INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6” x 9” black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI
A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600
AN INVESTIGATION OF THE RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN UNDERGRADUATE MUSIC EDUCATION STUDENTS' EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCE AND STUDENT TEACHING PERFORMANCE

by

Gregory Robert Fant

A Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of the SCHOOL OF MUSIC AND DANCE In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements For the Degree of DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY WITH A MAJOR IN MUSIC EDUCATION In the Graduate College THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1996
As members of the Final Examination Committee, we certify that we have read the dissertation prepared by Gregory R. Fant entitled An Investigation of the Relationships Between Undergraduate Music Education Students' Early Field Experience and Student Teaching Performance.

and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Robert A. Cutietta
Date: 7/2/96

John R. Fitch
Date: 7/2/96

Nancy E. Ferguson
Date: July 2, 1996

Final approval and acceptance of this dissertation is contingent upon the candidate's submission of the final copy of the dissertation to the Graduate College.

I hereby certify that I have read this dissertation prepared under my direction and recommend that it be accepted as fulfilling the dissertation requirement.

Dissertation Director
Robert A. Cutietta
Date: 7/2/96
STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This dissertation has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this dissertation are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his or her judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: [Signature]
Acknowledgements

The author wishes to acknowledge the following people for their constant support of this project. First, the Music Education Faculty at the University of Arizona, especially Dr. Robert Cutietta, all of whom have gone beyond the call of duty to make this a reality. Second, my colleagues at New Mexico State University, especially Dr. William Clark, for believing in my potential. Third, Dr. Debbie Anders from the Department of Teaching and Teacher Education for her qualitative and literature guidance. Fourth, Doug and Peggy Klein, for giving me a home away from home.
This project is dedicated to Beth, Joshua, and Amy.

I thank God for your love and support.

"I can do all things through Christ who gives me strength"

Philippians 4:13
TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES ............................................................................. 8

ABSTRACT .................................................................................. 9

I. INTRODUCTION ........................................................................ 10
   Background ........................................................................... 10
   Theoretical Basis .................................................................. 12
   Need .................................................................................... 15
   Purpose ................................................................................ 16
   Research Questions ................................................................ 17
   Definitions ........................................................................... 17
   Limitations ........................................................................... 18
   Overview ................................................................................ 18

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE ............................................................. 19
   Overview of the State of Teacher Education ......................... 19
   Reflection and Teacher Education ....................................... 20
   Graduate Opinions of their Teacher Education Training ....... 21
   Variability in Teacher Education Programs ......................... 22
   Outcomes of Field Experience ............................................. 23
   Correlational Studies dealing with Teacher Education .......... 28
   Summary ............................................................................... 32
   Implications for the Present Study ....................................... 32

III. METHODOLOGY ........................................................................ 34
   Sample .................................................................................. 34
   Dependent Variables ............................................................ 35
   Independent Variables .......................................................... 36
   Design .................................................................................... 37
   Procedures ............................................................................ 38
   Analysis ................................................................................ 39
   Timetable .............................................................................. 40
   Summary ............................................................................... 40
TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued

IV. PRESENTATION OF RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS.............41

  Descriptive Data.................................................41
  Interjudge Reliability........................................44
  Interview Reliability.........................................44
  Curricular Validity...........................................45
  Correlation Significance and Magnitude.......................45
  Quantitative Questions........................................45
  Qualitative Question..........................................49
  Summary..........................................................67

V. DISCUSSION OF RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS....................69

  Discussion.......................................................69
  Conclusions......................................................74
  Relationship with Past Research..............................75
  Implications for Education....................................77
  Implications for Future Research.............................79

APPENDIX A: REHEARSAL EFFECTIVENESS SCALE.................81

APPENDIX B: SURVEY OF TEACHING EFFECTIVENESS..............83

APPENDIX C: INTERVIEW FORM.......................................91

APPENDIX D: VIDEO TAPE COVER LETTER..........................113

APPENDIX E: BACKGROUND DATA....................................115

APPENDIX F: SUBJECT SCORES......................................117

APPENDIX G: CURRICULAR DATA....................................119

APPENDIX H: NON-CURRICULAR DATA.............................122

APPENDIX I: MICROTEACHING CONTEXT............................124

REFERENCES................................................................126
## LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 4.1. Descriptive Statistics for the Dependent Variables ............... 42
TABLE 4.2. Descriptive Statistics for the Curricular Variables ............... 43
TABLE 4.3. Descriptive Statistics for the Non-Curricular Variables .......... 44
TABLE 4.4. Correlation Coefficients for Context .................................. 46
TABLE 4.5. Correlation Coefficients for Feedback ................................. 47
TABLE 4.6. Non-Curricular Correlation Coefficients .............................. 48
TABLE 4.7. Subject Ranking .......................................................... 50
TABLE 4.8. Subject Aliases ......................................................... 52
ABSTRACT

This correlational study examined the relationships between undergraduate music education students' early field experiences and student teaching performance. Subjects were 40 music student teachers from eleven universities. Student teaching performance was determined from video samples using two teacher effectiveness forms, the Rehearsal Effectiveness Scale and the Survey of Teaching Effectiveness. Two independent judges were used and interjudge reliability was found to be .73 on the Survey of Teaching Effectiveness and .69 on the Rehearsal Effectiveness Scale. Reliability between forms is .88.

Subjects were interviewed to collect data on both curricular and non-curricular undergraduate field experiences. These data were correlated with each subject's score on the teacher effectiveness forms. No significant correlations were found between total early field experience and student teaching performance. Significant correlations were found between early field experiences with feedback and student teaching performance ($r = .439$ and $.507; p < .01$). A significant negative correlation was found between early field experiences without feedback and student teaching performance ($r = -.316, p < .047$). No significant correlations were found to exist between the non-curricular index and student teaching performance.

Based on their average student teaching performance ranking, five subjects were identified as a subsample for closer analysis. Data on their backgrounds, high school experiences, curricular experiences, and non-curricular experiences is presented.

Conclusions include the following: 1. Early field experience with feedback and peer microteaching are positively related to student teaching performance. 2. Early field experience regardless of feedback, non-curricular experience, degree type and student background are not related to student teaching performance. 3. Early field experience without feedback has a negative relationship with student teaching performance. 4. A methods/conducting lab is an effective setting for microteaching experiences. Implications for education and future research are presented.
Chapter I

Introduction

"The music teacher education program has been a success; it requires no apology; it merits praise. Success is, however, a relative quality and one cannot be sanguine about the results achieved by music teacher education. It has produced and continues to produce too many ineffective and ill-prepared music teachers" (Leonhard, 1985, p. 10).

"Students, inadequately educated at the public school level - enroll in ineffective teacher training programs - return to the public schools inadequately prepared - their students, poorly educated," (Meske, 1986, p. 65) a vicious circle of teaching as one was taught. These two statements show the continuum of thought on this country's music teacher education programs.

School performance programs in this country are unparalleled in the world. Yet, as Leonhard points out, "music teacher education has changed little in the last 50 years" (p. 10). He goes on to say, "the problem is that no program has ever been systematically developed for the specific purpose of preparing music teachers. Existing programs without exception are hybrids, the result of cross fertilization of three related programs from different types of institutions - the conservatory, the liberal arts college, and the teacher's college" (p. 11). Within this system, individual components are often added, retained, or deleted based upon political demands, or opinion, not on a sound research base. This study will examine one aspect of the teacher training program. The focus will be on how early field experiences relate to student teaching success.

Background

There is a great deal of variability in the way undergraduate music education programs are operationalized (Colwell, 1985). Schmidt (1989) found that while most schools cover the same topics, the amount of time devoted to each varies considerably. One area of variability is in the amount of field experience required. For instance, a range
from 0 to 300 hours of required early field experiences were reported from 180 NASM schools (Verrastro & Leglar, 1992, p. 683).

Variability among programs goes beyond mere quantity. There appears to be wide variability in the nature of the experiences as well. Rozmajzl (1992) sent a survey to participants of the Mountain Lake Colloquium on elementary music education, and wide variability was found not only among the number of hours of early field experience but also in the kind of activities included as early field experience. These activities included: observations (both live and video taped), microteaching, macro teaching, observation journals, observation evaluations, internships, reflective seminars, laboratory classes, and mentorship programs. These experiences were operationalized in a variety of ways: as part of a class with group activities, as part of a class with individual activities, independent of any class, and in combinations of the above. About the only commonality among the participants was that all respondents had some type of early field experience for their students.

While most of the research that has examined the music education program has been in the form of surveys and/or interviews, a few have utilized other methodologies. These studies use methodologies which provide evidence of the value of field experiences. L’Roy (1983) provides evidence that in at least one program music education students without prior teaching experience have a weak occupational identity. Wolfgang (1990) built upon L’Roy’s work by examining a group of students involved in a prestudent teaching field experience. Although the study dealt with one school, it provides some evidence that field experiences promote a strong occupational role identity. His results also indicate that most of the students did not automatically adopt the norms of their cooperating teacher, thus not continuing the status quo.

The diversity found in both the nature and quantity of the field experience among programs points to the lack of consensus among those involved with preservice education as to the degree of importance of field experiences. On one side are those educators who feel that field experiences tend to maintain the status quo in music education. On the other side are those educators who see field experiences as the best method of giving students a
practical and realistic view of their future.

Colwell (1985) presents an exhaustive overview of the "state of music teacher education," in which he says that "good and poor teachers seem to exit from the same curriculum" (p. 39). It is unclear why or how this is so.

Theoretical Basis

The main goal of teacher education programs is to help candidates move from the role of student to the role of teacher. Three views of this process are important for the theoretical basis of this study. These three perspectives are: sociological, development of expertise, and reflective.

From a sociological perspective, occupations can be viewed as social roles. Therefore, teacher education is a process of developing occupational roles. Teacher socialization is a process through which an individual becomes integrated into a social group by learning a group's norms, values, and behavior (L'Roy, 1983). Although an in-depth examination of occupational role development is beyond the scope of this research, the opportunities which a student has to move into this role are of concern.

Opportunities to develop role identity present themselves in various forms during the undergraduate experience. The most common forms are clinical experiences, early field experiences, and student teaching. There are those in the field of education that view student teaching as the culmination of the teacher preparation program. This implies that much of the teaching curriculum is focused on enabling a student to function successfully as a student teacher. If this is indeed the case, then teachers of teachers should be concerned with how early field experiences relate to student teaching performance.

Berliner (1988) posits a theory of development in expertise in which one moves through the different stages of novice, advanced beginner, competent, proficient, and expert. These five stages follow a general model presented by two Berkeley professors, Hubert Dreyfus, a philosopher, and Stuart Dreyfus, a computer scientist. Berliner speaks of a study where experts and novices had to teach a 15 minute lesson on probability to approximately 15 high school students. "The experts were unhappy about
their participation in this task, in part, because the students they had to teach were not the ones they taught regularly. Their own students were trained in routines to make the class run smoothly.” It is with these well practiced routines that experts exhibit a “fluidity and effortlessness” in their performance. “What looks to be easy for the expert and so clumsy for the novice is the result of thousands of hours of experience and reflection” (Berliner, 1988, p. 15). Clinical experiences often mark the beginning point for the accumulation of this teaching experience.

Mere teaching practice is apparently not enough. The need for critical reflection upon one’s performance is also necessary to become a master teacher. Schön (1987) offers insight to the ideas of reflective practice and current problems with schools of professional development.

In a broad sense, the professional education of teachers follows a three part hierarchy of knowledge: relevant basic science, relevant applied science, and a practicum which addresses the technical skills of day to day practice (Schön, 1987, p. 8-9). Schön applies this concept to all professional training in the university setting. There is a tendency for research to be more aligned with basic science than with practical application. Because of this, many educators question the gap that is perceived to exist between "school's prevailing conception of professional knowledge and the actual competencies required of practitioners in the field" (p. 10).

Schön’s basic premise is that the artistry of a profession should be education’s focus. "It is no accident that professionals often refer to an 'art' of teaching or management and use the term artist to refer to practitioners unusually adept at handling situations of uncertainty, uniqueness, and conflict" (p. 16). Much like the applied music teacher, music educators must incorporate coaching in with teaching to develop this artistic approach. "Perhaps learning all forms of professional artistry depends... on the freedom to learn by doing in a setting relatively low in risk, with access to coaches who initiate students into the 'traditions of the calling' and help them, by 'the right kind of telling,' to see on their own behalf and in their own way what they need most to see" (p. 17). This is the essence of reflective practice.
Two definitions must be addressed in dealing with the epistemology of reflective practice: "knowing-in-action" and "reflection-in-action." Knowing-in-action refers to the know-how we reveal in our intelligent action-observable physical performances like riding a bicycle and private operations like an analysis of a balance sheet. The knowing is in the action. Knowing-in-action works as long as the situation falls within the boundaries of what we have learned to view as normal. "A professional's knowing-in-action is embedded in the socially and institutionally structured context shared by a community of practitioners" (Schön, 1987, p. 33). Reflection-in-action is a process of sequences: a. a situation of action, b. routine responses producing a surprise, c. surprise leading to conscious reflection, d. questioning the knowing-in-action assumptions, e. reflection giving rise to on the spot experimentation (p. 28). Although this is an idealized format, it is an accurate summation of how one deals with zones of indeterminate practice.

Another way of defining reflection in action is student self assessment. According to Verrastro and Leglar (1992), a common element in all feedback systems is that they encourage self assessment. Therefore feedback, especially for the novice, is necessary for students to reflect on their actions. Two of the most common ways this has been operationalized in music education are videotaped self analysis and systematic observation.

Two theoretical positions have been described, Berliner's development of expertise and Schön's reflective practice. "The research on the development of expertise suggests that we have not recognized the limits of the novice and the potential for growth of the advanced beginner and competent teacher as we develop teacher education programs" (Berliner, 1988, p. 26-27). Reflection in action helps the student deal with zones of indeterminate practice. If reflection is used as a development tool, then feedback is especially important for the novice. The point is that developmental differences are real and they may have important implications for teacher education programs and policies. "We may be unable to shorten the trip very much because extensive experience is fundamental to development, but we certainly ought to help nurture those willing to undertake the journey by providing training and evaluation appropriate for their level of
development” (Berliner, 1988, p. 27).

