question 4

What concepts/curricular areas do current music teachers feel were most and least helpful to their success in teaching music?

I used frequencies and percentages to answer the fourth research question. Participants were asked to list courses and/or curricular areas they felt were most valuable, least valuable, and courses and/or curricular areas they feel would have been greatly beneficial in their undergraduate music program. I measured which courses/curricular areas were most valuable, least valuable, which participants desired most by combining items that were identical or almost identical, and calculating percentages for each item. Participants could list up to three items each; therefore, the total number of responses is greater than the total number of participants, and the percentage is of the total number of responses for each question.

4.1 What courses/curricular area do current music teachers feel was most valuable in their success in teaching music?

Participants listed skills method courses (including instrumental, vocal, etc.) to be the most valuable course/area in their undergraduate studies ($n = 130$, 22.7%), followed by conducting ($n = 72$, 12.9%) and level method (i.e., elementary, secondary) courses ($n = 55$, 9.6%). Skills method courses falls under the curricular area/construct of functional performance, conducting falls under the conducting and musical leadership area/construct, and level method courses fall under education, but for the purpose of this study fall into the conducting and musical leadership construct. See Table 15 for a summary of frequencies and percentages for all courses/curricular areas listed by participants as most valuable to their success in teaching music.

Table 15.*Frequencies of Most Valuable Undergraduate Courses/Curricular Areas*

Course/Curricular Area	<i>n</i>	%
Skills Methods (instrumental, vocal, etc.)	130	22.7
Conducting (advanced, choral, instrumental)	74	12.9
Level Methods (elementary, secondary)	55	9.6
Theory (basic, advanced, etc.)	43	7.5
Field Experience (observations, student teaching, practicum, etc.)	43	7.5
Ensembles	32	5.6
Applied Lessons (voice, instrument, conducting)	29	5.1
Piano (skills, accompany, lessons, etc.)	25	4.4
Rehearsal Technique	25	4.4
Aural Skills	18	3.1
Arranging/Instrumentation	15	2.6
Diversity (exceptionalities, disabilities, cultural, etc.)	14	2.4
Administration	13	2.3
Education (General, Intro music)	12	2.1
Psychology (educational, music, etc.)	11	1.9
Literature	10	1.7
History (jazz, western, etc.)	9	1.6
Marching Band (techniques, drill writing, ensemble)	6	1
Classroom Management	3	0.5
Technology	2	0.3
English/Writing	2	0.3
Lesson Planning	1	0.2

4.2 What courses/curricular area, if any, do current music teachers feel was unhelpful to their success in teaching music?

Participants listed general education courses (also known as liberal arts courses) including courses in math, science, foreign language, etc., as the least valuable taken in their undergraduate studies ($n = 71$, 20.2%). The next four least valuable courses were very close in frequency, including skills methods ($n = 36$, 10.3%), music history ($n = 35$, 10%), advanced theory ($n = 33$, 9.4%), and non-music specific education courses ($n = 32$, 9.1%). Skills methods

falls into the curricular area/construct of functional performance, and advanced theory falls into the area/construct of history, analysis, and literature. General education courses and non-music specific education courses do not fall into the constructs, as they are decided by institution requirements for type (liberal arts, R1, etc.), and local. Many participants commented it was not the course that was of low value, but the way it was taught. See Table 16 for a summary of frequencies and percentages for all courses/curricular areas listed by participants as least valuable.

Table 16.

Frequencies of Least Valuable Undergraduate Courses/Curricular Areas

Course/Curricular Area	<i>n</i>	%
General Education (Math, Science, Foreign Language, etc.)	71	20.2
Skills Methods (instrumental, vocal, etc.)	36	10.3
Music History	35	10
Advanced Theory	33	9.4
Education (non-music specific)	32	9.1
Technology	19	5.4
Methods (level: elementary, secondary, mid, high)	19	5.4
Music Education	12	3.4
Piano	11	3.1
Performance Attendance (convocation, etc.)	11	3.1
Psychology (education, child, etc.)	9	2.6
Performance	8	2.3
Diversity (exceptionalities, disabilities, cultural, etc.)	8	2.3
Theory (basics, aural skills, etc.)	7	2
Aural Skills	6	1.7
Literature	6	1.7
Music Appreciation	6	1.7
Arranging/Orchestration	6	1.7
Ensemble	5	1.4
Marching Band (ensemble, techniques, methods)	4	1.1
Advanced Conducting	3	0.9
Lessons	2	0.5
Diction	2	0.5

4.3 What concepts were not taught as a part of the undergraduate curriculum that current music teachers felt would have been beneficial in undergraduate music education studies?

Participants listed a large variety of courses that were either not offered in their undergraduate music education studies and that would have been beneficial, or courses/concepts they desired more within their degree program. Music specific classroom management was the most commonly listed concept ($n = 55$, 10.2%) participants felt would have been beneficial to have or have more of within their undergraduate music education studies. 44 participants (8.7%) listed that a more modern music technology course would have been beneficial in their undergraduate studies, including learning about sound systems, engineering, recording, notation, etc. Instrument repair ($n = 31$, 6.1%) and administration/program management ($n = 22$, 4.3%) followed closely as top desired courses. See Table 17 for a summary of frequencies and percentages for all courses/curricular areas participants felt would have been beneficial during their undergraduate studies.

Table 17.

Frequencies of Desired Courses/Curricular Areas

Course/Curricular Area	<i>n</i>	%
Classroom Management (Music Specific)	55	10.2
Music Technology (Sound systems/engineering, recording, notation, etc.)	44	8.7
Instrument repair	31	6.1
Administration/Program Management	22	4.3
Teaching Music to Special Learners (Diverse – emotional/mental/physical, ELL)	21	4.2
More/Updated General Music Methods (Elementary, secondary)	19	3.8
Budget/Financing/Fundraising (Music teacher focused)	17	3.4
Communication (Parents, colleagues, admin, community, etc.)	17	3.4
Arranging/composition (all ensembles, all levels)	16	3.2
More Methods Courses (Instrumental, Vocal, String) -Teaching Focused	16	3.2
Social Emotional Learning	12	2.4
Trauma-Informed Teaching	12	2.4
Curriculum Design/Development	11	2.1

Course/Curricular Area	<i>n</i>	%
More Diverse Field Experience	11	2.1
Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion in Music	10	2.0
Teaching Non-traditional Instruments (Guitar, ukulele, etc.)	10	2.0
Marching Band Methods	10	2.0
Jazz Methods/Pedagogy	9	1.8
Lesson planning (local standards, long term, non-music educational “fads”)	9	1.8
Modern Band	9	1.8
Programming/Literature – All Levels - Diverse (Culture & Time-Period)	9	1.8
Advanced Conducting/More Podium Time	8	1.6
Behavior Management/Conflict Resolution	8	1.6
Program Building	7	1.4
Classes on various teaching environments like suburban, urban, rural	6	1.2
Contemporary/Diverse Music History	6	1.2
Rehearsal technique	6	1.2
Teaching beginning instruments and note reading	6	1.2
Methods for Teaching Voice for Instrumentalists	5	1.0
Teaching student with various skill levels simultaneously	5	1.0
Assessment/Grading	4	0.8
Culturally Responsive Teaching	4	0.8
How To Teach Music Appreciation	4	0.8
Orff/Kodaly training	4	0.8
Popular Music (teaching, learning)	4	0.8
Music Business	3	0.5
Chamber/Small Ensembles	3	0.5
Drill Design/Writing	3	0.5
Mental/Physical Health Pertaining to Music Education/Performance - Balance	3	0.5
Music Learning Theory/Styles	3	0.5
Music Psychology/Philosophy	3	0.5
Non-traditional ensembles	3	0.5
Expectations/Preparing for Evaluations	3	0.5
Non-Primary Lessons	3	0.5
Teaching Non-traditional Ensembles	3	0.5
World Music (vetted and culturally responsive)	3	0.5
Advocacy	2	0.4
Beginning Band Methods	2	0.4
Child Psychology/Development	2	0.4
Improvisation	2	0.4
Foundational Theory - Score Analysis	2	0.4
Rock band	2	0.4

Course/Curricular Area	<i>n</i>	%
Anything vocal!	1	0.2
Choral accompanying	1	0.2
Creating tasks to show proficiency	1	0.2
Importance of research	1	0.2
Jazz History	1	0.2
Jazz Theory	1	0.2
Lab Band	1	0.2
Marching Band dance and choreography	1	0.2
Pediatric Vocal Pedagogy	1	0.2
Practicing time	1	0.2
Something like toastmasters/talking in front of a group	1	0.2
Teaching Music History	1	0.2
What to do the first day	1	0.2
Diction courses for instrumentalists	1	0.2

Research Question 5

Which demographic variables, if any, have significantly different responses to survey construct items?