Need

"At this point in our history there is little if any disagreement as to the importance of providing both early field experiences and student teaching in a teacher education program” (Zeichner, 1987, p. 114). Teacher educators should be concerned with developing conceptual and curricular frameworks for field experiences not debating as to whether or not field experiences should be offered. Zeichner goes on to say that we should focus on “discovering which particular kinds of field experiences and which individual components within programs contribute to their educative functions” (p. 114). As Guyton and McIntyre (1990) point out, “many institutions add hours to their student teaching and school experiences component without examining what occurs during these experiences” (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990, p. 516). Early field experience knowledge is largely idiosyncratic (Applegate, 1987). These statements offer a concise summary of the state of affairs regarding field experience in teacher education.

Although most professional educators consider field experience to be a necessary part of the undergraduate curriculum, as evidenced above, some disagree as to its value. Lowriendee (1990) found that although laboratory experiences are abundant, there is little agreement as to how often these experiences should be offered, which behaviors should be practiced, or which courses should incorporate them. Those that devalue field experience see it as maintaining education’s “status quo.” They would rather see the first year teacher come into the school and be an innovator. But, as Berliner (1988) points out “the image of the new teacher as the creative lesson planner, eschewing the teachers’ manual and bringing a fresh eye to the creation of the curriculum, has already been attacked as unfair by others” (p. 22).

On the other hand, most teacher education graduates consider the field components of their undergraduate experience as the most valuable. The field experience gives them a view of the “real” teaching world. Applegate (1985) presents both the pros and cons of early field experience. Examining the positives, she states that "early field
experiences allow prospective teachers to identify their own educational beliefs, to develop a sense of purpose for teaching and to begin to acquire a concept of what good teaching is" (Applegate, 1985, p. 60-6). Other positives related to early field experiences include allowing students to examine personal motivation to teach, develop self confidence, and see different teachers and styles of teaching.

Problems exist in the way early field experiences are actualized. Knowing what students do in early field experiences is not enough; how students interpret and integrate early field experience activities into their understanding of teaching may be more important. Zeichner's quotes also reflect the concern of many professional educators that simply spending more time in the schools will not help much. Likewise, the act of practicing is not enough; the student must know what to practice and know when the practicing is correct. This can be a function of reflective practice. "Without guided reflection and interpretation of field experience activities, students may be left accepting all teaching behaviors as valid and all student responses as natural. The education of a teacher will be little more than apprenticeship" (Applegate, 1985, p. 61).

All educators want the best possible experience for their students. With so much variability in the way in which early field experience programs are operationalized, one cannot be sure if the field experiences are worthwhile or a colossal waste of time. Specifically it may be that certain types of field experiences do little if any good at increasing a preservice teacher's teaching ability. Conversely, it may be that certain types of experiences greatly enhance teaching ability. While unsubstantiated statements abound, the research literature is surprisingly quiet on this point.

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships that exist between undergraduate field experiences and student teacher performance. By examining student teacher performance and its relationship to both curricular and non-curricular field experiences, this study attempted to identify those components of the undergraduate experience which help students become more competent teachers.
Research Questions

In a broad sense, this study will address the question: What relationships exist between undergraduate field experiences and student teacher performance? Specifically it will examine how opportunities for role development relate to student teacher performance. Field experiences will be examined from two views, curricular and non-curricular. Four specific questions will be addressed. For the curricular field experiences:

1. Does the number of early field experiences done prior to student teaching correlate with student teaching performance?
2. Does the number of early field experiences done prior to student teaching that include feedback or other reflective activities correlate with student teaching performance?

For the non-curricular field experiences:

3. Does the non-curricular index correlate with student teaching performance?

For both curricular and non-curricular experiences:

4. How do the overall field experiences differ between students who have high student teaching performance scores and those that do not?

Definitions

Early field experience - refers to any experience that an undergraduate music education major may have where he or she takes on the role of the teacher or observes a “live” classroom situation from the teacher’s perspective.

Correlation - correlation coefficients are expressed in terms of a number between -1.00 and +1.00. A correlation will be considered significant if p ≤ .05.

Teacher competence - Medley (1984) defines competence in terms of what the teacher does. For the purposes of this study, competence is how well the student teacher scores on the Rehearsal Effectiveness Scale (Appendix A) and the Survey of Teaching Effectiveness (Appendix B).

Non-Curricular Index - a number which is derived from the length and quantity of non-curricular experiences where the student took on the role of a teacher.
Feedback - this term is used to describe those early field experiences where a candidate receives criticism on his or her teaching performance. This criticism is usually from a university faculty member, but can also include comments from peers and cooperating teachers. It is most often associated with microteaching.

Follow-up - this term is used to describe those early field experiences where there is focused discussion after a student has observed someone teaching. Usually the observation is done in an elementary or secondary classroom and the discussion is between candidates and university supervisors or some other teaching professional. Writing assignments without personal interaction are not considered to be follow-up for this study.

Limitations

Since the dominant focus of this study is on relationships, causation is beyond the scope of this work. The cause of this relationship would be only speculation unless further research is done.

Overview

The rest of this study is divided into four chapters. Chapter 2 is a review of the literature. Chapter 3 is a presentation of the methodology, including design and procedures. Chapter 4 includes the data analysis and results. Chapter 5 is a discussion of the results along with conclusions and implications for education as well as future research.
Chapter II

Review of Literature

Literature from education in general and music education in specific is included in this review. Beginning with a broad overview of the present state of teacher education, the chapter will address the following themes: reflective teaching, graduates' opinions of their educational program, the variability in programs, outcomes of field experience, and correlational studies.

Overview of the State of Teacher Education

The focus of teacher education has shifted from a process of skill training to an emphasis on cognition, personal perspective, narrative method, and reflection (Carter & Anders, 1996). Over the past decade, the emerging conception of teachers is that of a reflective professional. Carter and Anders (1996) present five orientations to teacher education. The first is a practical /craft orientation which stresses the practical ways of the day to day activities of a teacher. The focus would be on things such as class management and lesson planning. "The craft perspective has been given new energy within an emerging focus on the special knowledge or wisdom teachers derive from the actual experience of teaching and from examining and reflecting on their own experiences" (p. 560). The second, technological orientation, is rooted in behavioral psychology. Using approaches such as microteaching, intensive observation, peer coaching, and simulations, the focus is on compiling skills that are associated with student achievement. The third is a personal orientation. Here theory and practice are embedded in one's personal experience. The fourth, academic orientation, focuses on a rigorous academic program followed by an apprenticeship with a teacher who has an academic orientation. The fifth, critical /social orientation, is similar to personal orientation. It focuses on teacher empowerment and emphasizing methods that start with the teacher's own experience and understanding.
Obviously, these five orientations are not mutually exclusive. What seems to be happening is a fundamental change in the conception of teacher education. The emphasis "is on teachers' ability to inquire into teaching and think critically about their work using their craft and personal knowledge as well as the knowledge derived from studies of learning, development, and society" (Carter & Anders, 1996, p. 562).

**Reflection and Teacher Education**

The idea of a reflective professional is not new: Dewey wrote about it as early as 1904 (Lanier & Little, 1986; Richardson, 1996). Yet, its increased emphasis in the education of teachers is a rather recent phenomenon. The benefits of this emphasis have been documented by Cruickshank (1990). He found that prestudent teachers who had training in reflective teaching were less anxious, less frightened, and more confident about beginning student teaching. Students with reflective teacher training have shown an increase in their ability to critically analyze classroom teaching. This is supported by Foxx’s (1991) study of preservice teachers’ journals which focused on their weekly classroom observations. Over half of the students showed increased reflectivity over the course of the semester. Higher levels of reflection were demonstrated when students had opportunities to engage in discussions with the cooperating teacher. Other outcomes included students being able to see relationships between instructional strategies and student motivation, identify their own strengths and weaknesses, and identify professional goals.

As one views the five orientations (Carter & Anders, 1996) in light of the practice of field experience, the concern is shifting from what is to be learned in field settings to how candidates interpret what they experience. The use of teaching experiences in preservice education can be traced back to the days of the normal school. Many components of early field experience such as peer teaching and simulation are not new ideas. But, "over time it is becoming more apparent that the purpose of teaching experience is changing from an apprenticeship toward a more professional notion
emphasizing the need to create students of teaching” (Cruickshank & Armaline, 1986, p. 39). One problem with field experience is that teaching candidates are thrown from an environment where knowledge is more or less predigested to one where they must learn from their own experiences (Carter & Anders, 1996). Another problem is the lack of theoretical and conceptual frameworks (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). All too often field experiences do not have clearly defined goals and fall short of their learning potential. As Zeichner (1980) points out, “if we want field-based experiences to contribute to the development of thoughtful and reflective teachers....then we must begin to focus our concerns on the quality of these experiences as they are actually implemented in the field. We know very little about the subtleties of socialization during field based experiences beyond the gross indicators of central tendencies” (p 52). In his view, field experiences socialize candidates into existing school practice.

Graduates' Opinions of their Teacher Education Training

One of the most common methods of examining teacher education programs is by surveying graduates (Boardman, 1990; Colwell, 1985; Shires, 1990; Verrastro & Leglar, 1992). Teachers in the field claim that most of what they know about teaching was learned from experience. Therefore, many of these surveys recommend that the field experience component be stronger (Verrastro & Leglar, 1992). Similar opinions were found in at least one group of teaching candidates before they began student teaching. McDermott (1991) reports that methods courses were valued equally with practicums and teacher education courses with a theoretical or philosophical focus were rated lowest in terms of learning how to become a teacher. Even though the conclusions of many of these surveys are tentative, two reoccurring points are important. The first is that the college education program should be more practical; and second, there tends to be variability among programs of various institutions (Verrastro & Leglar, 1992).
Variability in Teacher Education Programs

Many have documented the variability in teacher education programs (Boardman, 1990; Galluzzo & Craig, 1990; Verrastro & Leglar, 1992) and indicate that the number and type of field experiences have some of the greatest variation. This variation is evident not only among schools, but also among studies. For instance, concerning the number of hours of early field experience among private colleges, Hsieh (1989) found a range of 100-129 hours. Stone (1987) reports up to 150 hours and Schmidt (1989) reports a range of 0-300 hours. Schmidt’s results must be viewed with some caution because the distribution was skewed; few institutions required more than 200 hours and only schools in Ohio reported 300 hours of field experience.

Considering the types of early field experience, Lowriendee (1990) surveyed schools of education about their laboratory experiences. Of the 132 schools responding, 90% include laboratory experiences. Microteaching and demonstration lessons dominated the activities, but little agreement was found as to which teaching behaviors should be emphasized. Nor was there any agreement as to the place of the laboratory experience in the curriculum. Furthermore, most institutions have conducted little if any research on the effectiveness of the laboratory component of their program.

One of the more thorough studies with a music focus was done by Rozmajzl (1992). He surveyed all participants (77) of the Mountain Lake Colloquium on elementary music education. Sixty-eight surveys were returned, a return rate of 88%. Focusing on Introduction to Music Education Courses, he found that they were often taken during the sophomore year. Opportunities were provided for the entire class to observe master teachers (elementary, choral, and instrumental). Other activities included: microteaching, macroteaching, keeping journals or observation reports, and discussion of observed teaching. Forty-one of the sixty-eight surveys required an Introduction to Music Education and 33 of these included field experiences. Of these 33, 24 visited classrooms as a group; nine allowed students to select their own observations from among elementary, secondary choral, and secondary instrumental; 22 required observations to be on their own time rather than as a group; and seven had microteaching taking place during
observations. The number of visits made by classes or individual students varied greatly, ranging from 1 to 25 visits. Respondents from several schools reported that students are involved in 40-60 hours of observation, while one school required three full days of observation.

Rozmajzl also found that 24 of the 68 schools require observations in addition to those required by a specific course. The required number of hours ranged from 2 to 50. Eleven schools indicated that some microteaching occurs during observations. 13 kept journals and 10 had students meet periodically in a group forum or seminar to discuss what was perceived during their observations. Other types of field experience included internships, working and/or observing a college preparatory program, music laboratory classes, working with on site children's choirs, and mentorship programs.

In recent years the amount of time required and the number of field experience offerings in teacher education programs has expanded (Applegate, 1987; Carter & Anders, 1996; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). With many state departments of education mandating early field experience, nearly all teacher education programs in the United States include some type of early field experience (Stone, 1987). Furthermore, two Music Educators National Conference Task forces (1972 and 1987) have stressed the need for all music education certification programs to include laboratory and field experiences (Rozmajzl, 1992). With this increase in early field experience activity, studies which examine the outcomes of these experiences are particularly important.

Outcomes of Field Experience

The literature which focuses on the outcomes of field experience tends to be a mass of contradictory views. As McIntyre points out, “field experience is probably the most praised, most criticized, most entrenched, most debated, but certainly least understood part of preservice teacher education (Wolfgang, 1991 p. 13).

One commonality among those studies that focus on the positive outcomes of field experience is the increase in candidates' self-confidence and self-esteem (Applegate, 1987; Cannon, 1992; Cole, 1994; Denton, 1982; Levy, 1980; Sunal, 1980). Another
commonality is that early field experience gives candidates an opportunity to integrate practical experience with theoretical knowledge (Denton, 1982; Hsieh, 1989; Sunal, 1980). Early field experiences give prospective teachers the opportunity to examine their personal motivation to teach, identify their own educational beliefs, develop a sense of purpose for teaching and begin to acquire a concept of good teaching (Applegate, 1985).

Although cognitive development is not commonly associated with early field experience, Denton (1982) found that early field experience can provide a meaningful context for subsequent methods course work. He examined 139 candidates who were involved in 30 hours of field experience, most of which was observation. The candidates were tested on cognitive attainment. The results support the idea that cognitive attainment can be positively influenced by field experience.

McDermott (1995) and Gormley (1993) both conducted studies that compared students with field experiences and students without field experiences. In both cases the students with field experience were undergraduates and those without field experience were graduate students. Both found that students with field or practical experiences moved more quickly to mature thoughts about teaching and learning. Those graduate students without field experience tended to be more concerned about themselves as teachers, while the undergraduates with field experience were more concerned about pupil learning. It is interesting that Berliner (1988) addresses “greenhorns” who come into education through an alternative certification route lacking pedagogical knowledge. “With their minimum of classroom experience, often with no student teaching, and with just a little time spent in observation, they should be considered severely handicapped because of their ignorance” (p. 20). Berliner goes on to say that all too often teacher education programs do not recognize that developmental differences are real and that training should be appropriate to their level of development.