I calculated a series of analytical tests to determine if any demographic factors influenced participants' responses to the constructs measured. I ran one-way Analysis of Variance tests (ANOVAs) for each independent demographic variable with more than two groups to see determine if any had a significant influence on participant responses for each of the constructs. I ran Hypothesis Statistic Tests (*t*-tests) for each independent demographic variable that had only two groups. The Bonferroni adjusted *p*-value was .0083 due to the six analysis tests ran to lessen the chance of a Type 1 error.

Undergraduate Institution Type

I conducted a one-way ANOVA to check for significant differences between participant responses to each construct based on their undergraduate institution type, including Department of Music, School of Music, College of Music, and Conservatory of Music. Levene's Test for Homogeneity of Variances determined assumptions were met for equal variance. There were no

significant differences in perceived preparedness of each construct based on undergraduate institution type. See Table 18 for a summary of the one-way ANOVA for undergraduate institution type.

Table 18.

Summary of One-Way ANOVAs for Undergraduate Institution Type

Construct	<i>Dept.</i>		<i>School</i>		<i>College</i>		<i>Conservatory</i>		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Conducting	4.21	.68	4.23	.83	4.21	.68	4.21	.68	.185	.906	.002
Musical Leadership	3.34	.91	3.42	1.13	3.30	1.05	2.71	.22	.719	.542	.009
Arranging	3.44	1.30	3.70	1.50	3.41	1.47	3.33	1.59	.623	.601	.008
Functional Performance	4.42	.58	4.42	.79	4.40	.66	4.47	.33	.060	.981	.001
History/Analysis/Literature	4.17	.75	4.18	.93	4.14	.66	4.03	.52	.054	.983	.001
Fieldwork/21 st -Century	3.66	.93	3.83	1.08	3.83	1.05	3.57	.76	.550	.649	.007

Undergraduate Region

I conducted a one-way ANOVA to check for significant differences between participant responses to each construct based on the region in which the undergraduate institution they attended is located, including Eastern, North Central, Northwest, Southern, Southwestern, and Western. Levene's Test for Homogeneity of Variances determined assumptions were met for equal variance for each construct. There were no significant differences in perceived preparedness of each construct based on undergraduate institution type. See Table 19 for a summary of the one-way ANOVA for undergraduate institution region.

Table 19.*Summary of One-Way ANOVAs for Undergraduate Region*

Construct	<i>Eastern</i>		<i>North Central</i>		<i>Northwest</i>		<i>Southern</i>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Conducting	4.20	.77	4.10	.61	4.46	.55	4.32	.79
Musical Leadership	3.33	1.03	3.28	.72	3.31	.53	3.50	1.07
Arranging	3.46	1.45	3.37	1.21	4.19	.91	3.77	1.60
Functional Performance	4.46	.67	4.41	.61	4.58	.67	4.44	.64
History/Analysis/Literature	4.17	.81	4.13	.76	4.00	.42	4.22	.80
Fieldwork/21 st -Century	3.58	1.03	4.05	.71	3.14	.20	3.91	1.10
	<i>Southwestern</i>		<i>Western</i>		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>η²</i>	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Conducting	4.32	.75	4.04	.58	.655	.658	.014	
Musical Leadership	3.17	1.13	3.15	.74	.554	.735	.012	
Arranging	3.60	.94	3.07	1.10	.896	.485	.021	
Functional Performance	4.37	.78	4.22	.60	.356	.878	.008	
History/Analysis/Literature	4.10	.83	4.06	.52	.174	.972	.004	
Fieldwork/21 st -Century	3.83	.96	3.58	.90	1.46	.205	.033	

Teaching Region

I conducted a one-way ANOVA to check for significant differences between participant responses to each construct based on the region in which they were currently teaching is located, including Eastern, North Central, Northwest, Southern, Southwestern, and Western. Levene's Test for Homogeneity of Variances determined assumptions were met for equal variance for each construct. There were no significant differences in perceived preparedness of each construct based on undergraduate institution type. See Table 20 for a summary of the one-way ANOVA for teaching region.

Table 20.*Summary of One-Way ANOVAs for Teaching Region*

Construct	Eastern		North Central		Northwest		Southern	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Conducting	4.23	.74	4.10	.75	4.13	.67	4.27	.78
Musical Leadership	3.41	1.02	4.41	.66	2.69	.65	3.37	1.06
Arranging	3.54	1.47	3.84	1.22	3.63	.77	3.49	1.54
Functional Performance	4.48	.69	4.46	.49	4.49	.74	4.39	.65
History/Analysis/Literature	4.20	.85	4.11	.61	4.04	.64	4.14	.84
Fieldwork/21 st -Century	3.68	1.03	3.95	.73	2.77	.76	3.81	1.05
	Southwestern		Western		<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Conducting	4.34	.74	4.03	.72	.539	.747	.028	
Musical Leadership	3.37	1.06	3.11	1.07	.945	.452	.046	
Arranging	3.46	1.13	3.15	1.21	.435	.824	.024	
Functional Performance	4.34	.80	4.18	.59	.675	.643	.036	
History/Analysis/Literature	4.20	.71	4.04	.56	.162	.976	.000	
Fieldwork/21 st -Century	3.80	.89	3.73	1.00	1.25	.289	.061	

Undergraduate Preparation Type

I conducted an independent samples *t*-test to check for significant differences between participant responses to each construct based on teacher preparation type, including traditional undergraduate music education preparation, and non-traditional preparation. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances determined assumptions were met. Results of the *t*-test indicated a significant difference in responses between the two preparation types in the area of conducting ($t(238) = 2.73, p = .007$). Participants who completed a traditional music education undergraduate degree felt more prepared in the area of conducting ($M = 4.26, SD = .72$) than participants who had a non-traditional preparation ($M = 3.77, SD = .87$). Cohen's *d* resulted in an effect size of .669, indicating a moderate effect due to preparation type.

Results of the *t*-test also indicated a significant difference in responses between the two preparation types in the area of functional performance ($t(228) = 2.72, p = .007$). Participants

who completed a traditional music education undergraduate degree felt more prepared in the area of functional performance ($M = 4.45$, $SD = .66$), than participants who had a non-traditional preparation ($M = 3.96$, $SD = .70$). Cohen's d resulted in an effect size of .727, indicating a moderate effect due to preparation type.

The areas of Musical Leadership ($p = .046$) and Fieldwork/21st Century ($p = .035$) could potentially have significantly different results between preparation types. Neither area met the Bonferroni-adjusted p of $<.0083$, but they do have a p value less than the typical .05 with a moderate effect size. The Bonferroni adjustment corrects for potential Type 1 error, but is prone to Type 2 error of stating something is not significant that is significant (Perneger, 1998). See Table 21 for a summary of the independent samples t -test for type of undergraduate preparation.

Table 21.

Summary of Independent Samples T-Test for Preparation Type

Construct	Traditional		Non-Traditional		df	t	p	Cohen's d
	M	SD	M	SD				
Conducting	4.26	.72	3.77	.87	238	2.73	.007*	0.669
Musical Leadership	3.38	1.01	2.84	.97	239	2.01	.046	0.535
Arranging	3.53	1.40	3.34	1.52	222	.628	.613	0.136
Functional Performance	4.45	.66	3.96	.70	228	2.72	.007*	0.727
History/Analysis/Literature	4.18	.79	3.92	.81	227	1.13	.260	0.322
Fieldwork/21 st -Century	3.78	.99	3.19	1.13	222	2.12	.035	0.584

* $p < .0083$

Highest Degree Achieved

I conducted an independent samples t-test to check for significant differences between participant responses to each construct based on highest degree achieved, including participants with just a bachelor's degree and participants with a graduate degree(s) and/or an advanced certificate. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances determined assumptions were met. There were no significant differences in perceived preparedness of each construct based on highest

degree achieved. See Table 22 for a summary of the independent samples *t*-test for highest degree achieved.

Table 22.

Summary of Independent Samples T-Test for Highest Degree Achieved

Construct	<i>Bachelor's</i>		<i>Advanced Studies</i>		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Conducting	4.18	.72	4.26	.76	238	-.830	.407	0.108
Musical Leadership	3.15	.99	3.49	1.00	239	-2.63	.009	0.342
Arranging	3.28	1.32	3.71	1.44	222	-2.37	.019	0.318
Functional Performance	4.32	.71	4.49	.63	228	-1.83	.068	0.243
History/Analysis/Literature	4.05	.79	4.25	.79	227	-1.88	.062	0.250
Fieldwork/21 st -Century	3.76	1.01	3.72	1.01	222	.289	.773	0.039

Years Taught

I conducted an independent samples *t*-test to check for significant differences between participant responses to each construct based on years of teaching experience, whether participants had five or less years of professional teaching experience, or six or more years of professional teaching experience. Levene's Test for Equality of Variances determined assumptions were met. Results of the *t*-test indicated a significant difference in responses between participants who had five or less years of teaching experience and participants who had six or more years of teaching experience in the area of arranging ($t(220) = 2.75, p = .007$). Participants who have taught for five or less years felt more prepared in the area of arranging ($M = 3.85, SD = 1.51$) than participants who had taught for six or more years ($M = 3.32, SD = 1.31$). Cohen's *d* resulted in an effect size of .382, indicating a small effect due to years of teaching experience.

There is a potential significant difference among years taught in the area of Fieldwork/21st Century ($p = .018$). The area did not meet the Bonferroni-adjusted p of $<.0083$,

but does have a p value less than the typical .05 with a small effect size. See Table 21 for a summary of the independent samples t -test for years of teaching experience.

Table 23

Summary of Independent Samples T-Test for Years Taught

Construct	<i>5 or less</i>		<i>6 or more</i>		<i>df</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Cohen's d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>				
Conducting	4.31	.64	4.17	.79	236	1.35	.178	0.184
Musical Leadership	3.30	1.05	3.36	.99	238	-.388	.698	0.052
Arranging	3.85	1.51	3.32	1.31	220	2.75	.007*	0.382
Functional Performance	4.42	.66	4.41	.67	226	.131	.896	0.018
History/Analysis/Literature	4.18	.82	4.14	.77	225	.259	.796	0.036
Fieldwork/21 st -Century	3.94	.96	3.62	1.01	220	2.37	.018	0.331

* $p < .0083$

Summary

Participants overall felt between somewhat unprepared to prepared in each of the NASM music competency areas based on their undergraduate teacher preparation program. There were no curricular areas in which participants on average felt strongly prepared, or strongly unprepared, and very few in which participants felt prepared. Participants felt that their undergraduate programs prepared them most in the area of functional performance, followed closely by the area of conducting, including elements pertaining to directing ensembles. Participants felt that their undergraduate programs prepared them the least in the area of musical leadership, followed closely by arranging. Skills method courses (including instrumental, vocal, etc.) had the highest frequency of curricular areas/courses listed as most valuable, but also the second highest frequency of courses listed as least valuable. Conducting, level methods (i.e., elementary, secondary), theory, field experiences, and ensembles also had a high frequency of being listed as a most valuable course. The curricular area/course with the highest frequency as least valuable was general education courses. In addition to skills methods, other curricular

areas/courses with a high frequency of being the least valuable to participants' success in teaching include music history, advanced theory, non-music specific education course, and level methods. Music specific classroom management had the highest frequency of curricular areas/courses either not taught, or that participants desired more of in their undergraduate program. Other areas with high frequency include music technology, instrument repair, administration/program management, and teaching music to special learners. Preparation type (traditional undergraduate music education or non-traditional) had a significant effect on participants' perceived level of preparedness in the areas of conducting and functional performance. Years of teaching experience (5 or less, or 6 or more) had a significant effect on participants' perceived level of preparedness in the area of arranging.

Chapter Five

Discussion

Program evaluation research to understand how music education institutions can better serve their preservice teachers is necessary for continued growth in the field of music education (Colwell, 1985). Many music teachers are entering the field feeling unprepared in multiple areas (Conway, 2002), which contributes to a low retention rate of music teachers, especially in culturally diverse settings (Emmanuel, 2002). This could be because many music education programs are functioning based on a curriculum established during a time when the field of music education was drastically different (Asmus, 2000). Limited literature exists on the need for curricular reform in music education, but most of it is prior to this century, which does not alleviate the institutions that are resistant to change (Sarath et al., 2014). A study from within this century analyzing current music teacher perceptions' of how institutions can better prepare preservice music teachers is necessary for both their success, and the success of their future students.

Despite the growing need to understand how we can better prepare future music teachers, research is limited on current music teacher perception of music education curriculum and collegiate music program evaluation. The purpose of this study was to examine current music teachers' perceptions of their undergraduate music education coursework, in terms of how well it prepared them for their career in teaching music. I sought to examine music teachers' perceived level of preparedness in each of the NASM music competency areas (Conducting and Musical Leadership, Arranging, Functional Performance, and Analysis History, and Literature), courses that were of most and least value to participants' success in teaching music, desired courses/concepts to be added to or expanded in the undergraduate music education curriculum,

and to determine if there were differences among responses based on demographic variables.

This survey examined six constructs, including the perceived level of preparedness in each of the four NASM constructs (Conducting and Musical Leadership was split into two constructs), and elements of 21st-Century Teaching/Field Experience. Survey participants who submitted usable data include a total of 270 current music teachers from 44 of the 50 states in the United States.

This chapter consists of discussion and interpretation of the results presented in the previous chapter, overarching conclusions, implications of the results, and suggestions for further research about of music education curriculum reform.

Preparedness to Teach NASM Music Competencies

NASM guidelines for music programs have been a consistent topic of controversy among music educators based on their relativity and effectiveness (Forsythe et al, 2007). The guidelines are intentionally broad to leave institutions the freedom to format their curriculum to best fit their specific student-body (NASM, 2022), though there are other accrediting bodies and institutional guidelines that must be followed for curriculum as well. I used the NASM music competencies as constructs in my survey both to address validity, and to demonstrate how other areas can fit into the established competencies. I incorporated 21st-century elements into each of the constructs including items found in the literature as important for successful music teaching.

Participants rated their perceived preparedness for each statement using a six-point Likert scale (*1 = very unprepared, 6 = very prepared*). Each construct resulted in a subscale mean in the three to four range, which equates to “somewhat unprepared” to “somewhat prepared.” It is concerning that no constructs resulted in a subscale mean in the five to six range (“prepared” to “very prepared”). Furthermore, there were only three statements out of all the construct groups that resulted in a mean in the five range, and none that resulted in the six range. It can be

assumed that this means music teachers participants generally did not feel well prepared for their career in teaching music based on their undergraduate music education curriculum.

Participants overall felt most prepared in the area of functional performance, specifically relating to items on their primary instrument including performing solo and in ensembles on their primary instrument and teaching their primary instrument. Participants felt moderately comfortable teaching elements of performance outside of their primary instrument/area, but did not feel prepared to teach non-traditional instruments, such as the ukulele. Participants also expressed they were unprepared in the area of instrument repair, and musician health including mental and physical.