One of the earliest studies dealing with developmental stages and teacher education is the work of Fuller (1969). She theorized that teacher education programs often try to meet the needs of candidates in a sequence different from the sequence which candidates
feel those needs. Fuller posited that there are three levels of teacher concerns: 1. concern about self, 2. concern about self as a teacher, 3. concern about pupils. Her findings support the notion that a sequential program of field experience helps the candidate move through these levels of concern. Support for her ideas is found in the work of Pigge (1990), Cohoon (1988), McDermott (1995) and Gormley (1993). One study that did not find students shifting from self to task during a field experience was that of Strawitz (1984).

Another positive outcome of early field experience is in the area of socialization and role development. There is evidence that field experience encourages the student to develop career commitment and a sense of occupational identity (Verrastro & Leglar, 1992). The strongest cases are presented in the work of L'Roy (1983) and Wolfgang (1991).

L'Roy examined the occupational identity in undergraduate music education majors at North Texas State University (now University of North Texas). This was at a time when the University of North Texas did not have early field experiences. One hundred sixty-five questionnaires and thirty-eight interviews were used to gather data. The results indicate that the students' career role models were not music educators. This lack of occupational identity was related to the limited opportunities these students had to take on the role of teacher during their preservice training. Those students who had teaching experience did report a stronger commitment to music education than those that had no teaching experience.

Wolfgang (1991) used a similar approach in his in-depth study of 21 undergraduate music education students who were part of preservice practicum. Data were gathered from each subject through three interviews, a questionnaire, observations, and journals. Like many of the surveys already mentioned, the students in this study had a great deal of appreciation and enthusiasm for their field experience. Their acclaim fell into the following categories:
1. They were able to evaluate themselves performing teaching tasks that they could do only while actually being in front of pupils. These tasks were listed in their preexperience interviews as the concerns they had for themselves such as conducting rehearsals, hearing mistakes, and managing pupils' behavior.

2. They were able to develop confidence in their choice of teaching area and level.

3. They were able to begin the role transition from student to teacher.

4. They were more motivated to continue their campus studies to become teachers.

Those who see field experience as being a negative influence don't object to the experience, but rather question the context and outcomes. For example, Zeichner (1980) acknowledges that field experiences can socialize candidates into existing school practice. His question is whether or not this is desirable. There must be more focus on the quality and context of these experiences. There are many problems with the way early field experiences are actualized. “Without guided reflection and interpretation of field experience activities, students may be left accepting all teaching behaviors as valid and all student responses as natural. Then the education of the teacher will be little more than apprenticeship” (Applegate, 1985, p. 6).

Often those who question the value of field experiences feel that what is presently being learned in those experiences is not what they would want the teaching candidate to learn. “A great confidence has been expressed in recent years in the benefits of providing candidates with field experience earlier rather than later in their professional course sequence. Although it is common sense that candidates should have early exposure to life at the ‘chalk face’ in order to make more informed career choices, a number of questions about the value of earlier practica remain unanswered. How can candidates benefit from being exposed earlier and longer to practices most teacher educators do not want them to emulate?” (Katz & Raths, 1985, p. 13). These unwanted practices tend to promote survival and class management rather than thought on student learning (Carter & Anders, 1996; Lanier & Little, 1986; Taylor & et al., 1992). This kind of criticism centers on the idea that teachers must be more than managers. Managers can keep an organization going
but do not usually provide direction or significant improvements (Lanier & Little, 1986). This difficulty of learning from experience has been discussed since the turn of the century.

According to Applegate (1985), some students have encountered negative events in their field experience. These events include: spending most of the experience on tasks which are menial, boring busywork, having little opportunity to converse and interact with the cooperating teacher, and finishing the experience wondering what was to be learned.

In contrast to the evidence already presented which espouses the benefits of field experience, other studies have found quite different results. In studies done by Wilson (1988), Myers (1987), and Stiscak (1987), the results found no change in attitudes of candidates after completing an early field experience. Brand (1982; 1985) even concludes that student teaching has no effect on the classroom management beliefs and skills of music education candidates. Although Rios-Perez (1991) found that students after 20 hours of early field experience had some affective gains, he found no evidence that the students made significant connections between theory and practice nor did pedagogical knowledge increase. Malone (1984) concludes that early field experiences are more effective with freshmen and sophomores, while Myers (1987) found that freshmen did not increase insights as a result of their field experience. Clarken (1993) may offer the best explanation for these contradictions. The value of field experience is dependent on candidates being taught how to learn from the experience. Therefore, field experiences can play an "educative or miseducative role in preparing future teachers" (p. 4).

Clarken's insight may also explain Grossman's (1980) results. Grossman compared students from Central Washington University who chose an undergraduate program which included early field experience with students who chose a traditional program. The traditional students were ranked and rated higher by their supervising teachers. One major problem in the study is that the sample sizes were not equal; therefore the initial variance may have not been the same. In other words, the students who chose the non-traditional program may have been different to begin with.
In spite of the contradiction found in field experience literature, Applegate (1987) does offer some tentative conclusions. As a result of field experiences:

1. Learning about "self" is one principal outcome
2. Self-esteem seems to be higher
3. Adjustment to field experience may depend upon the structure provided by the college faculty member.
4. Time available to converse with cooperating teacher is a chief concern
5. Cooperating teachers seem to have a significant influence
6. Early field experience students need time to review their experiences with peers and university faculty
7. "The effective nature of the experience takes precedence over the cognitive" (p. 81).

In sum, field based experiences seem to include positive and negative consequences that are complicated and subtle in nature (Zeichner, 1980).

Before examining the correlational literature, two other field experience studies should be mentioned. The difference with these is that rather than compare field experience versus non field experience, both examined different types of field experience. Malone and Strawitz (1985) compared students who had just a field experience with those who had a field experience which included microteaching. The microteaching group scored better on a measurement of science teaching skills, attitudes toward science, and science process skills. Winitzky and Arends (1991) report three related studies which examine the impact of variations in field experience on preservice student's knowledge, skill, and reflectiveness. The third study found that a clinical discussion approach and a microteaching approach are equally viable for candidates to practice teaching strategies. Yet, they had the most success using microteaching videotapes to assess skill.

Correlational Studies dealing with Teacher Education

The correlational literature is rather limited, but is pertinent to this project. Two studies have investigated the curricular variables which may predict effectiveness in music
teaching. Benner's 1963 study examined the relationship between preservice measures and ratings of music teaching success. Success was measured by the ratings of the teacher done by administrative personnel, principals or music supervisors. Preservice ratings included undergraduate music, music education, and professional education course grades as well as the percentile rank on a psychological test. Positive, significant correlation coefficients were found between the ratings and student teaching grades, the ratings and profession education grades, and the ratings and music education methods. Other correlations were not significant. Four years later, Borkowski (1967) conducted a similar study but added measures of student achievement. He found no significant correlations but did note a positive correlation between experts' opinions and selected undergraduate course work.

Personality attributes have also been considered in some predictive studies. Schmidt and Hicken (1986) found that a composite measure of personality attributes was the best single predictor of achievement in music student teaching. This variable accounted for 17.1% of the variance. Other independent variables included: SAT math scores, SAT verbal scores, music GPA, teaching area, as well as the Student Teacher Personality Attributes. Conclusions point toward the need of considering personality attributes as an admission criterion for music education degree programs. Krueger (Verrastro & Leglar, 1992) also examined the relationship between teacher effectiveness and personality. He reported that "personality and motivation are related to teaching success in fairly powerful ways" (p. 680). He goes on to say that a stable relationship between objective and subjective measures of teaching effectiveness has yet to be established.

In general education, Marso and Pigge (1991) examined the relationship between university supervisors ratings of student teacher performance with three sets of measurements: 1. high school and college GPA, 2. self reported attitudes and concerns about teaching, and 3. Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and Rooter's locus of control scores. Using a sample of 87 student teachers, Marso found five predictor variables accounted for approximately 30% of the variance in student teaching performance ratings. They were:
university GPA, self-rating of future effectiveness as a teacher, and three of the eight Myers-Briggs scores. "It appears that prospective teachers with a combination of high university GPA, who perceive themselves as likely to become highly successful future teachers, who have a Myers-Briggs classification preference for intuition in contrast to sensing and who have a Myers-Briggs classification preference for feeling rather than thinking are more likely to have their student teaching performance rated higher... than their fellow student teachers" (p. 5).

Olsen (1981) examined the relationships between various amounts of observation and practice of 15 teacher behaviors during preservice experience to the use of those behaviors during student teaching. Eighty-eight candidates from four universities responded to a questionnaire which assessed the extent to which the student observed and practiced the 15 teacher behaviors during early field experiences. Cooperating teachers evaluated the extent which their student teachers actually used the 15 teacher behaviors during student teaching. The conclusions include two important points: (1) There is no relationship between the number of clock hours of early field experience and the use of the 15 teacher behaviors in student teaching. (2) Observation and practice in early field experience are not significantly related to the use of the 15 teacher behaviors in student teaching.

Using subjects from multiple universities is not as common as focusing on subjects from one school. In a study of relationships between early field experiences and student teaching, grade point average, and success in obtaining employment as a teacher, Stupiansky (1984) found that a combination of professional education GPA and total hours of early field experience were the best set of discriminants for students in secondary education, while GPA was the best discriminant for students in elementary education. The subjects were all from Indiana University.

Keeping a single school focus, Folkert (1977) also investigated the relationship between early field experience and student teaching performance. The subjects were 127 students from Michigan State University enrolled in student teaching. Students were classified into one of four categories: those with in-school early field experience exceeding
50 hours, those with in-school early field experience less than 50 hours, those with any early field experience outside of a school setting (such as camp counselor, Sunday School teacher), and those with no early field experience. The dependent variables included the student’s self evaluation of her effectiveness and the cooperating teacher’s evaluation of the student’s effectiveness. These evaluations examined the student teacher’s performance in four areas: rapport with students and staff, classroom management, subject knowledge and preparedness for teaching techniques, and personal and professional characteristics. Student teachers who had in-school field experience were rated higher in two areas, rapport with students and staff and personal and professional characteristics, than those without in-school experiences. It is important to note that the probability level for this study was set at .15.

Finally, Calfee (1983) focused on the field experience hours completed the year prior to student teaching. His subjects were 111 elementary education majors from the University of Akron. Because of recent school and state changes in certification requirements, the number of field experience hours rose drastically, creating a great deal of variability in the subjects’ field experience hours (0-290). Two research questions were addressed: (1) Is there a relationship between the number of field experience hours completed in the year prior to student teaching and overall student teaching performance? (2) Is there a relationship between the number of field experience hours completed in the year prior to student teaching and the ratings received on 12 specific teaching skills evaluated at the end of student teaching? Results indicated that there was no significant relationship between the number of field experience hours and overall student teaching performance. Five teaching behaviors were found to be related to more field experience hours. These were: (a) is poised and self-controlled, (b) communicates clearly, (c) dresses appropriately, (d) provides effective use of class time, and (e) provides consistent reinforcement for acceptable behavior.
Summary

From the literature presented, contrasting views of field experience abound. State departments of education mandate increases in hours (Carter and Anders, 1996), yet universities disagree on how to implement these hours (Rozmajzl, 1992; Schmidt, 1989). While L'Roy (1983) and Wolfgang (1991) see the socialization that occurs during field experience as positive and necessary, Zeichner (1980) questions whether this is a desirable outcome. Wilson (1988) and Myers (1987) report no change in attitudes during one field experience, yet Applegate (1987) sees increases in self-confidence and self-esteem as one of the positive outcomes. Denton (1982) found that field experience allows students to integrate theoretical knowledge with practical application; Rios-Perez (1991) did not find this type of integration.

Regardless of the empirical findings, graduates see field experience as one of the most important parts of their undergraduate experience and want more (Verrasstro and Leglar, 1992). Yet some professors want less (Katz and Raths, 1985), fearing that field experience teaches candidates to focus on survival rather than student learning. With Calfee (1983) finding no relationship between the number of early field experience hours and student teacher performance and Stupiansky (1984) finding some correlation between field experience secondary student teaching performance, the best way to structure field experience remains to be seen. Clearly there is need for additional studies which will shed light on this important topic.

Implications for the Present Study

Most of the correlational studies have examined only one school, those that have not have used inconsistent methods of evaluating student teacher performance. For example, Olsen (1981) used cooperating teachers' evaluations of student teaching. The present study used subjects from 11 universities and had the same panel evaluate each student teacher's performance. Since reflection is a growing area of interest in teacher education (Carter and Anders, 1996), opportunities for feedback and discussion were examined.
It seems implausible that the conflicting results are solely the result of contradictory measurement tools. Instead, it may be that the studies were too focused on only curricular field experiences. Students are often involved in a mosaic of experiences that interweave with the structured curriculum. The influence of these outside experiences has not been explored. Therefore this study will also investigate the non-curricular activities of the subjects.
Chapter III

Methodology

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships that exist between undergraduate field experiences and student teaching performance. By examining student teacher performance and its relationship to both curricular and non-curricular field experiences, this study will attempt to identify those components of the undergraduate experience which help students become more competent teachers. Four specific questions were addressed. For the curricular field experiences:

1. Does the number of early field experiences done prior to student teaching correlate with student teaching performance?

2. Does the number of early field experiences done prior to student teaching that include feedback or other reflective activities correlate with student teaching performance?

For the non-curricular field experiences:

3. Does the non-curricular index correlate with student teaching performance?

For both curricular and non-curricular experiences:

4. How do the overall field experiences differ between students who have high student teaching performance scores and those that do not?

Sample

Secondary music student teachers were recruited from each of eleven universities. Although 50 music education student teachers agreed to participate, 10 dropped out before the study was completed for a variety of reasons. Therefore the sample consisted of 40 student teachers. The eleven universities were public institutions and were chosen on the basis of the music education coordinator’s willingness to support this project. From the sample of 40, a subsample of five was used to address the fourth research question. Students in the subsample were identified by their average rank on the two teacher
effectiveness instruments which are described later in this chapter. These five were the 
highest ranking student, the lowest ranking student, the student at the median, the student 
at the 25th percentile and the student at the 75th percentile.