Participants overall felt mostly prepared in the area of conducting, with the exception of specialty ensembles like jazz, marching band, and non-traditional ensembles. Functional performance and conducting being the constructs music teachers felt most prepared in supports a common trend in the literature of music programs putting a heavier emphasis on the areas of music than education (Hourigan & Scheib, 2009), whether it be for better or for worse.

Participants felt least prepared in the area of musical leadership, specifically in terms of being a leader in the classroom. Participants reported an average in the two range (unprepared) in elements of handling social-emotional aspects of teaching, handling student disagreements or refusals to participate, teaching students with adverse emotional needs, and teaching students with high levels of trauma. Social emotional learning and trauma informed teaching have been at the forefront of importance in teaching in recent years; trauma informed teaching is as equally complex as other important areas of teaching, and therefore must be taught (McEvoy & Salvador, 2020).

Across all construct areas, participants felt unprepared in non-traditional areas of music, including leading a non-traditional ensemble, arranging for a non-traditional ensemble, and teaching non-traditional instruments. There is a lack of diversity in music ensemble offerings at all institutional levels, elementary through college (Prescott et al., 2008), which will not change if music teachers do not feel prepared to teach non-traditional ensembles.

Aspects of 21st-century teaching and arranging fell into the three-range of “somewhat unprepared”. The low to moderate level of perceived preparedness in the music competency areas presents a concern for the future of music teachers and presents a need for further exploration.

Most and Least Valuable Courses

Participants listed up to three curricular areas/courses they felt were most valuable, and up to three curricular areas/courses they felt were least valuable within their undergraduate music education curriculum. Skills methods (instrumental, vocal, etc.), conducting, level methods (elementary, secondary), theory, field experience, ensembles, and applied lessons were listed with the highest frequency as the most valuable courses within participants’ undergraduate studies. Similar research from prior years found the most valued courses were student teaching, lessons, conducting, theory, and ensembles (Brophy, 2002; Conway, 2002, 2012, 2022; Groulx, 2016, Hourigan & Scheib, 2009). Despite these studies ranging over a span of 21 years, music teachers seem to still hold most value to the same courses.

Similar to previous studies, there was controversy over skills music method courses. This appeared with the highest frequency in the most valuable list, but also appeared with the second highest frequency in the list of least valuable courses. Previous studies found the same controversy, stating that participants felt the concepts that should be the focus of the course are

of utmost importance to music teacher success, but the way the courses are taught are not always beneficial to their purpose (Brophy, 1994; Conway 2002, 2012, 2022; Forsythe et. al, 2007; Groulx, 2016; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009). The majority of participants in this study who listed skills method courses as least valuable commented next to their responses that the course itself is very important, but the way that it was taught made it of least value. Many participants who listed technology, music education, and level methods (elementary, secondary) made the same comment of the course being necessary, but adjustments need made to the way it was taught for it to be valuable.

The most frequently listed least valuable course was general education, or liberal arts courses including math, science, and foreign language. Other courses with the highest frequency on the least valuable list included music history, advanced theory, and non-music specific education courses. Many participants listed that they enjoyed their advanced theory courses, but they were not beneficial to their success in teaching music at the K-12 level. This partially aligns with previous studies conducted, that primarily listed education courses as the least valuable (Brophy, 1994; Conway 2002, 2012, 2022; Forsythe et. al, 2007; Groulx, 2016; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009). Out of all the courses listed, many participants commented that the advanced courses are not necessary for all focus areas in music education. This includes advanced conducting, advanced theory, and upper-level piano. Many participants stated they did not see the value in performance attendance (also known as convocation, weekly recital, etc.) for education majors. This could be addressed in multiple ways, including adjusting the course structure, or a simple discussion about the purpose at the first meeting. See Tables 15 and 16 for the full list of most and least valuable courses, including frequencies and percentages.

Additional Courses Desired

Previous studies have sought to discover 21st-century skills desired by music teachers. These studies discovered that communication, administration, and technology are not only desired, but necessary for teacher preparation programs to include in order to successfully prepare music teachers (Brophy, 1994; Conway 2002, 2012, 2022; Forsythe et. al, 2007; Groulx, 2016; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009). Groulx (2016) stated additional skills such as “technical skills, effective teaching, administrative skills, engaging in schools, support for career specialization, and preparation for a broader range of careers” should be present in undergraduate music education programs (p. 21).

I sought to discover more specific curricular areas/courses current music teachers felt could be beneficial to either be added or expanded within the curriculum. Participants listed a wide, intriguing variety of curricular areas/courses they felt would be beneficial to preservice music teachers. The most commonly listed curricular area/course desired by participants was classroom management with a total of 55 (10.5%) appearances on the list. Other items listed that relate to classroom management included trauma-informed teaching and social emotional learning. Classrooms teachers have seen an increase in student trauma in recent years (Conway, 2022), and therefore there is an increased importance for coursework involving classroom management and trauma informed teaching at the undergraduate level.

Music technology had the second highest frequency in desired curricular areas/courses to be added to or expanded within the curriculum. Participants commented they would like to see a more modernized music technology course, or a variety of courses. Many participants specified that they would like to have a course on sound systems including aspects of recording and sound engineering. Other participants desired advanced music technology courses, or a course on

notation. Offering multiple courses in technology could alleviate this desire and offer students a more specified track towards their career goals. Technology is a rapidly growing field, and fortunately is also growing in administrative support (Abril & Gault, 2008; Bannerman & O’Leary, 2021; Dammers, 2012). Working with administration to offer these courses potentially to non-music majors as well could help be a marketing point.

There are many courses listed that align with the courses in the previous section, in which music teachers felt unprepared for based on their music education undergraduate program. These courses include instrument repair, administration/program management, non-traditional instruments/ensembles, updated music education courses, and courses of diversity including cultural, mental, and physical diversity. See Table 17 for frequencies and percentages of the full list of curricular areas/courses current music teachers felt would be beneficial to preservice music teachers.

Differences in Responses Among Demographics

There were very few differences in responses based on the demographic variables tested. I only tested demographic variables that would result in constructive and informative data to serve a pragmatic approach. Type of music teacher preparation was one of the only variables to yield significant differences among groups. I recoded this variable from four groups (traditional music education undergraduate program, performance undergraduate program, alternative program, and other) into two groups (traditional music education undergraduate program and non-traditional preparation) since to allow for more evenly distributed groups. The ANOVA revealed significant differences in participants’ responses to the area of conducting, and to the area of functional performance based on their preparation type. Participants who completed a traditional music education undergraduate degree felt more prepared in both of these areas than

participants who had a non-traditional music teacher preparation. It is interesting that participants with a non-traditional preparation felt less prepared in the area of functional performance, as a majority of participants in that category had an undergraduate degree in music performance. This could be attributed to those individuals having ample preparation on their own instrument, but no preparation on any other instrument.

The only other significant difference among all constructs and demographic areas measured was in response to the arranging construct, based on years of teaching experience. Participants with five or less years of teaching experience felt their undergraduate program prepared them more in the area of arranging than teachers with six or more years of teaching experience. There has been a growing need for arranging in recent years, partially due to the COVID-19 pandemic and directors being forced to get creative with arranging for various types of ensembles. Institutions may be taking that into consideration and offering more courses or including arranging more in their curriculum than in previous years.

There were no significant differences found in participant responses based on undergraduate institution type (department, school, college, or conservatory of music), the region in which participants completed their undergraduate degree, the region in which they were teaching, or their highest degree achieved. Participants were specifically asked to answer questions based on their undergraduate experience, which could be a potential explanation for the lack of significant difference between responses based on highest degree achieved. The lack of differences among other variables including region and institution type could be regarded as a positive, as it demonstrates consistency among all areas in the country, and equality of education among varying levels of programs. This lack of differences also demonstrates a need for further

discussion and action on undergraduate music education curriculum, as the concerns are consistent nationwide.

Closing and Recommendations

Music education is not a complacent field, and therefore, the curriculum should not be complacent. The field is constantly growing and updating, which means music teacher education programs need to update along with the field. It is imperative that music teacher educators and administrators are following current trends in music education, both in research and observations, to keep their programs current and relative for preservice teachers.

A music education degree is already a heavy credit degree, so adding courses could be unrealistic at many institutions. However, there are many ways we can approach the issues mentioned in this study without necessarily adding more courses to the already heavy course load for students. Many participants in this study stated for multiple courses/areas, that is not the course itself that was unvaluable, but the way it was taught. This was especially common in music education and music method courses. Many music teachers felt like their music education courses were not taught in a way that is relative to 21st-century teaching. Music education faculty must make coursework more relevant and relational to students (Brophy, 2002; Conway, 2002; 2012; 2022; Groulx, 2016; Hibbard, 2017; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009; Pellegrino et al., 2017).

Many of the other concepts listed can be addressed through already existing courses, such as music education courses. Diversifying field experience will address many of the items listed as desired, including more field experience, experience with classroom management, experience in a variety of settings, trauma-informed teaching, diversity, applicable music education, and many more. If there is no room for a diversity and inclusion course to be added, or even if there is, diversity can be added to any preexisting course. Diversity can be incorporated into ensembles

by performing music by diverse composers. Diversity can be made present in history courses by discussing more than just the standard Western-European music history. Diversity can be present by doing cultural activities in a elementary general setting. The same suggestions can be made for special and diverse learners. Instrument repair should be incorporated into each instrumental method courses. This can be done by having the institution's music vendor do a guest demonstration of the most common instrument repairs for each instrument. Topics of music administration can be incorporated into any education or ensemble course. Professors of these courses can help to alleviate the lack of preparedness in many areas by reconstructing their courses and incorporating 21st-century aspects of music teaching.

Music institutions and faculty must make these decisions and incorporations based on the needs of their specific student body. It is vital that institutions explore this need, and even survey their own students in order to better prepare them for their career in teaching music.

Future Research Implications

This study was intended to provide both a broad overview of music teacher perception of their undergraduate music education curriculum, as well as specific elements that could help prepare future music teachers. This study could be repeated and explored further in numerous ways. There were a total of 270 music teacher participants who completed the survey for usable data. The overall population represented 44 out of the 50 states in the United States, represented a mixture of institution type, and were split fairly evenly in teaching local (urban, rural, suburban, small town). Researchers considering using this survey should consider recruiting from more/larger venues to gather a higher total number of participants, and to have each state represented. This would alleviate some of the smaller generalizations. A similar study could also be conducted in various other areas of music, including performance degrees, music therapy, etc.

A follow-up study I would like to pursue is surveying current music teacher educators using the same constructs, but instead of a level of preparedness, doing a level of importance scale for each construct to gather their opinions on the effectiveness of the current music education curriculum. A similar study could also be done for current music education students, and then the three results could be compared with one another for an additional study.

Given that this study explored all areas of the curriculum, there is much room for follow-up studies on specific areas of the curriculum. An additional follow-up study I would like to pursue involves focusing on the skills methods courses, given the controversy in multiple studies on how they should be taught, and the level of importance. I plan to conduct a study exploring and analyzing multiple ways this course is taught. The current study resulted in broad data stating a need for updates to the curriculum. I encourage researchers and scholars to conduct research on the specific curricular areas to determine how we can adjust and/or add courses to better prepare preservice music teachers.

It is my hope that results from this study can be used to encourage collegiate music education programs to explore the idea of curricular reform. Since this study is quantitative, the numbers can be shared with administration for simple understanding and explanation, without a necessary knowledge of the content area. Additionally, I hope that this study can catapult researchers into their own curricular studies to support a need for undergraduate music education curricular reform.

Closing

The purpose of this study was to explore current music teacher perceptions of their undergraduate music education program in order to determine how institutions can better prepare preservice music teachers. Emphasized results of this study include:

- Current music teacher perception of preparedness in each of the NASM music competencies based on their undergraduate music education curriculum
- Current music teacher perception of most and least valuable courses/areas within the music education undergraduate curriculum
- Courses/areas current music teachers believe could benefit preservice music teachers
- Differences in perception based on demographic variables

Undergraduate music education curriculum updates and evaluation are necessary for the success of future music teachers, and music programs. Based on the results of this study, current music teachers do not feel well prepared for their careers in teaching music from their undergraduate music education preparation program, and desire more. It is my hope that music administrators and professors will use these data as a reference to explore the needs of their specific student body, and cultivate strategies to better prepare their preservice music teachers. Administrators and professors must work to keep the content being taught at their institution accurate, current, relevant, and progressive. As musicians and teachers we are constantly evaluating ourselves and growing; it is time we pay the same attention to the music education curriculum to continue the growth for future music teachers.

References

- Abril, C. R., & Gault, B. M. (2008). The state of music in secondary schools: The principal's perspective. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 56(1), 68–81.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0022429408317516>.
- Asmus, E. (2000). The need for research in music teacher preparation. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 10(1), 5–5. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105708370001000102>.
- Bannerman, J. K., & O'Leary, E. J. (2021). Digital natives unplugged: Challenging assumptions of preservice music educators' technological skills. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 30(2), 10–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083720951462>.
- Baumgartner, C. M. (2020). Student teaching. In C. Conway, K. Pellegrino, A. M. Stanley, & C. West (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of preservice music teacher education in the United States* (pp. 509–544). Oxford University Press.
- Barry, N. H. (1996). *The effects of special training and field experiences upon preservice teachers' level of comfort with multicultural teaching situations* (ED397035). Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York. ERIC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED397035>.
- Barry, N. H. & Caravan, L. (2020). Preservice music teachers' reactions to field-teaching experiences: A qualitative analysis of discussion board posts. *Contributions to Music Education*, 45, 81-103. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1256052>.
- Bauer, W.I. (2012). The acquisition of musical technological pedagogical and content knowledge. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 22(2), 51–64.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083712457881>.

- Brophy, T. S. (2002). Teacher reflections on undergraduate music education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 12(1), e19–e25. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10570837020120010501>.
- Bruenger, S. D. (2010). Why select new music teachers chose to, or chose not to, apply to teach in an urban school district? *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 19(2), 25–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083709346787>.
- Burton, S. L., Knaster, J., & Knieste, M. (2014). Staying in tune with music education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 25(1), 65-77. <https://doi:10.1177/1057083714548587>.
- Campbell, P. S. (2002). Music education in a time of cultural transformation. *Music Educators Journal*, 89(1), 27-32.
- Chomeya, R. (2010). Quality of psychology test between likert scale 5 and 6 points. *Journal of Social Sciences*, 6(3), 399-403. <https://doi.org/10.3844/jssp.2010.399.403>.
- Chou, H. (2007). Multicultural teacher education: Toward a culturally responsible pedagogy. *Essays in Education*, 21, 139–162. <https://openriver.winona.edu/eie/vol21/iss1/13>.
- Chua, S. L., & Welch, G. F. (2019). A quantitative study of experiences impacting music teacher development. *Psychology of Music*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0305735619873387>.
- Colley, B. (2009). Educating teachers to transform the trilogy. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 19(1), 56–67. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083709344042>.
- Colwell, R. J. (1985). Program evaluation in music teacher education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, Bulletin 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. 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. (2022). Preservice music teacher education: The view from 20 years later. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 31(3), 10–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10570837221075676>.
- Cronk, B. C. (2020). *How to use SPSS: A step-by-step guide to analysis and interpretation* (11th ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Dammers, R. J. (2012). Technology-Based Music Classes in High Schools in the United States. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, (194), 73–90.
<https://doi.org/10.5406/bulcouresmusedu.194.0073>.
- Dew, D. (2008). Construct. In P. J. Lavrakas (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of survey research methods* (pp. 134-134). Sage Publications, Inc., <https://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412963947.n91>.
- Dillman, D.A. (2014). *Internet, Phone, Mail, and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method* (4th ed.). New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons. (ISBN#: 978-1118456149).
- Dorfman, J. (2016). Exploring models of technology integration into music teacher preparation programs. *Visions of Research in Music Education*, 28.
- Elliott, D. J. (1992). Rethinking music teacher education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 2(1), 6–15. <https://doi.org/10.1177/105708379200200103>.
- Emmanuel, D. T. (2002). *A music education immersion internship: Pre-service teachers' beliefs concerning teaching music in a culturally diverse setting* (Order No. 3064224). Available

from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (252242335).