**Dependent Variables**

The dependent variable was a measure of each student’s teaching competence, 
using Bergee’s Rehearsal Effectiveness Scale (see Appendix A) and the Survey of 
Teaching Effectiveness as developed by Hamann and Baker (1996) (see Appendix B). 
The Rehearsal Effectiveness Rating Scale consists of three factors: conducting technique, 
teacher-student rapport, and instructional skills. Each factor has ten items that are 
evaluated on a five point Likert scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. 
Bergee (1992) determined interjudge reliability by having a panel of five evaluators use the 
thirty item scale to rate eight videotaped student teachers. The overall coefficient was .91; 
sub scale coefficients ranged from .77 to .91. All coefficients were statistically significant 
(p < .01). Criterion-related validity was determined by comparing the panel’s scale scores 
with these eight student teachers’ final evaluations. This was not significant (p = .41), 
possibly because the final evaluations used a generic instrument that had no context 
specific items. Considering that Bergee developed the scale from the responses of 251 
persons involved in some aspect of music student teaching, content validity is reasonable 
and justifiable.

The Survey of Teaching Effectiveness was developed by Don Hamann and Dawn 
Baker at Kent State University. The survey is in two parts. Part I focuses on lesson 
delivery skills and is weighted 40%; Part II focuses on planning and presentation of the 
lesson and is weighted 60%. Items in Part I include posture, eye contact, gestures, facial 
expression, and vocal inflection. Items in Part II include evidence of lesson planning, 
subject matter competence, pacing, sequencing pattern, and teaching style. Each of these 
items is comprised of questions with an anchored five point Likert scale (see Appendix 
B). The final score can range from 10 to 50.
The validity for the Survey of Teaching Effectiveness is reported to be $r_s = .89$. This was computed by having a group of evaluators rank a series of videotaped teaching episodes from best to least best. After a period of three weeks, the same panel assessed the videotapes using the Survey of Teaching Effectiveness. These scores were ranked and compared with the previous rankings. Using a test-retest procedure, reliability for the survey was found to be $r = .83$. (Hamann, 1996)

Using the definition as presented by Medley (1984), competencies focus on what the teacher does (process). Effectiveness, on the other hand, focuses on the product (the effect of what the teacher does on others). Although both instruments use the term effectiveness, the real focus is on competency. For the sake of clarity, the Rehearsal Effectiveness Scale will be referred to as the Bergee form and the Survey of Teaching Effectiveness will be referred to as the Hamann form.

**Independent Variables**

The independent variables are divided into two parts: curricular and non-curricular. Addressing the curricular aspects, the independent variables are: observations, microteaching, and tutoring. Each were quantified by tallying the total number of each type of experience and each type of experience with feedback or follow-up. Since remembering these specifics may be a problem, each student was asked if they took the following: Introduction to Music Education or Introduction to Education, methods courses, conducting courses, internship, early field experiences that were independent of any courses, and/or lab course. Following this, the amount of tutoring, microteaching, and observations was assessed for each course. A total number of experiences for each variable was determined by adding up the experiences from each course. The music education coordinators were asked to corroborate the curricular information supplied by the students.

Non-curricular aspects were quantified using Wolfgang’s (1990) designations on seven items creating a non-curricular index. These seven items include: giving private
lessons, ensemble directing (e.g. church group, fraternity choir), peer leadership (e.g. ensemble section leader, drum major), music teaching not required by the school (e.g. drum instructor for a high school marching band), non-music teaching, tutoring not required by a course, and other. The following designations were used to quantify these non-curricular experiences: 0 = none, 1 = some (short duration, up to a few months), 2 = moderate (six months to two years), 3 = extensive (longer than two years).

Design

Creswell (1994) points out that as early as 1959 some researchers considered combining qualitative and quantitative methodology. Since that time, interest in and use of combined methodology has increased. A pragmatic argument has arisen that claims that the dichotomy between qualitative and quantitative approaches is false. "Researchers should make the most efficient use of both paradigms in understanding social phenomena" (p. 176). Creswell describes three models of combined designs: two-phase, dominant/less dominant, and mixed methodology. It is this second model that this study followed.

With the dominant/less dominant model, the study has a main focus, in this case quantitative, and a secondary focus that examines a subsample, in this case qualitative. The dominant focus was on the correlations that may exist between student teacher performance and the undergraduate field experience. The less dominant focus was a qualitative study of the interview scripts of a five person subset that represented the range of scores on the student teacher performance instrument.

Since the purpose of this study is to examine relationships after the "treatment" has occurred, the dominant design is ex post facto. An important point about this type of design is that correlations do not indicate causation. In other words, even if there is a strong positive correlation between microteaching and student teaching, this does not mean that the microteaching causes the student teaching performance. Yet, if such a correlation is found, then an area for further study has been identified. As Isaac and Michael (1981) point out, correlational research is "appropriate where variables are very
complex and/or do not lend themselves to the experimental method and controlled manipulation” (p. 49).

Shavelson (1988) defines internal validity as the “extent to which the outcomes of a study result from the variables which were manipulated, measured, or selected in the study rather than from other variables not systematically treated” (p. 22). With an ex post facto design, internal validity focuses on how the variables were selected rather than manipulated. Since there has been a national push for more early field experiences, and these three variables (observation, microteaching, and tutoring) are included in most music education programs, albeit with a great deal of variability in how they are operationalized, they are a logical choice for examination.

The external validity of this study must be viewed with caution. Although the sample was selected from the secondary music student teachers at eleven universities, the generalizability to all music student teachers is not valid. The eleven universities are all public institutions in the United States. These results can be generalized to those institutions which have similar programs of music teacher education.

**Procedures**

The music education coordinators at each participating university were contacted for a list of their secondary music student teachers. Since some universities had student teachers split the experience between elementary and secondary levels, only those students who were teaching secondary in the first half of their experience were considered. This was done so that the elementary experience would not be a contributing factor. A total of 50 student teachers were contacted and asked to participate.

All 50 were sent videotapes on which to record a sample of his or her student teaching. They were asked that this videotape be made during the early part of their student teaching experience, preferably no later than their fifth teaching episode. One subject was not allowed to video herself because of cooperating school policy. Although follow-up calls were made to make sure the students were recording themselves, nine others did not return the videotapes for unknown reasons. Therefore, ten subjects were
dropped from the study because a videotaped sample of their teaching was not available. The 40 videotapes that were returned, were evaluated using the Bergee form and the Hamann form by a panel of experienced music educators.

The independent measures were gathered by interview after the student returned the videotape. Each student and the music education coordinator were interviewed by phone. All interviews were tape recorded so that data could be verified. Using the Interview Forms (Appendix C), students were asked about their course work that included any field experience. If a great amount of variation was found between the responses of students from the same school, the music education coordinator was asked to corroborate the curricular information. Additional questions addressed non-curricular experiences as well as descriptive information such as: age, sex, number of years in undergraduate school, instrument, brief description of high school musical experiences, and instruments played other than major.

An independent researcher, not associated with this study, randomly selected five interviews to verify the data. This researcher listened to the recorded interviews and filled out the interview forms. This second group of forms was compared with the original forms to determine scoring reliability.

A subsample of five students that represent the range of scores on the student teaching competency instruments was analyzed. The five interviews were transcribed and analyzed for the purposes of examining the nature of the students' experiences.

Analysis

Three of the four research questions focus on how early field experience correlates with student teaching performance. Therefore a correlation coefficient was computed for both curricular questions and the non-curricular question.

The fourth question focuses on the subsample. The taped interviews were transcribed and summarized. From these transcriptions, the nature of each subject's total experience was described and compared.
Timetable

In January, 1996, eleven music education coordinators were contacted and asked for a list of their current student teachers. From these lists, student teachers were selected from each university. Each student teacher was then contacted to confirm his or her participation in this study.

The video sample of each student's teaching was gathered during the first few weeks of the student teaching experience. Ideally, this was no later than the fifth teaching episode. Because of the variability in schedules of the schools involved, not all videos were gathered until the end of March, 1996. The videos were evaluated during the first two weeks of May, 1996.

The interviews were conducted from the middle of January, 1996 through the end of April, 1996. Data analysis took place during the last part of May, 1996.

Summary

This correlational study, which is a dominant/less dominant design, focuses on the relationships that exist between early field experience and student teaching performance. The subjects were forty secondary music student teachers from eleven universities. A video of their student teaching was assessed using the Rehearsal Effectiveness Scale and the Survey of Teaching Effectiveness. Each student and music education coordinator was interviewed to determine the amount and nature of the early field experience. These interviews addressed curricular and non-curricular experiences. Correlation coefficients were computed. Additionally, a sub-group that represents the range of student teaching competency scores was identified. The nature of this sub-group's early field experience was compared and contrasted. This study took place during the first quarter of 1996.
Chapter IV

Presentation of Results and Data Analysis

The data analyses are presented in the following order: descriptive data, reliability and validity results, the three quantitative questions, the qualitative question, and a summary.

Descriptive Data

Subjects were forty music student teachers from eleven public universities representing nine states. These universities were selected because at least one member of the music education faculty was willing to support this research. All provided names and phone numbers of current music student teachers. Music education coordinators from four of the eleven schools made initial contacts and obtained the video samples. Subjects from the other seven universities were contacted directly and asked to participate. They were then sent blank videotapes with a cover letter (Appendix D) confirming the details of the initial phone conversation. Once videotapes were returned, the phone interview (Appendix C) was conducted.

Because of variation in school and music education department size, equal numbers of subjects from each school were not possible. The breakdown of the number of subjects by school is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University B</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University C</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University D</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University E</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University F</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University G</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University H</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University I</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University J</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University K</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These numbers reflect 100% of the music student teachers at University C, University H, and University I. The other schools did not have 100% of their music student teachers...
participating. It should be noted that three other student teachers were willing to participate but cooperating school policy did not allow videotaping of classroom students.

The average subject age was 24 years, with a range of 21 to 44; only two students were over 30. Twenty-seven students were earning their undergraduate degree. Their average time in school was 5.29 years, with a range of four to eight years. Two students were part of a program where teacher certification took one year beyond the bachelor's degree. At the completion of their program they will have a teaching certificate and a master's degree. One student had already completed a master's degree and was working only on teacher certification. Although there was not a conscious effort to get equal numbers of males and females, the male to female ratio was 1:1. Eight subjects had a choral emphasis and 32 had an instrumental emphasis. Complete background data is presented in Appendix E.

Scores for the Bergee form were computed by assigning values to the Likert scale. Strongly agree was scored as a five and strongly disagree was scored as a one. The scores were added and divided by the total number possible, therefore the reported score is expressed as a percentage. The scoring procedure for the Hamann form is found on the last page of the form (see Appendix B). The judges' scores were averaged for a final rating on each form. These ratings were used as the dependent variables. Descriptive statistics for the dependent variables are presented in Table 4.1. Scores for each subject are presented in Appendix F.

Table 4.1

Descriptive Statistics for the Dependent Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bergee Form</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamann Form</td>
<td>22.49</td>
<td>4.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Data for the independent variables were gathered from the interview forms. "Tutoring" is expressed as the number of students per week times the number of sessions per week times the number of weeks. "Microteaching" is expressed as a number of experiences. Although each experience could range in time from five to fifty minutes, most were less than a full class period. "Observations" are also reported as the number of experiences; one experience was equal to one hour of observation or one class period of observation. Descriptive statistics for the curricular independent variables are presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2
Descriptive Statistics for the Curricular Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Early Field Experience</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>45.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total microteaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>42.67</td>
<td>31.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total observations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>41.00</td>
<td>25.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience with Feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>51.05</td>
<td>37.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microteaching with feedback</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>33.70</td>
<td>24.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations with follow-up</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>19.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Complete Curricular data is presented in Appendix G.)

The following designations were used to quantify the non-curricular experiences: 0 = none, 1 = some (short duration, up to a few months), 2 = moderate (six months to two years), 3 = extensive (longer than two years). If a subject report multiple experiences for a particular non-curricular category, then each experience was quantified and added together. For example, in order to get a nine for ensemble directing, the subject could have reported directing two different church choirs. each for two and half years and a
children’s choir for three years. Descriptive statistics for the non-curricular variables are presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3
Descriptive Statistics for the Non-Curricular Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Giving private lessons</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble directing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer leadership</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-music teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-curricular Index</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.02</td>
<td>4.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Complete Non-Curricular data is presented in Appendix H.)

**Interjudge Reliability**

Two experienced music educators served as judges of the videotapes. Correlation coefficients between the two judges are $r = .73$ for the Hamann form and $r = .69$ for the Bergee form. The correlation coefficient between the two tests is $r = .89$.

**Interview Reliability**

Five of the taped interviews were randomly selected and listened to by an independent researcher. The researcher filled out a set of interview forms (Appendix C) for each tape, which were compared with the primary interview forms. The incidence of agreements is 95%. Most of the disagreements are really minor points, such as the type of
writing activity that was associated with an observation. A couple were judgment calls, for instance, should a group presentation be considered as a microteaching experience? These types of experiences were not included in the data analysis.

**Curricular Validity**

The accuracy of a person's memory could be questionable, especially when she was asked to report on experiences from as many as five years ago. Therefore, when wide variance in field experience was found in the responses of the subjects from the same school, music education coordinators were contacted to verify whether such variance was possible. In several instances, a change in program design and/or requirements made such variation plausible. In instances where a reason for the variation could not be determined or where the coordinator felt that the student's answer was incorrect, adjusted responses were recorded and used in the data analysis.

**Correlation Significance and Magnitude**

The significance level was set at .05. The magnitude of the correlations was described as either low (.20-.40), moderate (.40-.60), substantial (.60-.80) or high (.80-1.00) (Best and Kahn. 1993). These are conservative descriptions considering the complex nature of the variables and the possibility of a restricted sample.

**Quantitative Questions**

For all three quantitative questions, correlation coefficients were computed using *Statistica*, a statistical software package made by StatSoft. The first two questions focus on the curricular experiences of the subjects.

1. Does the number of early field experiences done prior to student teaching correlate with student teaching performance?

   The answer to question one is in four parts. In part one the independent variable is total early field experience; this includes the total number of experiences from tutoring, microteaching, and observing. The correlation coefficient between the total early field
experience and the Hamann form is $r = .156, p < .337$. The coefficient for the Bergee form is $r = .294, p < .066$. Therefore, total early field experience does not correlate with student performance on either form.