<http://spot.lib.auburn.edu/login>.

Forsythe, J. L., Kinney, D. W., & Braun, E. L. (2007). Opinions of music teacher educators and preservice music students on the National Association of Schools of Music Standards for Teacher Education. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 16(2), 19–33.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/10570837070160020104>.

Gfeller, K., Darrow, A. A., & Hedden, S. K. (1990). Perceived effectiveness of mainstreaming in Iowa and Kansas schools. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 38, 90-101.

Groulx, T. J. (2016). Perceptions of course value and issues of specialization in undergraduate music teacher education curricula. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 25(2), 13–24.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083714564874>.

Haning, M. (2016). Are they ready to teach with technology? An investigation of technology instruction in music teacher education programs. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 25(3), 78–90. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083715577696>.

Hibbard, S. L. (2017). *Music teacher presence: Toward a relational understanding* (Order No. 10760119). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global. (2020844785).

<http://spot.lib.auburn.edu/login>.

Hunter, L. R. (2011). School-university partnerships: a means for the inclusion of policy studies in music teacher education. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 112(3), 137–143.

<http://doi:10.1080/10632913.2011.566086>.

Hourigan, R. M., & Scheib, J. W. (2009). Inside and outside the undergraduate music education curriculum: Student teacher perceptions of the value of skills, abilities, and

- understandings. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 18(2), 48–61.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083708327871>.
- Howard, K., Swanson, M., & Campbell, P. S. (2014). The diversification of music teacher education: Six vignettes from a movement in progress. *Journal Of Music Teacher Education*, 24(1), 26–37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083713494011>.
- IGI Global. (n.d.). *What is curriculum reform*. IGI Global. Retrieved September 5, 2022, from <https://www.igi-global.com/dictionary/engaging-the-community-in-curriculum-reforms-for-more-engaged-learners/6473#:~:text=1..teaching%20more%20meaningful%20and%20effective>.
- Kimpton, J. (2005). What to do about music teacher education: Our profession at a crossroads. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 14(2), 8–21.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/10570837050140020103>.
- Kladder, J. (2020). Re-envisioning music teacher education: An investigation into curricular change at two undergraduate music education programs in the U.S. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 121(4), 141–159.
<https://doiorg.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.1080/10632913.2019.1670311>.
- Leglar, M. A. (1993). A profile of research in music teacher education. *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning*, 4(1), 59-67.
- Lehman, P. R. (1992). Curriculum and program evaluation. In R. Colwell (Ed.), *Handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 281-294). New York: Schirmer Books.
- L'Roy, D. (1983). The development of occupational identity in undergraduate music education majors.

- Logsdon, L. F. (2013). Questioning the role of “21st-century skills” in arts education advocacy discourse. *Music Educators Journal*, 100(1), 51–56.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0027432113499936>.
- May, B. N., Willie, K., Worthen, C., & Pehrson, A. (2017). An analysis of state music education certification and licensure practices in the United States. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 27(1), 65–88.
<http://dx.doi.org.spot.lib.auburn.edu/10.1177/1057083717699650>.
- McEvoy, C. A., & Salvador, K. (2020). Aligning Culturally Responsive and Trauma-Informed Pedagogies in Elementary General Music. *General Music Today*, 34(1), 21–28.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1048371320909806>
- McGinnis, E. J. (2018). Developing the emotional intelligence of undergraduate music education majors: An exploratory study using Bradberry and Greaves’ (2009) Emotional Intelligence 2.0. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 27(2), 11–22.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083717723919>.
- Music Educator Certification. (2020, July 06). Retrieved October 24, 2020, from
<https://nafme.org/my-classroom/certification/>
- NAfME. (2018, August 3). *Standards*. NAfME. Retrieved September 5, 2022, from
<https://nafme.org/my-classroom/standards/>.
- NAfME. (2023, February 27). *Federated State Associations*. NAfME. Retrieved March 3, 2023, from
<https://nafme.org/about/federated-state-music-education-associations/>
- National Association for Music Education. (2022a, June 14). *History and Leadership*. NAfME. Retrieved March 5, 2022, from <https://nafme.org/about/>

National Association for Music Education. (2022b, April 20). *Research Survey Assistance from NafME*. NAFME. <https://nafme.org/nafme-research/research-survey-assistance-from-nafme/>

National Association of Schools of Music (2022). *NASM Handbook 2021-22*. Reston, VA: National Association of Schools of Music.

NEA (2012). Preparing 21st century students for a global society: An educator's guide to the "Four Cs" National Education Association

Pellegrino, K., Conway, C. M., & Millican, J. S. (2018). Tenure and promotion experiences of music teacher educators: a mixed-methods study. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 27(2), 82–99. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083717730085>.

Perneger, T. C. (1998). What's wrong with Bonferroni adjustments. *BMJ*, 316, 1236. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.316.7139.1236>.

Peterson, C.H., Peterson, N.A., & Powell, K.G. (2017). Cognitive interviewing for item development: validity evidence based on content and response processes. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 50(4), 217-223, <https://doi.org/10.1080/07481756.2017.1339564>.

Powell, B., Hewitt, D., Smith, G. D., Olesko, B., & Davis, V. (2020). Curricular change in collegiate programs: Toward a more inclusive music education. *Visions of Research in Music Education*, 35, 1–22.

Prescott, J., Li, S., & Lei, M. (2008). Traditional Chinese instrumental music: importing diversity into Midwestern America. *International Journal of Music Education*, 26(4), 374–384. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761408098057>

- Privitera, G. J., Ahlgrim-Delzell, L. (2018). *Research Methods for Education*. United States: SAGE Publications.
- Robinson, N. R. (2017). Developing a critical consciousness for diversity and equity among preservice music teachers. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 26(3), 11–26. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083716643349>.
- Saldana, J. (2015). *The Coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). SAGE.
- Salvador, K. (2010). Who isn't a special learner? A survey of how music teacher education programs prepare future educators to work with exceptional populations. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 20(1), 27–38. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083710362462>.
- Sarath, E., Campbell, P. S., Myers, D. (2014). *Transforming music study from its foundations: A manifesto for progressive change in the undergraduate preparation of music majors*.
- State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education. (2014). *National Core Arts Standards*. Dover, DE: State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education.
- Taggart, C. C., & Hill, S. C. (2019). Musicianship for teaching. *The Oxford Handbook of Preservice Music Teacher Education in the United States*, 295.
- Toscher, B. (2020). The skills and knowledge gap in higher music education: an exploratory empirical study. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 21(10).
- VanWeelden, K., & Whipple, J. (2005). The effects of field experience on music education majors' perceptions of music instruction for secondary students with special needs. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 14(2), 62-69.
- VanWeelden, K., & Whipple, J. (2007). An exploratory study of the impact of field experiences on music education majors' attitudes and perceptions of music for secondary students with special needs. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 16(2), 34-44.

VanWeelden, K., & Whipple, J. (2014). Music Educators' Perceptions of Preparation and Supports Available for Inclusion. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 23(2), 33–51.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083713484585>.

Appendix A: Invitation Email

Subject: Research Survey: Collegiate Music Education Curriculum

Dear Music Educator,

I hope your school year is going well so far. My name is Natalie Smith, Ph.D. Music Education candidate and Graduate Assistant at Auburn University. I am writing you to ask for your expertise to help with my graduate research, “Music Teacher Perception of Undergraduate Music Education Curricula: A Quantitative Survey of Current Music Teachers.”

It is my aim to give teachers a voice. This study seeks to understand music teachers’ experiences. I am recruiting individuals who are currently employed as K-12 music teachers in the United States for this study.

Please consider taking this survey. It should take around 10 minutes to complete. There are no risks associated with participating in this survey. Your participation is completely voluntary and there will be no compensation. All responses are and will remain anonymous.

https://auburn.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9z3fLNiQI0156dg

PLEASE FEEL FREE to forward this email and link to any colleagues who are within five years of graduation from their undergraduate music education degree, and are currently or have taught music for at least one year.

Thank you in advance for your time and responses to this very important topic.

All the best,

Natalie Smith, MM

Ph.D. Candidate, Music Education | College of Education

Graduate Teaching Assistant | Department of Music

nes0031@auburn.edu

101 Goodwin Music Building, Auburn AL 36849

Appendix B: Reminder Email #1

Subject: Your Voice Matters: Survey on Collegiate Music Education

Dear Music Educator,

Earlier last week I sent you an email asking for your participation in my research study entitled “Music Teacher Perception of Undergraduate Music Education Curricula: A Quantitative Survey of Current Music Teachers”. Please consider participating in my online survey to help me gather information right from the source of how we can better prepare pre-service music teachers.

It is my aim to give teachers a voice. This study seeks to understand music teachers’ experiences. I am recruiting individuals who are currently employed as K-12 music teachers in the United States for this study.

Please consider taking this survey. It should take around 10 minutes to complete. There are no risks associated with participating in this survey. Your participation is completely voluntary and there will be no compensation. All responses are and will remain anonymous.

If you have already completed the survey, thank you. Since this survey is anonymous, I have no way of knowing who has already participated. If you have not had a chance yet to take the survey, I would greatly appreciate your time and support. The survey should take no more than 10 minutes. Your responses will help me to analyze the need for curricular reformation of undergraduate music education programs in order to better prepare future music teachers, and further support our field.

Please click the Qualtrics link below for further details and to begin the survey:
https://auburn.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9z3fLNiQI0156dg

PLEASE FEEL FREE to forward this email and link to any colleagues who are within five years of graduation from their undergraduate music education degree, and are currently or have taught music for at least one year.

Thank you in advance for your time and responses to this very important topic.

All the best,

Natalie Smith, MM

Ph.D. Candidate, Music Education | College of Education

Graduate Teaching Assistant | Department of Music

nes0031@auburn.edu

101 Goodwin Music Building, Auburn AL 36849

Appendix C: Reminder Email #2

Subject: Final Survey Call: What Do You Wish You had in Your Undergraduate Music Program?

Dear Music Educator,

Recently I sent you an email asking for your participation in my research study entitled “Music Teacher Perception of Undergraduate Music Education Curricula: A Quantitative Survey of Current Music Teachers.” Please consider participating in my online survey to help me gather information right from the source of how we can better prepare pre-service music teachers.

It is my aim to give teachers a voice. This study seeks to understand music teachers’ experiences. I am recruiting individuals who are currently employed as K-12 music teachers in the United States for this study.

Please consider taking this survey. It should take around 10 minutes to complete. There are no risks associated with participating in this survey. Your participation is completely voluntary and there will be no compensation. All responses are and will remain anonymous.

Thank you so much to those who have already completed the survey. Since this survey is anonymous, I have no way of knowing who has already participated. If you have not completed the survey, I would greatly appreciate your time and support. The survey should around 10 minutes. Your responses will help me to analyze the need for curricular reformation of undergraduate music education programs in order to better prepare future music teachers, and further support our field.

Please click the Qualtrics link below for further details and to begin the survey:
https://auburn.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_9z3fLNiQI0156dg

PLEASE FEEL FREE to forward this email and link to any colleagues who are within five years of graduation from their undergraduate music education degree, and are currently or have taught music for at least one year.

Thank you in advance for your time and responses to this very important topic.

All the best,

Natalie Smith, MM

Ph.D. Candidate, Music Education | College of Education

Graduate Teaching Assistant | Department of Music

nes0031@auburn.edu

101 Goodwin Music Building, Auburn AL 36849

Appendix D. Social Media Invitation to Participate

I am currently recruiting current music teachers to participate in my survey: “Music Teacher Perception of Undergraduate Music Education Curricula: A Quantitative Survey of Current Music Teachers.” A central aim of mine is to give current music teachers a voice of what they shouldn’t or shouldn’t be a part of a music education degree.

The survey takes about 10-12 min to complete and will help us form a better understanding of how collegiate music programs can better prepare preservice music teachers. There are no risks, benefits, costs, or compensation associated with participating. Thank you in advance for your participation!

Appendix E. Social Media Survey Distribution

I shared the survey to the following private (must be approved to join) Facebook groups:

- Band Directors: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/banddirectors>
- Graduate Wind Conductors:
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/graduatewindconductorsassociation>
- Music Teachers: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/musicpln>
- Elementary Music Teachers: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/elmusteach>
- IUP Music Education: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/297281173969689>
- BCPS Music Teachers: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/401108630081385>
- ECU Music Alumni: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/18754917283>
- Music Teacher Educators: <https://www.facebook.com/groups/494725634921695>
- Pennsylvania Collegiate Music Educators Association (PCMEA) State Group:
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/1557514154553076>
- Music Education Graduate Students:
<https://www.facebook.com/groups/musiceducationgraduatestudents>

I also shared the survey to my personal social media pages:

- Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/natalie.smith.9887/>
- Instagram: https://www.instagram.com/nat_smith95/

Appendix F: Information Letter
Information Letter for a Research Study entitled:
“Music Teachers’ Perceptions of Undergraduate Music Education Curricula: A Quantitative Survey of Current Music Teachers”

You are invited to participate in a research study to measure the effectiveness of undergraduate music education curriculum in order to discover any possible need for curricular reformation. The study is being conducted by Natalie Smith under the direction of Dr. Nancy Barry in the Auburn University Department of Curriculum and Teaching. You were selected as a possible participant because you are currently a music teacher, and are age 19 or older. What will be involved if you participate? If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete 69 questions plus 17 demographic questions. Your total time commitment will be approximately 10-12 minutes.

Are there any risks or discomforts? The risks associated with participating in this study are very little to none. To minimize any potential risks, we will keep the survey entirely anonymous.

Are there any benefits to yourself or others? If you participate in this study, you can expect to be a part of the journey to an updated music education curriculum, enhancing the future of music educators at all levels of teaching. We cannot promise you that you will receive any or all of the benefits described.

Will you receive compensation for participating? There will be no compensation for participating, but it is the hope that this will serve the greater good of music education.

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 questions about this study, please ask them now or contact Ms. Natalie Smith at nes0031@auburn.edu or Dr. Nancy Barry at nhb0002@auburn.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Research Compliance or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334)-844-5966 or e-mail at IRBadmin@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

Click on "I consent" to agree to participate in this study.

Appendix G: Survey Instrument

Introduction/Informed Consent

**INFORMATION LETTER for a Research Study entitled:
"Music Teachers' Perceptions of Undergraduate Music Education Curricula: A Quantitative
Survey of Current Music Teachers"**

You are invited to participate in a research study to measure the effectiveness of undergraduate music education curriculum in order to discover any possible need for curricular reformation. The study is being conducted by Natalie Smith under the direction of Dr. Nancy Barry in the Auburn University Department of Curriculum and Teaching. You were selected as a possible participant because you are currently a music teacher, and are age 19 or older. What will be involved if you participate? If you decide to participate in this research study, you will be asked to complete 69 questions plus 17 demographic questions. Your total time commitment will be approximately 10-12 minutes.

Are there any risks or discomforts? The risks associated with participating in this study are very little to none. To minimize any potential risks, we will keep the survey entirely anonymous.