The independent variable for part two is tutoring. Only six of the 40 subjects were required to do any tutoring as part of the curriculum. Because so many subjects had no tutoring experience, a coefficient using just these data would not be valid and was not completed.

The independent variable for part three is microteaching. The correlation coefficient for microteaching and the Hamann form is $r = .183, p < .257$. For the Bergee form, the coefficient is $r = .247, p < .125$. During the data gathering phase of the study, the context of the microteaching became a concern. Do peer microteaching settings or school settings correlate with student teaching performance? The correlation coefficients for these are presented in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4  
**Correlation Coefficients for Context**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hamann</th>
<th>Bergee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peer microteaching</td>
<td>$r = .275, p &lt; .086$</td>
<td>$r = .389, p &lt; .013$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School microteaching</td>
<td>$r = .037, p &lt; .821$</td>
<td>$r = .017, p &lt; .918$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Complete data on Microteaching Context is presented in Appendix I.)

Although neither total microteaching nor school microteaching correlate with student teaching, a low correlation between peer microteaching and the Bergee form does exist.

The independent variable for part four is observations. The correlation coefficient for the total number of observations and the Hamann form is $r = .116, p < .476$. For the Bergee form the coefficient is $r = .228, p < .158$. There is no correlation between the total
2. Does the number of early field experiences done prior to student teaching that include feedback or other reflective activities correlate with student teaching performance?

When microteaching or observing experiences were reported, subjects were asked to describe any feedback or follow-up associated with the activity. Microteaching experiences that included any kind of feedback were added together for the microteaching with feedback score. Observations that included follow-up discussion were added together for the observations with follow-up score. Observations that included only writing activities as follow-up were not included. A total early field experience with feedback score was obtained by adding the microteaching with feedback and observations with follow-up together. All three scores were correlated with both forms. The results are presented in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5
Correlation Coefficients for Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hamann</th>
<th>Bergee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microteaching with feedback</td>
<td>( r = .300, p &lt; .060 )</td>
<td>( r = .379, p &lt; .016 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations with follow-up</td>
<td>( r = .461, p &lt; .003 )</td>
<td>( r = .490, p &lt; .001 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total field experience with feedback</td>
<td>( r = .439, p &lt; .005 )</td>
<td>( r = .507, p &lt; .001 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From these results, the correlations are significant for all pairs except microteaching with feedback and the Hamann form. The correlation between microteaching with feedback and Bergee is moderately low, while the other four correlations are moderate.

Since total field experience, regardless of feedback, did not correlate and field experience with feedback did correlate, the relationship between field experience without
feedback and student teaching performance became of interest. On the Hamann form a
correlation coefficient of \( r = -.316, p < .047 \) was found, and on the Bergee form the
correlation coefficient was \( r = -.186, p < .250 \). From this data, a significant low negative
correlation between field experience without feedback and the Hamann form exists. Sixty-
Five percent of these experiences were observations.

3. Does the non-curricular index correlate with student teaching performance?

Indices based on the students' responses were added together to create the non-
curricular total. Students who listed more than one event in any category were given
credit when possible. For instance, if a student reported three music teaching events with
event A lasting six months, event B lasting six months, and event C lasting three years,
then the index for that category would be five rather than three. Correlation coefficients
were computed for the total as well as for each category. The results are presented in
Table 4.6.

Table 4.6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Curricular Correlation Coefficients</th>
<th>Hamann</th>
<th>Bergee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-curricular index</td>
<td>( r = -.016, p &lt; .923 )</td>
<td>( r = -.035, p &lt; .829 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving private lessons</td>
<td>( r = -.014, p &lt; .933 )</td>
<td>( r = -.034, p &lt; .837 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensemble directing</td>
<td>( r = .039, p &lt; .811 )</td>
<td>( r = .030, p &lt; .852 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer leadership</td>
<td>( r = .192, p &lt; .235 )</td>
<td>( r = .214, p &lt; .184 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teaching</td>
<td>( r = .172, p &lt; .288 )</td>
<td>( r = .109, p &lt; .504 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-music teaching</td>
<td>( r = -.134, p &lt; .409 )</td>
<td>( r = -.138, p &lt; .395 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tutoring</td>
<td>( r = -.112, p &lt; .493 )</td>
<td>( r = -.118, p &lt; .469 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>( r = -.387, p &lt; .013 )</td>
<td>( r = -.347, p &lt; .028 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With the exception of other, all coefficients are not significant. The other category has a significant correlation with both forms. This moderately low negative correlation indicates that subjects who reported higher numbers of other activities tended to score lower on both forms. This must be viewed with caution since 50% (20) of the subjects reported no other events and an additional 18% (7) reported other events that could not be quantified, such as "mother was a teacher," "willingness to help others," "personality," "being a missionary," and "attending music conferences."

**Qualitative question**

How do the experiences differ between students who have high student teaching performance scores and those that do not?

In order to identify the five subjects for this qualitative analysis, the scores from both evaluation forms were put in rank order. The rankings were then averaged. Table 4.7 shows the average ranking for all 40 subjects from highest (1) to lowest (40). The subject numbers with an asterisk represent the five subjects at the top, bottom, 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles. For the sake of clarity, the aliases presented in Table 4.8 will be used to discuss these subjects.
Table 4.7

Subject Ranking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject #</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Bergee Rank</th>
<th>Hamann Rank</th>
<th>Average Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7*</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33*</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19*</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.7 (cont.)

**Subject Ranking**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject #</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Bergee Rank</th>
<th>Hamann Rank</th>
<th>Average Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10*</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18*</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.8
Subject Aliases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Alias</th>
<th>Ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>bottom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>25th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>50th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>75th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Cab</td>
<td>Top</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of this analysis are presented in a four-part format: 1. background information, 2. high school musical experiences, 3. curricular experiences, 4. non-curricular experiences.

**Background information**

The background information serves as an introduction to the subsample. Joe and Kay’s major instrument is horn. Joan’s is voice, and both Bob and Cab’s is trumpet. With one of the five having a vocal emphasis and the other four having an instrumental emphasis, the subsample reflects the same ratio of vocalists to instrumentalists as the entire sample, 1:4.

The number of undergraduate years each took to complete their program of study is:

- Joe: 4
- Kay: 7
- Joan: 4 + 1 graduate
- Bob: 6
- Cab: 5
Here several differences become apparent. The most interesting is Joan's five year certification program. She completed her undergraduate degree in four years, but in order to be certified to teach, she had to complete a fifth year of training. At the end of this fifth year, she will have a master's degree as well as her certification. Even though Joe reports four years, he also went for three summers. Kay's longer than average time may be a result of her spending two years at a junior college. Bob's time was a little longer than average mainly because he changed his major to music education after two years in another field. Like Joe, he also went several summers. Even though Cab's time was a little less than the average, he did not start out in music education. He changed majors after the first year of college. Although differences exist in the amount of time it took for each subject to get their degrees, these differences do not distinguish the five in terms of their rankings.

Summaries of High School Musical Experiences

"Teachers teach as they were taught" is a common perception among many in education. In order to get an idea of what kinds of experiences these students brought with them to college, each was asked to describe their high school musical experiences. In order from bottom to top, a brief high school summary of each subject in the subsample is presented.

Joe began his answer with, "I think I had a better experience than a lot of people..." His perception seems accurate. Joe's high school offered two years of music theory in addition to the standard performing ensembles. Along with being a member of the marching and concert bands, he played in the orchestra for two years and in at least one musical. His high school career included two schools, a "mid-high" for ninth and tenth grades, and a "senior high" for eleventh and twelfth grades. At the mid high, Joe was drum major for one year. At the senior high, he was a drill leader. His theory class was equipped with the latest computer and midi technology. It is interesting to note that Joe's father is a music teacher and his mother is a classroom teacher.

Kay felt that she was held back in high school. "I wanted to do a lot of things but
my director would not let me.. because I have epilepsy.” It seems that Kay’s high school band director was worried about her medical condition. Other than participating in the band class, she was discouraged from participating in additional activities. However, she did report being section leader for two years. She studied piano for three years and competed in Piano Guild events. Like Joe, her mother is a classroom teacher. Before coming to University J, Kay spent two years at a junior college. She also shared why she wanted to become a music major:

When I was in elementary school, the middle school band came and gave a concert. I would listen and think how cool that would be. So I joined band when I got into 6th grade. The next year I decided that it was something I really enjoyed and I wanted to do forever. I pretty much decided then that I wanted to do something in music, I just wasn’t sure what.

When Joan was asked about her high school experiences, she presented a stream of thoughts without pausing. It was as if she had completely planned her answer. She took piano lessons until her sophomore year in high school. “I took piano lessons for nine years, but I don’t feel that I am good enough to accompany someone.” She studied voice privately during her senior year. At some point during her high school career, she performed in every choir that her school offered. This included concert choir, jazz choir, and sextet. Joan also performed in several musicals, serving as assistant director at least once. Her response when asked if she was a section leader is interesting: “I can’t remember if I was a section leader or not. I think I was. I directed the Freshman Choir my senior year, just a couple of numbers.”

Bob began talking about his high school experiences with: “I was in choir, show choir, and musicals...” Only after prompting did he include band. (This is an interesting response since he has an instrumental focus.) He came from a small high school and left the impression that he was involved in everything musical at his school. He studied piano from the fourth through tenth grades and took private trumpet lessons throughout high school. He was also an all-region band member.
Like Bob, Cab came from a smaller school. In retrospect, he felt that there was a heavy emphasis on marching band and not enough on fundamentals or concert band. He has no piano background and had only sporadic private trumpet lessons. He also commented on why he went into music.

Well, basically from my public school experiences all of my friends and all of my, you know, most fun times, most pleasant memories were from being in the band or going on band trips. Things like that. In school I was identified as being a trumpet player, I was associated with playing the trumpet. Because at the small school I did well at it, and so in a smaller situation like that it’s easy to be identified with one thing that you did well. Then in college I was not in music my first year. I really didn’t have any plans to go into music. But, over the course of that first year I didn’t ever play and I really missed it. So, I decided that going into music ed would be good for me. Just because I not only enjoy music, but I like to deal with kids and people and arrange and do things like that.

From these summaries, it is clear that all five wanted to be very active in their high school music program. Kay had the desire but was held back by her director. The other four were able to fulfill their desire. The top two subjects made a point about their high schools being small, while the bottom three did not mention size. Joe, the bottom subject, had the most extensive high school musical training, while Cab, the top subject, had the least. In retrospect, Cab felt that his high school training may have even been inadequate. It is interesting that the top two subjects both came from small schools and neither began their college careers as a music education major. As a matter of fact, neither were even music performance majors.

Rather than concluding that a bad high school experience makes a good student teacher, this may be the result of a strong zeal for teaching developing in students who realize that their high school experience could have been much stronger. Cab may have decided that his students were going to get a better experience than he got. Teachers do not always teach as they were taught.
Curricular Experiences

The curricular information has been grouped into five categories: A. introductory courses, B. technique courses, C. methods and conducting courses, D. practicums, and E. other courses. Considering the positive correlations found between field experience with feedback and student teaching performance, the curricular experiences of the subsample give insight into the circumstances that contribute to this relationship. The subsample represents three of the eleven schools, Universities D, J, and K. Cab and Bob (top two ranks) are from University K. Joan (middle rank) is from University D, and Joe and Kay (bottom two ranks) are from University J. Even though the top two ranks are from the same school and the bottom two ranks are from the same school, the rankings show the universities to be well mixed (see table 4.7). Yet, the differences among the five are the result of school differences as well as individual differences.

A. Introductory courses

Introductory courses include Introduction to Education or Introduction to Music Education. The bottom two subjects, Joe and Kay, took a general Introduction to Education course. Since Kay was a transfer student, she took this course at a junior college. She reported 20 observations as part of this course: all included follow-up discussion. Although most of the classes she observed were music classes, she also observed several elementary classrooms. Joe took this course at University J. No field experiences were required in his class. Joan (middle rank) was the only subject of the five who was not required to take an introductory course.

Although an Introduction to Music Education course is part of the curriculum at University K, Bob (75th percentile) reported that because he changed majors rather late in his college career, he was not required to take this course. Cab (top rank) reported that he took it a year later than most music majors because of his change in degree. He also reported five school observations that included a follow-up discussion. These were at the elementary and middle school levels. His observations included follow-up discussion with a music education professor. The differences among the five concerning
introductory courses are meaningful. Cab, the top rank, was the only one who had an introductory course with a music education focus.

B. Technique courses

Technique courses include woodwind, brass, percussion, and string techniques, as well as vocal pedagogy. All of these seemed to have more of a performing emphasis rather than a teaching emphasis. Differences exist in individual experiences from the same school due to a change in instructor or a refinement of the instructor's approach.

Both Joe and Kay (bottom two ranks, University K) took two semesters of each instrumental techniques course: woodwind, brass, percussion, and string. Neither reported any tutoring, microteaching, or observing in the string techniques course. Kay had one microteaching experience in her percussion techniques course. It was the final exam and she had to teach the instructor. She described the feedback as being extensive. Joe reported one microteaching experience in the brass techniques course. In this situation he taught another peer an introductory lesson on trumpet and described the feedback as moderate. Both reported four observations as part of the woodwind techniques course. There was not any follow-up discussion, but evaluation forms for each observation had to be turned in to the professor. Joe also reported four peer microteaching experiences in the woodwind techniques course with moderate feedback.

Joan's (middle rank, University D) emphasis is choral, yet her program required several instrumental technique courses. She reported taking one quarter of percussion, string, brass, and woodwind techniques. None of the four required tutoring or observing, but the brass techniques required one peer microteaching experience. The feedback from this experience was described as moderate. Her vocal pedagogy course included two microteaching experiences. The students wrote warm-ups based on class lectures and taught them to the class. Again, the feedback was described as moderate.

Like the other three subjects, Bob and Cab (top two ranks, University K) were required to take technique courses in all four instrumental areas. Both took only one semester of percussion techniques; Bob had an additional semester of private instruction.
Neither reported any tutoring, microteaching, or observing for this course. Bob reported that instead of taking a brass methods course, he took private instruction. This was done because of scheduling conflicts. Cab took two semesters of brass techniques, one in his sophomore year and one in his senior year. Over both semesters, he reported eight observations of university brass instructors teaching private lessons. Follow-up discussion was not a part of the course. After each observation, he turned in a one to two page paper on what he observed. Both reported taking a woodwind techniques course; Bob took two semesters and Cab took one semester. Cab also took a semester of private woodwind instruction. Neither reported any tutoring, microteaching, or observing for this course. Bob did not take string techniques, but took private instruction instead. Cab reported two semesters of string techniques where he had four peer microteaching experiences. The feedback was described as moderate.