Are there any benefits to yourself or others? If you participate in this study, you can expect to be a part of the journey to an updated music education curriculum, enhancing the future of music educators at all levels of teaching. We cannot promise you that you will receive any or all of the benefits described.

Will you receive compensation for participating? There will be no compensation for participating, but it is the hope that this will serve the greater good of music education.

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 a professional conference.

If you have questions about this study, please ask them now or contact Ms. Natalie Smith at nes0031@auburn.edu or Dr. Nancy Barry at nhb0002@auburn.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Auburn University Office of Research Compliance or the Institutional Review Board by phone (334)-844-5966 or e-mail at IRBadmin@auburn.edu or IRBChair@auburn.edu.

Click on "I consent" to agree to participate in this study.

- I consent.
- I do not consent.

Teaching

Are you currently employed as a K-12 music teacher in the United States?

- Yes
- No

Demographics

Please answer the following demographic questions.

What was your preparation for teaching music?

- Traditional Music Education Undergraduate Program
- Performance Undergraduate Program
- Alternative Program
- Other

What is your level of employment?

- Full-Time (40+ hours a week)
- Part-Time (less than 40 hours a week)

What is the state or U.S. territory in which you teach?

In what state or other U.S. territory is the undergraduate college/university you attended located?

What type of music institution did you attend (within the university)?

- Department
- School
- College
- Conservatory

How would you classify the area in which you teach?

- Urban
- Rural
- Suburban
- Small Town

What year did you graduate with your undergraduate music education degree?

What is your highest degree attained?

- Bachelor's
- Advanced Certificate
- Master's
- Education Specialist
- Doctorate

Including this year, how many years have you been professionally teaching?

Were you professionally teaching prior to the COVID-19 Pandemic?

- Yes
- No

What grade levels do you teach? Check all that apply.

- Elementary School
- Middle School
- High School

In which type of school do you teach?

- Traditional Public School
- Private School
- Charter School
- Magnet School

What is your primary instrument group that you studied during your undergraduate program?

- Woodwind
- Brass
- Percussion
- Strings
- Piano
- Voice

What is your area of focus in which you teach? Check all that apply.

- Instrumental Music - Band
- Instrumental Music - Strings
- Vocal Music
- General Music

What is your identified gender?

- Female
- Male
- Self-describe:
- Prefer not to say

What is your race/ethnicity?

- Asian
- Black/African American
- Hispanic/Latino
- Native American/American Indian/Alaska Native
- Pacific Islander/Native Hawaiian
- White/Caucasian
- Two or more races
- Self-describe:
- Prefer not to say

What is your age as of January 1st, 2023?

Conducting and Musical Leadership

The following questions are to measure your perception on how your undergraduate music education program prepared you for the teaching profession based on the necessary competencies as listed by the National Association of Schools of Music (NASM).

Please rate the following based on how well you believe your undergraduate curriculum prepared you for using these elements of Conducting and Musical Leadership in your career.

	Very unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat unprepared	Somewhat prepared	Prepared	Very prepared	Not applicable
Conducting a large ensemble (i.e., band, choir, orchestra, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Conducting a small or chamber ensemble	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

	Very unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat unprepared	Somewhat prepared	Prepared	Very prepared	Not applicable
Conducting an ensemble outside my specialty (e.g., conducting band if you are vocal-focused)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leading a jazz ensemble	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leading a marching band	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Leading a nontraditional ensemble (e.g., rock band)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Rehearsal technique	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teaching intonation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Listening in an ensemble or individually	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Error detection in ensemble	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Programming music for performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Lesson planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Please rate the following based on how well you believe your undergraduate curriculum prepared you for using these elements of Conducting and Musical Leadership in your career.

	Very unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat unprepared	Somewhat prepared	Prepared	Very prepared	Not applicable
Utilizing educational psychology (e.g., learning theories)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Classroom management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Handling social-emotional aspects of teaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Handling student disagreements or refusals to participate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teaching students with adverse emotional needs	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teaching students with high levels of trauma	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teaching in a variety of settings (urban, rural, suburban)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teaching students with disabilities	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Administrative duties that come with teaching (e.g., handling a budget)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
	Very unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat unprepared	Somewhat prepared	Prepared	Very prepared	Not applicable
Communication with families	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communication with colleagues	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Communication with administration	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Arranging

Please rate the following based on how well you believe your undergraduate curriculum prepared you for using these elements of arranging your career.

	Very unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat unprepared	Somewhat prepared	Prepared	Very prepared	Not Applicable
Use music notation software (e.g., Finale)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arrange for beginning ensemble (band/choir/orchestra)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arrange for intermediate ensemble (band/choir/orchestra)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arrange for advanced ensemble (band/choir/orchestra)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arrange for athletic band (marching band, pep band)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Arrange for nontraditional ensemble (e.g., rock band)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Compose ensemble literature or exercises	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Compose solo literature or exercises	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Design marching band drill	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Functional Performance

Please rate the following based on how well you believe your undergraduate curriculum prepared you for using these elements of Functional Performance in your career.

When answering the following prompts, please consider all instrumental areas including woodwind, brass, percussion, string, and voice.

	Very unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat unprepared	Somewhat prepared	Prepared	Very prepared	Not Applicable
Perform solo on my primary instrument (including voice)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Perform in an ensemble on my primary instrument (including voice)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach how to play my primary instrument (including voice)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Perform on instruments outside my primary area (e.g., woodwind player performing brass)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach how to play instruments outside my primary area (e.g., woodwind player teaching brass)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach nontraditional ensemble instruments (e.g., ukulele)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Individual instrumental/vocal pedagogy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach beginning instrumental/voice lessons	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach advanced instrumental/voice lessons	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach how to read music	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach practice techniques	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach performance technique of a variety of performance genres (e.g., baroque, romantic)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Instrument repair	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Musician health (mental and physical)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Accompany solo instrument/voice or ensemble, on piano	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Analysis/History/Literature

Please rate the following based on how well you believe your undergraduate curriculum prepared you for using these elements of analysis/history/literature in your career.

	Very unprepared	Unprepared	Somewhat unprepared	Somewhat prepared	Prepared	Very prepared	Not Applicable
Utilize, discuss, or teach traditional Western/European music history.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Utilize, discuss, or teach popular music history	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Utilize, discuss, or teach basic music theory, functional for a K-12 classroom	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Utilize, discuss, or teach advanced music theory	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Utilize, discuss, or teach concepts of music technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Discuss or teach important literature within your specialty area (i.e., solo, band, choir, orchestra, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Discuss or teach important literature outside your specialty area	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Discuss or teach diverse literature	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach music appreciation (middle or high school level)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Teach elementary general music	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Analyze a large-scale ensemble piece for efficient rehearsal	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Other 21st Century Teaching Concepts and Field Experience

Please respond to the following using the prompt ([note the different options](#)): My undergraduate music education institution offered coursework and/or included the following within the coursework:

	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree	Not Applicable
Adequate contextual (content taught/given before observation) field experience and/or observations prior to student teaching	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other outside experiences to enhance coursework	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Keeping the classroom current in terms of musical content and curriculum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Music technology	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Classroom management	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Diversity (racial, cultural, gender, sexuality, religious)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Diversity (intellectual, physical, emotional)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Listing

Please list one - three courses or concepts required as a part of your undergraduate degree program you feel were most valuable to your success as a music teacher.

1.
2.
3.

Please list one - three courses or concepts that were not present in your undergraduate degree program that you feel would have been greatly beneficial before going into the music education field.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3

Please list one - three courses or concepts required as a part of your undergraduate degree program you feel were least valuable to your success as a music teacher.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3

Comments

If you have any feedback or comments about the survey, please leave those here.

Focus Group Interest

We may be interested in conducting focus groups with teachers to more fully understand your experiences over the past year. Please write your email address in the box below if you would be willing to be considered for this.