It is not surprising that all five were doing course work that involves instrumental technique. Although the top two subjects did take class voice, the bottom two had no vocal training beyond sight singing. Yet, Joan, the vocal student, took several instrumental techniques courses. Since these courses are often taught by applied faculty (or teaching assistants) as opposed to music education faculty, the sporadic occurrence of microteaching is not surprising.

C. Methods and Conducting courses

The structure of these courses at the three universities is quite different and sheds the most light on the quantitative relationships. These include conducting courses as well as methods courses which were described by the subjects as having an elementary, secondary, instrumental, and/or choral focus.

Examining the bottom two ranks from University J. Joe and Kay, neither took an elementary methods course, yet, both took an instrumental methods course that included an elementary component. As part of this methods course, both had two peer microteaching experiences with extensive feedback. Joe reported one middle school observation that included follow-up discussion. Kay reported four middle school
observations that included follow-up discussion. Both took two semesters of conducting, with Joe taking a third conducting course one summer. Kay had 11 microteaching experiences during the two semesters with the feedback being described as extensive. Ten of these experiences were done in the conducting class and one was in front of a university ensemble. Joe reported 13 microteaching experiences, one with moderate feedback and the other 12 with extensive feedback. Three of these were with a university ensemble.

Joan, middle rank from University D, reported that her secondary choral methods course did not include any mentoring, microteaching, or observing. Her elementary methods course was taken in conjunction with an elementary practicum (described in the next section), therefore all the field experience was done as a part of the practicum. She also took a classroom instruments course where she reported two peer microteaching experiences with moderate feedback.

Joan took two quarters of conducting, one instrumental and one choral. In each she reported three peer microteaching experiences. The feedback from the choral semester was moderate and from the instrumental semester the feedback was extensive. Her school also requires a two year teaching lab. The students take three quarters each year and focus on conducting as well as methods. Joan reported 24 microteaching experiences over the six quarters. The lab was taught by a team of professors. Because one of the key professors was not involved her second year, she reported differences in the number of experiences and amount of feedback. For the first year she had 15 microteaching experiences with extensive feedback. The second year she had nine microteaching experiences with moderate feedback.

The top two ranks from University K, Bob and Cab, reported taking a one semester general music methods course, which was divided into two parts, K-3 and 4-8. Microteaching and observing were required. Bob reported four peer microteaching experiences where he got extensive feedback. He did two observations at the elementary level, where he took notes and had the opportunity for follow-up discussion. Cab reported six peer microteaching experiences, where he described the feedback as
He reported one observation at the elementary level, where he also took notes and had follow-up discussion.

One of the most interesting aspects of the curriculum at University K is the structure of the instrumental methods and conducting courses. Rather than having two separate courses, these are combined for a four semester sequence. Cab offers an interesting description of this program:

It's two full years, four semesters. Officially it is broken down into...I'm not sure what the official breakdown is, but he runs it as one big homogeneous. here are the first year students, here the second year students. We are going to do the same thing for the entire year and repeat the second year. But in the second year, the second year students teach a lot to the first year students.

This is similar to Joan's methods lab, the difference being that Joan did have separate conducting courses. Of the eleven schools involved in this study, only these two, University D and K, offer this kind of course.

Microteaching is the main thrust of this course. With so many experiences associated with one course, the variation in microteaching experiences from Bob and Cab was rather large. Bob reported 48 and Cab reported 80. This variation was true with all participants from University K. When this was discussed with the music education coordinator, it was determined that some students reported only full class microteaching, while others reported small group and full class. The coordinator supported Bob's 48 experiences and suggested that Cab's should be lowered to 60. Both Bob and Cab reported the feedback as being extensive.

The structure of the methods and conducting courses is one of the most important differences among the subjects in the subsample. The extensive microteaching opportunities that the top three subjects experienced indicates a definite difference among the rankings of the five. The bottom two had only three semesters of methods and conducting, while the top two had five semesters. Even though Joan's nine quarters of methods/conducting experience may suggest a point of diminishing return, her
dissatisfaction with three of those quarters must be noted. All of this indicates that context is important.

In summary, methods courses can be effectively combined with conducting courses. This offers a holistic approach to the development of teaching skills. Yet, the instructors of such courses must be committed to microteaching experiences with feedback on performance.

D. Practicums

Joan's (middle rank) curricular experiences are unique among the subsample. The certification program at University D takes five years to complete, but students leave with a master's degree. In addition to student teaching in the fifth year, she had four practicums during her undergraduate years. None of the other subjects in the subsample reported any practicum work. Examining the entire sample of 40, only the two students from University D reported practicums.

Three of Joan's four practicums were taken during the regular school year. Each was one quarter in length and required two visits per week for nine weeks. Students were expected to observe, and when possible and appropriate, teach. The practicums were organized by the university and specific assignments were made for each student. Joan's elementary practicum included 18 hours of observation with some follow-up and four microteaching experiences with extensive feedback. She also had 18 hours of observation for both her middle school and high school practicums. Although she had to keep a journal, there were no opportunities for follow-up discussion. The cooperating teacher for the middle school practicum did not allow her to do any teaching. During her high school placement, she did nine sectionals and taught the entire class twice. She described the feedback from the two full class experiences as moderate. She did not get any feedback on her sectional work other than that the students seemed to enjoy working with her. Joan seemed to value her teaching experiences in the practicum, but stated "I really didn't get a lot out of the observations." Her fourth practicum, during a summer session, was a special education course with a music focus. The placement was at a boys' home
and included three microteaching experiences with moderate feedback.

At face value, the practicum course seems like a good idea and can be a good experience. Yet, with two of the five ranking higher and not having a practicum, one can only question the value of such courses.

E. Other courses

At the end of the curricular part of the interview, each student was asked if there were any other courses in their college experience that included “tutoring,” “microteaching,” or “observing.” The following experiences were reported:

Joe (bottom rank, University J) did 18 hours of community service as part of his multicultural education course. He fulfilled this requirement by tutoring two students once a week for the semester. He also reported 12 peer microteaching experiences with extensive feedback as part of an introduction to counseling course. This course was not required for his degree.

Kay (25th percentile, University J) did not have any other curricular experiences to report. Likewise, Joan (middle rank, University D) took courses in the school of education, but all of her field experience was through the music education department.

Bob (75th percentile, University K) reported taking one graduate seminar that was not part of the required curriculum. It was a ten day course titled Advanced Instrumental Technique. Freshmen high school band students were hired to serve as a laboratory ensemble for this class. Bob reported 10 microteaching experiences with extensive feedback.

When asked about early field experiences outside the music department, both Bob and Cab (top rank, University K) reported that 60 hours of observations were required through the school of education. These observations were done over the course of two semesters, 30 hours each semester, and are part of the course requirements of two education classes. Both students were assigned to specific schools to do their observing. In Bob’s case, 30 hours was spent observing and the other 30 was spent teaching “pull-outs” at a junior high school. Although he got no feedback on teaching the pull-outs, he
did have follow-up discussion on the observations. Cab spent all 60 hours observing and also reported having some follow-up discussion. During the 60 hours, he remembered three times when the cooperating teacher allowed him to do something with the ensemble, but only when the cooperating teacher was called away from the class. Therefore, he got no feedback on these experiences. Cab also reported five observations as part of a special education class. Again, there was some follow-up discussion. Both also reported having to keep a journal on their observations. At the end of the curricular part of his interview, Bob made an interesting statement in regard to the amount of teaching experience: "you never get enough."

From these other courses, differences among the five exist, the most important being 60 hours of observations that were required of the top two. Extended observations that are part of the teacher certification requirements were common among subjects in the full sample. Yet, once again, context is an important factor. Follow-up discussion seems to be a critical part of these observation experiences.

Non-curricular Experiences

All subjects were asked seven questions concerning their non-curricular activities.

1. Have you ever taught private lessons?

   All five had done some private instruction, four during their college career and one during high school. Bob reported teaching three students while he was in high school. When asked why he didn’t continue teaching in college, he said he was simply too busy. The scope of the private lesson activity for the other four is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of experience</th>
<th>Number of students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>one year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay</td>
<td>one summer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joan</td>
<td>six months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cab</td>
<td>two years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one student per semester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;about&quot; three students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>two students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one to three students</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
All five left the impression that scheduling time to teach privately was difficult. Joe's statement, "I do not have time to take on a studio," is indicative of this impression. Two other comments are interesting to note. After talking about not having time to teach more than one student per semester, Joe goes on to say, "I try to find one student who really needs help and teach him at a really reduced rate...like $5.00 per hour." When Kay was first asked about teaching privately, her initial response was "over the summers." When she was asked how many, she answered, "just one." This was a common trend in Kay's interview. Her initial response was a very general statement that made her experience sound stronger than it really may have been.

2. Have you ever directed an ensemble, such as a church group or fraternity choir?

Four of the five had experiences which would fit into this category. Cab's was unique; he conducted a group for his wedding. Not only did he organize and rehearse the ensemble, but he also arranged all the music. Bob directed his fraternity choir for a year and occasionally substituted for his church choir director. Joan has been a church choir director for six months; before that she was part of a team that led worship at another church. Kay's initial answer was "a lot of it." "I conducted the church service for quite a while." She defined "conducting the church service" as leading congregational singing, which she did for 1 1/2 years.

3. Have you ever led a peer group, such as ensemble section leader or drum major?

Three of the five reported serving as section leaders in their marching bands. Cab served for one year, Bob for two years, and Joe for three years. Joe was also a fraternity officer for one semester.

4. Have you ever done any music teaching not required by the university?

All five reported some amount of music teaching. Cab and Bob had the least amount of experience. Cab's was one week of a high school band camp sponsored by his university. Bob's was a week of music for a vacation Bible school. He did music for
elementary children and stated, “I will never do that again.” He went on to say that the amount of preparation he had to do for this group was more than he expected. Kay also reported doing some camp work. Yet, hers was two weeks with a high school band program that was in between directors. The former director had already picked music for the upcoming year. The students had organized their own rehearsals in absence of a director but were having problems with the music. The drum majors asked Kay to help them. This was a unique situation. Joan and Joe’s experience was during the school year. Joan taught a small children’s choir for four months. Joe taught a home school beginning band for one semester. He had seven students that met two times per week. When asked why he only did it for one semester, he replied, “It was hard to do with my schedule.”

5. Have you ever done any non-music teaching?

Three of the five answered “yes” to this question. Kay had the least amount with six months of Sunday School teaching. Joan reported teaching crafts and games in a recreation program for four summers while she was in high school. During her college years, she taught Sunday School and Vacation Bible School sporadically. Her longest experience was two years as a Bible study leader for a group of seven women. Bob’s background also includes several church-related experiences. He has been a youth activities director for almost a year and a senior high Sunday School teacher for one year. Bob was also a telemarket manager/trainer for two years. He was responsible for teaching employees telemarketing techniques and procedures. Most of the training was one on one, and most of the work was for arts organizations.

6. Have you ever done any tutoring not required by a course?

Although several subjects reported helping friends with particular assignments or courses. Joe was the only one who reported organized tutoring activities. For three semesters, he was part of a campus tutoring program that assigned tutors to students requesting help. He worked with approximately 12 students per semester, usually for one
hour per week depending on individual student needs and subject matter.

7. Is there anything else that you feel has helped you become a teacher that we haven’t covered?

   Cab was the only subject in the subsample who did not have anything to add. The other four had a wide range of responses. It is interesting to note that 50% of the total number interviewed had nothing to add. Of the 50% that did answer this question, five included observations that they were not required to do. This is the case with Joe. He reported going to observe as a freshmen whenever he had a chance, which was about 15 times. He tried to stay for two or three hours, but indicated that it was hard to stay that long. When asked why, he responded, “I had not learned much patience” at that time and that he was rather arrogant. He had trouble dealing with students who did not value music as much as he did, yet he does feel that he has grown out of this.

   Kay included three points in her answer. The first was her two and half years as a manager at a fast food restaurant. The second was the influence of her mother being an elementary teacher. The third, almost an afterthought, was doing lots of public speaking. She never clarified this activity beyond “giving talks in church.” Bob also mentioned public speaking. He talked about his high school experiences in speech contests and musicals as helping him be more “communicative” and helping him come out of his “shell.” He focused on this concept of “coming out of my shell” when he reported his two years of ROTC training.

   Joan talked about the impact of her private voice teacher as being a model for her to follow. “Knowing my own voice helps me to help my students get to know their voices.” When asked if there was anything else, she responded, “nothing really formal. I’ve learned to be an open person. I think that my personality helps in being a teacher. And also my faith, being a Christian, I can rely on God and not just my own resources.”
Summary

Forty subjects from 11 universities with a range of high school experiences participated in this study. Student teaching performance was determined by two independent judges rating video samples of their student teaching using two teacher effectiveness forms. Interjudge reliability was found to be .73 on the Hamann form and .69 on the Bergee form. Reliability between forms is .88.

All 40 subjects were interviewed to collect data on their undergraduate field experience, both curricular and non-curricular. These data were correlated with each subject's score on both teacher effectiveness forms. No significant correlations were found between total early field experience and student teaching performance. Significant correlations were found between early field experiences with feedback and student teaching performance ($r = .439$ and $.507; p < .01$). A significant negative correlation was found between early field experiences without feedback and student teaching performance ($r = -.316, p < .047$). No significant correlations were found to exist between the non-curricular index and student teaching performance.

Based on their average student teaching performance ranking, five subjects were identified as a subsample for closer analysis by taking the rankings from the top, bottom, 25th, 50th, and 75th percentiles. Data on their backgrounds, high school experiences, curricular experiences, and non-curricular experiences is presented. The high school experience data shows that the top two subjects in the subsample came from small high schools and the bottom subject came from a large well equipped high school. The curricular experiences indicate that although similar titles are used at the different universities represented, the field experiences are very different. The top two students came from a university where peer teaching is strongly emphasized. The bottom two students came from a university where field experience is not emphasized. Even though the performance rankings show a mixture of all universities, six of the top ten are from universities with an emphasis on field experience. The non-curricular data indicate that all subjects in the subsample were involved in some private teaching. Ensemble directing and non-music teaching were centered around experiences associated with a church setting.
Most of the music teaching reported was done in summer camp situations. It is interesting to note only the three males reported peer leadership positions and all three were associated with a marching band. Although a willingness to help others was implied by several in the subsample, only one was involved in organized tutoring activities. Although the question on other events brought a variety of answers, many of these are not measurable.
Chapter V

Discussion of Results and Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationships that exist between undergraduate field experiences and student teaching performance. By examining student teacher performance and its relationship to both curricular and non-curricular field experiences, this study has attempted to identify those components of the undergraduate experience which help students become more competent teachers. In order to examine these relationships, four specific questions were addressed. In this chapter each question is discussed separately, then collectively. This is followed by conclusions, relationships with past research, implications for education, and implications for future research.

Discussion

1. Does the number of early field experiences done prior to student teaching correlate with student teaching performance?

The number of early field experiences does not correlate with student teaching performance. This is true for the total number of experiences as well as the microteaching total and the observation total. As the interviews were conducted, two basic settings for microteaching became apparent: peer and school. Because of this, the relationships between microteaching setting and student teacher performance were examined. Peer microteaching included any on-campus activities where the learners were the subject's peers. School microteaching was usually off campus and included those activities where the learners were elementary or secondary aged students. No relationships between school microteaching and student teaching performance were found. Yet, a weak relationship between peer microteaching and student teaching performance was found. This is described as a weak relationship because a low correlation was found
between peer microteaching and only one of the two student teaching evaluation forms, in this case the Bergee form. The strength of this relationship can be described in terms of the percentage of variance in the dependent variable accounted for by the independent variable. In other words, the amount of variance on the Bergee form explained by the variance in peer microteaching is 14%.

2. Does the number of early field experiences done prior to student teaching that include feedback or other reflective activities correlate with student teaching performance?

The answer to this question is yes. Early field experiences that have a feedback or follow-up component do positively correlate with student teaching performance. Significant correlation coefficients were found for observations with follow-up and both forms, total field experience with feedback and both forms, and microteaching with feedback and the Bergee form. Examining the strength of these relationships, one finds that microteaching with feedback accounts for approximately 14% of the variance on the Bergee form. Observations with follow-up account for approximately 24% of the variance on the Bergee form and 21% on the Hamann form. Total field experience with feedback accounts for approximately 26% of the variance on the Bergee form and 19% on the Hamann form.

Even though these positive correlations range from moderate to moderately low, the descriptions are conservative. Teaching is a complex process, therefore these correlations may be stronger than these descriptors indicate. With variance in feedback accounting for approximately one fourth of the variance in student teaching performance, feedback appears to be a crucial element in teacher preparation. Feedback could also be an important factor in the significant correlation between the Bergee form and total peer microteaching, since feedback is more common in a peer situation than in a school situation.

Field experience without feedback has a negative relationship with student teaching performance. In other words, students who scored low on the Hamann form had more
field experience without feedback than those who scored higher. This gives more evidence of the importance of feedback. It also suggests that field experience without feedback may be counterproductive. Students who microteach with no feedback or observe with no follow-up may develop techniques and/or ideas that hurt them as student teachers. Since 65% of the experiences without follow-up were observations, this is an area for greatest concern.

Correlational research must be interpreted with caution. To conclude that early field experience with feedback caused the higher scores would be an overstatement of the limitations of this study. On the other hand, a relationship exists: students who had more field experience with feedback prior to student teaching scored higher on teaching skills during student teaching. How one should respond to this information is addressed later in this chapter.

3. Does the non-curricular index correlate with student teaching performance?

This answer is no. No relationships were found to exist between any of the non-curricular activities and student teaching performance. The near zero value of many of these coefficients suggests that students who performed well on both forms had the same, and in some cases fewer, non-curricular experiences than those who performed poorly. This finding was surprising at first. The literature review showed that non-curricular experiences were seldom included in other studies. It was hoped that at least some of the variance in student teaching performance could be explained by the non-curricular activities. Yet, when this finding is viewed in light of the curricular relationships, it seems logical. The feedback or follow-up components seem to be important in the relationships between field experience and student teaching performance. Since these non-curricular events did not have a structured feedback component, the near zero correlation could be viewed as supporting the need for feedback or follow-up.
4. How do the overall experiences differ between students who have high student teaching performance scores and those that do not?

A five subject subsample was used to address this question by examining their background information, high school musical experiences, curricular experiences, and non-curricular experiences. This qualitative data tends to clarify and confirm the quantitative results. Conclusions based on the subsample analyses are examined in light of the entire sample when possible. For example, the bottom two subjects in the subsample report their major instrument as horn and the top two as trumpet. This implies that major instrument denotes a difference between high and low scoring students. When this is examined in light of the entire sample, there are horn players scoring both high and low. Therefore, major instrument does not seem to differentiate between those in the total sample.

The background data shows the five in the subsample to be similar in age and a good mixture of males and females. Although the top two of the five are males, four of the top five overall are female. It is significant to note that the student in the five year master's certification program did not perform better than many who were getting undergraduate certification. This is not surprising since the average amount of time spent in school (approximately five years) was similar. Therefore degree type (bachelor's vs master's) does not seem to have any relationship with student teaching performance. Furthermore there is no relationship between student teaching performance and the amount of time one takes to get a degree. Joe (bottom rank) completed his degree in four years and three summers, while Cab (top rank) completed his degree in five years.

An examination of the high school musical summaries does not reveal any meaningful differences. Although the top two subjects in the subsample were from small high schools, so were low scoring students who were not part of the subsample. Finding no differences is important. It implies that school size, instrument, or private instruction are not factors relating to student teacher performance.
The curricular data indicate that there are differences in the experiences of the five in the subsample. The most interesting difference is the conducting laboratory/methods course that the top three reported and the practicums that Joan (50th percentile) reported. Only two schools involved in the study required this conducting laboratory/methods course, yet subjects from these two schools represent one fourth of the total sample. Of the ten that reported taking this course, eight are ranked above the 50th percentile. Since peer microteaching with extensive feedback is common with this course, this gives insight and support to the relationships found between student teaching performance and early field experience with feedback as well as the relationship between total peer microteaching and student teaching performance.

When Joan described her practicum experience, she commented on how she valued the teaching and feedback, but she did not get much out of just observing. Observations without follow-up seem to have little meaning for students, nor do they have any relationship with student teaching performance.

One final curricular difference: while the top three took an elementary or general music methods course, the bottom two did not. For the bottom two, elementary methods was structured as part of their instrumental methods. Only eight students in the entire sample reported not taking a general music methods course, these were split with four ranked above the 50th percentile and four below. This coupled with the fact that universities were well mixed among the forty rankings implies that program structure may not be the most important part of the curriculum.

With several curricular differences emerging from the subsample comparison, the question of differences among schools arises. Statistical comparisons between universities could not be made due to the unequal numbers from each school.

Since no relationships were found to exist between the non-curricular experiences and student teaching performance, it is not surprising that the non-curricular experiences in the subsample lack any trends that would differentiate them. These two findings are mutually supportive. Although there are no differences, two themes seem to emerge from this data, time and opportunity. Time for these kinds of non-curricular activities seems to
be difficult to schedule. This was stated several times by Joe and implied by Cab's lack of activity. Opportunities for these kinds of activities were not always present. The number of section leaders for any group is limited, as are the number of ensemble directing experiences. Since many of these activities, such as ensemble directing, music teaching, and non-music teaching, were associated with a religious group, students without a church community may be more limited in their opportunities.

Examining the quantitative and qualitative results collectively, the strongest and most important finding is that there is a positive relationship between early field experience with feedback and student teaching performance. The magnitude of this relationship is enhanced when one considers the possibility of a restricted sample. The correlations are based on best to least best continuum; in other words the lowest scoring student teacher is not necessarily a bad student teacher. All subjects did pass student teaching. This implies that variability among subjects is actually very small. Since correlational statistics focus on variance, then a moderate correlation within a restricted sample may only be an indication of a much stronger relationship.

**Conclusions**

1. Early field experience with feedback is positively related to student teaching performance.
2. Early field experience, regardless of feedback, is not related to student teaching performance.
3. Early field experience without feedback has a negative relationship with student teaching performance.
4. Non-curricular experiences where the student takes on the role of teacher are not related to student teaching performance.
5. Peer microteaching experience is positively related to student teaching performance.
6. Degree type (bachelor or master) does not relate to student teaching performance.
7. Student background does not relate to student teaching performance.
8. A methods/conducting lab is an effective setting for microteaching experiences.
9. Observations without follow-up have little or no effect on teaching ability.

**Relationship with past research**

The conclusions support several points made in the review of literature. Previous findings dealing with program variability, problems with field experience, lack of relationship between total field experience and teaching performance, and the importance of feedback as a component of context are discussed.

The types and numbers of field experiences found in this study are similar to those reported by Rozmajzl (1992). Schmidt (1989) reported a range of 0-300 hours of observations. The range reported by the subjects in this study is narrower, 5-108. Yet, considering that Schmidt’s data was skewed and that many in the present study reported microteaching as part of their observations, these data are in line with each other. The great variation in total number of field experiences, 12-214, corroborates the findings of Boardman (1990), Galluzzo (1990), and Verrastro (1992).

Two comments from the interview data illustrate points made by Applegate (1985) and Verrastro and Leglar (1992). Joan stated “I really didn’t get a lot out of the observations.” Here she is referring to 36 hours of observation where she had no follow-up or feedback, an example of the negative events presented by Applegate (1985). According to Applegate these events include:

1. Spending most of the experience on tasks which are menial, boring busywork
2. Having little opportunity to converse and interact with the cooperating teacher
3. Finishing the experience wondering what was to be learned.

Teachers in the field claim that most of what they know about teaching was learned from experience. Therefore, many post-graduate surveys recommend that the field experience component be stronger (Verrastro & Leglar, 1992). Bob’s statement in regard to the amount of teaching experience: “you never get enough.”, mirrors the feelings of many teachers. This raises the question of whether self-perception is accurate. Feeling good
about a completed task and doing a good job with the task are not always synonymous.

Not finding any significant relationships between total early field experience and student teaching performance supports the conclusions of Olsen (1981) and Calfee (1983). Olsen concluded that there is no relationship between the number of clock hours of early field experience and the use of 15 teacher behaviors in student teaching. Likewise, Calfee's results indicated that there was no significant relationship between the number of field experience hours and overall student teaching performance.

The significant relationship between field experiences with feedback and student teaching performance implies that just having field experiences is not enough. What happens during that experience is important. This is echoed in the work of Zeichner and Wolfgang. Zeichner (1980) states that rather than arguing about whether or not to have field experiences, "we must focus our concerns on the quality of these experiences." Wolfgang (1991) concludes that proper guidance is an essential component of the practicum experience. The practicums that Wolfgang discusses are very similar to what Joan experienced.

The context of an experience can be influenced by a number of forces, such as setting, activities, and personalities. Joan's conducting laboratory experience is one example. Joan's lab was taught by a team of professors. Because one of the key professors was not involved her second year, she reported differences in the number of experiences and amount of feedback. For the first year she had 15 microteaching experiences with extensive feedback. The second year she had nine microteaching experiences with moderate feedback. One person made the difference in not only class activities but also her perception of the experience.

Field experiences can play an "educative or miseducative role in preparing future teachers" (Clarken. 1993, p. 4). Therefore, students must be taught how to learn from the experience. As Schön (1987) states; practice is not enough, critical reflection on performance is necessary to become a master teacher. Feedback and/or follow-up are important for reflection. This is illustrated by Foxx's (1991) finding that higher levels of
reflection were demonstrated when students had opportunities to engage in discussions with cooperating teachers.

This idea of context being important is further supported by Applegate (1987). She concluded that adjustment to field experience may depend upon the structure provided by the college faculty member and that early field experience students need time to review their experiences with peers and university faculty.

When the positive relationship between field experience with feedback and student teaching performance is viewed in light of past research, its importance is magnified.

**Implications for education**

The basic approach to music teacher education seems to be working; none of these students were considered to be failures. It is presumed that all of them passed student teaching. Therefore these implications for education focus on how to make early field experiences more effective and efficient.

Early field experiences must have feedback or follow-up. Candidates need guidance to learn from the experience. Without proper guidance, the candidate may not be able to focus on the beneficial aspects of the experience. This seems to be especially true for observing. Experiences with follow-up discussion had one of the strongest correlations with student teaching performance.

Since early field experiences without follow-up or feedback had a negative correlation with student teaching performance, these kinds of experiences should be avoided. Adding observation hours just for the sake of having more time in the schools does not increase quality. In fact, more hours without follow-up could actually be hurting the candidate. The focus of teacher education programs should be on creating quality field experiences rather than creating a large quantity of experiences.

Finding appropriate school settings for students to gain teaching experience before student teaching is often frustrating. Even when appropriate settings are found, having a young candidate teach may not be the best thing for the classroom students. When decisions must be made concerning what is best for the candidate and the classroom
students, the classroom students' needs must be foremost. Therefore a peer teaching lab may be one of the best settings for developing teaching ability. Even though the situation may be artificial, it can be more effective than some "real" classrooms. It offers a "win/win" situation for all concerned. The university instructor has more control over the candidates' experiences without having to worry about classroom student learning. Constant feedback from the instructor as well as peers can create a rich environment for all candidates involved in the lab. Instructors of this type of lab should also remember Joan's experience. She had a two year methods lab where the second year was not as strong as the first; this was due to a change in instructors. Therefore course content and structure must be closely examined and monitored.

Peer labs may be an excellent way for initiating microteaching experiences. But observations of real class situations should continue as long as there are follow-up activities. Some form of discussion between the university instructor and the candidate concerning what the candidate observed must be a part of these experiences. This can be accomplished by having candidates go and watch "real" classrooms in groups and then participate in group discussions. Having candidates go and watch classrooms individually and then bringing their observations to a group discussion can also be effective. Another way of accomplishing this is by watching video tapes of "real" classrooms and having the candidates discuss the video tape. Providing follow-up to these kind of experiences is not always easy, but it must be arranged to insure that the candidate gets the most from the experience.

Even though the non-curricular experiences had no correlation with student teaching performance, this does not imply that university instructors should discourage these activities. The lack of feedback from these types of experiences, however, should be a concern. Candidates should be encouraged in these kinds of activities as long as they do not take precedence over the guided experiences. Since time was a concern for several in this study, music education instructors should not promote non-curricular activities at the expense of early field experiences with feedback.
Implications for future research

Future research based on this study is suggested in terms of replication and extension. A replication of this study should include several modifications. The first would be to get a larger sample size. The second would be to conduct it as a longitudinal study. If data were collected throughout each subject’s college career, problems created by a memory lapse would be lessened. This would also give an opportunity for more detailed information concerning the context of the experience. The third would be to monitor exactly when each videotape was made. Subjects and music education coordinators were asked to videotape before the fifth teaching episode; how closely this was followed was not monitored. Furthermore, the subjects chose which lessons were videotaped. In order to overcome this weakness, each videotape should include date of taping, date that student teaching began, and a description of the student teaching experience up to the point of the videotape.

An extension of this study would continue to search for an explanation of the unknown variance. It was hoped that non-curricular experiences would provide some insight. Since this was not the case, other ways to quantify non-curricular experiences should be explored. Furthermore, other variables should be examined. Context has already been mentioned several times. Feedback and follow-up may not be specific enough. Other context factors may be just as important.

Another possibility came out in Joan’s interview. When asked about other non-curricular experiences, she answered, “to be an open person. I think that my personality helps in being a teacher.” Other researchers have examined personality. Schmidt and Hicken (1986) found that a composite measure of personality attributes was the best single predictor of achievement in music student teaching. This variable accounted for 17.1% of the variance.

Marso and Figge (1991) found that five predictor variables accounted for approximately 30% of the variance in student teaching performance ratings. "It appears that prospective teachers with a combination of high university GPA, who perceive themselves as likely to become highly successful future teachers, who have a Myers-
Briggs classification preference for intuition in contrast to sensing and who have a Myers-Briggs classification preference for feeling rather than thinking are more likely to have their student teaching performance rated higher than their fellow student teachers" (p. 5).

Personality was also a factor in Folkert's (1977) study. Student teachers who had in-school field experience were rated higher in two areas, rapport with students and staff and personal and professional characteristics, than those without in-school experiences. It is possible that a greater amount of variance may be explained with the following combination of variables: personality, field experience with feedback, and context.

Correlational research is particularly useful in identifying areas for further study. Since a relationship between field experience with feedback and student teaching performance has been found, studies to determine if this is a cause and effect relationship are needed. The educational community should make a continuing effort to analyze the effects and relationships between the curriculum and teaching performance. The curriculum must constantly be evaluated in terms of providing the best experiences in the most efficient manner to produce the best teachers possible.
Appendix A

Rehearsal Effectiveness Scale
## Rehearsal Effectiveness Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Evaluator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 1. Conducting Technique
- Effective use of left hand gestures
- Extensive repertory of beat styles
- Conducts in manner that indicates character of music
- Acceptable interpretation of music
- Thorough knowledge of score
- Effective command of beat patterns
- Clearly indicates accents, attacks, releases, and dynamics
- Maintains tempo accuracy and stability
- Conducts phrases as well as beats
- Demonstrates high level of intensity

### 2. Teacher-Student Rapport
- Constructively and effectively manages student behavior
- Demonstrates ability to motivate students
- Interprets accurately psychological mood of group
- Gives precise, understandable explanations and directions
- Communicates confidence and assurance
- Uses a variety of teaching techniques
- Paces rehearsals effectively
- Uses techniques that minimize off task behavior
- Provides for individual rates of learning
- Exhibits marked enthusiasm

### 3. Instructional Skills
- Uses vocabulary appropriate to level of students
- Appears organized and efficient
- Effectively uses instructional aids
- Relates material to other fields
- Demonstrates ability to follow lesson/rehearsal plan
- Poses pertinent questions
- Uses effective reinforcement techniques
- Relates content to prior and future learning
- Uses correct grammar and pronunciation
- Maintains a professional demeanor

SA: Strongly agree  A: Agree  N: Neutral  D: Disagree  SD: Strongly Disagree
Appendix B

Survey of Teaching Effectiveness
June 6, 1996

Greg Fant
4960 Garnet Street
Las Cruces, NM 88012

Dear Mr. Fant:

Your request for permission to include the Survey of Teaching Effectiveness in the appendix of your dissertation was received. On behalf of Dr. Baker and myself, we are pleased to grant you permission to include the Survey of Teaching Effectiveness in the appendix of your dissertation.

Thank you for your interest in our evaluation form. Please let us know if either of us can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

Dr. Donald L. Hamann, Coordinator
Department Music Education

Dr. Dawn Baker
Department of Music Education
Survey of Teaching Effectiveness

I. Lesson Delivery Skills (Weighted 40%)

POSTURE

A. Head & Body:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"Excellent" = Head lifted and centered; body lifted, relaxed, and poised
"Poor" = Head forward or to one side; body rigid or slouched

B. Arms & Hands:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"Excellent" = Normally relaxed with flowing gestures
"Poor" = Hand(s) in pocket(s), fidgeting/wrapping or clenched; arms crossed front or back

C. Legs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"Excellent" = Balanced; weight equally distributed
"Poor" = Crossed; locked knees, swaying; leaning on one leg

EYE CONTACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"Excellent" = Movement about room with individual eye contact
"Poor" = Locked; staring; looking over heads or at floor

GESTURES

A. Hands & Arms:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"Excellent" = Natural, flowing; appropriate for spoken content
"Poor" = Absence of gestures; mechanical; inappropriate and/or contrived

B. Upper & Lower Body:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"Excellent" = Change of stance, varying proximity to group; upper body directional change
"Poor" = Absence of movement; nervous pacing

FACIAL EXPRESSION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"Excellent" = Naturally varying; uncontrived changes of eyes, mouth, and facial muscles
"Poor" = Absence of variation; exaggerated and/or contrived
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VOCAL INFLECTION

A. **Dynamics:**

- **Excellent** = Comfortably and easily understood; naturally varying with appropriate accents and emphasis
- **Poor** = Too soft to hear; uncomfortably loud; forced from the throat; static

B. **Tempo & Phrasing:**

- **Excellent** = Comprehensible pace with moderate variations and appropriate pauses
- **Poor** = Too fast for comprehension; too slow for interest; fixed tempo; lack of pauses

C. **Pitch:**

- **Excellent** = Natural variations for emphasis; voice is pitched for teacher/student listening comfort and ease i.e. predominantly in lower third of range
- **Poor** = No variation; contrived; speaking predominantly in upper two-thirds of range

D. **Diction:**

- **Excellent** = Clearly articulated vowels and consonants; projected; easy to understand
- **Poor** = Placed in back of throat, swallowing words; lack of resonance, lazy tongue & lips

II. **PLANNING & PRESENTATION OF LESSON (WEIGHTED 60%)**

EVIDENCE OF LESSON PLANNING

A. **Content:**

1a. **Materials - Appropriate Music:**

- **Excellent** = Music appropriate for the age and ability of the students
- **Poor** = Music not appropriate for students

1b. **Material - Music & Concept:**

- **Excellent** = Music exemplary of the concept being developed
- **Poor** = Music unrelated to concept; poor example
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A. **Content Continued**

1c. **Materials - Supportive:**

   "Excellent" = Used appropriate supportive materials i.e., charts, recordings, video-taped presentations, computers, pictures
   "Poor" = Materials unrelated to concept; poor materials

2. **Objectives:**

   "Excellent" = Determined appropriate objectives; students were made aware of objectives
   "Poor" = Objectives were not appropriate; students were unaware of lesson objective focus

B. **Organization:**

1a. **Activities - Type:**

   "Excellent" = Type of activities were appropriate for students' age and skill and/or for number of students in the setting.
   "Poor" = Inappropriate activities for students' abilities, age, or for the number of students in the setting.

1b. **Activities - Number:**

   "Excellent" = Number of activities were appropriate for students' age, skill, and for the length of the class; each activity was of appropriate length
   "Poor" = Inappropriate number of activities for students, situation, and setting; inappropriate length of activities.

1c. **Activities - Sequencing:**

   "Excellent" = Activities were sequenced logically
   "Poor" = Lack of order and/or flow of activities; activities missing in learning sequence

**SUBJECT MATTER COMPETENCE**

A. **Information & Demonstrations:**

   "Excellent" = Presented correct information; accurate demonstration
   "Poor" = Presented incorrect, contradictory, or misleading information; did not or could not accurately demonstrate i.e., clapped or sang incorrect rhythms; did not demonstrate or provide information
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B. **Musical Model:**

- **Poor** 1 2 3 4 5
- **Excellent**

"Excellent" = Expressive and accurate, i.e., attention to phrasing
"Poor" = Non expressive, incorrect or inappropriate modeling; no modeling evidenced

C. **Conducting:**

- **Poor** 1 2 3 4 5
- **Excellent**

"Excellent" = Appropriate gestures for the group and the situation
"Poor" = Inappropriate gestures or not evidenced

### Pacing

A. **Logistics:**

- **Poor** 1 2 3 4 5
- **Excellent**

"Excellent" = Organized, orderly; evidence of student learned logistics, i.e., students get instruments or books quickly, efficiently, quietly return to their seats and continue to prepare and ready themselves for the rehearsal/class
"Poor" = Chaos; students have no planned routine(s) that enable them to prepare for class

B. **On - Task**:

- **Poor** 1 2 3 4 5
- **Excellent**

"Excellent" = Class began and ended promptly; wasted time minimal, time effectively utilized; definite closure to lesson
"Poor" = Class began late, students released late and student hurriedly put away equipment/materials; time not utilized effectively; class ended without closure

C. **Flow:**

- **Poor** 1 2 3 4 5
- **Excellent**

"Excellent" = Appropriate balance between teacher directives/explanations and student participation: one activity led to another without interruptions or breaks
"Poor" = Teacher talked too much; too much time spent going from one activity to another; long, disruptive breaks between and within activities

D. **Responsiveness to Group**

- **Poor** 1 2 3 4 5
- **Excellent**

"Excellent" = Teacher responded appropriately to group and individual musical/technical needs and problems
"Poor" = Teacher was unaware of, did not respond, or responded inappropriately to group or individual musical/technical needs and problems
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## SEQUENCING PATTERN/REHEARSAL CYCLE

### A. Directive:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"Excellent" = Specific directive identifying task to be accomplished  
"Poor" = Non-specific directive with no specific task to be accomplished

### B. Feedback:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"Excellent" = Specific positive or negative feedback provided; utilized student ideas and comments when/where applicable.  
"Poor" = No feedback or non-specific feedback provided

## TEACHING STYLE

### A. Charisma, Energy, Confidence, Enthusiasm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"Excellent" = Secure, animated; captured student attention and interest  
"Poor" = Sluggish, lethargic, insecure; students were bored or disinterested

### B. Interest Shown in Students/Topic:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"Excellent" = Sincere; interest evident in student welfare and in topic presented  
"Poor" = Lacked sincerity; interest in student or topic not evident; "only went through motions"

### C. Supports and Encourages Students' Efforts:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

"Excellent" = Sincere praise provided; emphasized positive aspects of student efforts; constructive suggestions and comments provided  
"Poor" = Sarcastic; belittled students and students' efforts; emphasized negative aspects of student efforts; contrived praise.
Evaluation Totals

Part I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Posture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eye Contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gestures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facial Expression</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal Inflection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of Part I: \[ \text{Total of Part I} \times 2 \times .40 = \quad \]

Part II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Lesson Planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter Competence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequencing Pattern</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Style</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total of Part II: \[ \text{Total of Part II} \times 2 \times .60 = \quad \]

Total Score = \[ \text{Total of Part I} + \text{Total of Part II} = \quad \]

Total Score Range: 10 Ineffective - 50 Extremely Effective

© Copyright 1996 Hamann and Baker. Used by permission
Appendix C

Interview Form
Interview Form

Name ___________________________                      Date ___________

School ___________________________

Age ___________________________

Sex ___________________________

Number of years in undergraduate school ___________________________

Major Instrument ___________________________

Minor Instrument(s) ___________________________

Brief description of high school musical experiences:
# Interview Form

Name ___________________________  Date ___________

School ___________________________

## Curricular Experiences

**Did you take?**  
*Introduction to Music Ed* or *Introduction to Ed.*

Classification when you took the course  
Fr.  Soph.  Jr.  Sr.

**Tutoring**

- number of students per semester  __________
- frequency of sessions  __________

**Microteaching**

- number of experiences - per semester  __________
- type and amount of feedback
  - 0 none
  - 1 some
  - 2 extensive

- context ____________________________________

**Observations**

- number of experiences - per semester  __________
- was there a follow-up discussion or analysis?  Yes  No

Did you just watch, follow an observation guide, script, or keep some other formal record.

- description ___________________________________
- context _______________________________________

Notes:
# Interview Form

Name ____________________________ Date __________

School ___________________________

## Curricular Experiences

### a general or elementary music methods course

Classification when you took the course  
Fr.  Soph.  Jr.  Sr.

Tutoring  
- number of students per semester  
- frequency of sessions

Microteaching  
- number of experiences - per semester  
- type and amount of feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>none</th>
<th>some</th>
<th>extensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>number</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- context ___________________________

Observations  
- number of experiences - per semester  
- was there a follow-up discussion or analysis?  
  Yes  No

Did you  
- just watch,  
- follow an observation guide, script,  
- or keep some other formal record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- context ___________________________

Notes:
**Interview Form**

Name ___________________________  Date __________

School ___________________________

**a Brass methods course**

Classification when you took the course  Fr.  Soph.  Jr.  Sr.

**Tutoring**

- number of students per semester
- frequency of sessions

**Microteaching**

- number of experiences - per semester
- type and amount of feedback
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>extensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  context ______________________________________

**Observations**

- number of experiences - per semester

Was there a follow-up discussion or analysis?  Yes  No

Did you just watch, follow an observation guide, script, or keep some other formal record.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

context ______________________________________

**Notes:**
Interview Form

Name ___________________________ Date __________

School __________________________

a Woodwind methods course

Classification when you took the course Fr. Soph. Jr. Sr.

Tutoring

number of students per semester ______

currency of sessions ______

Microteaching

number of experiences - per semester ______

type and amount of feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>none</th>
<th>some</th>
<th>extensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

context __________________________

Observations

number of experiences - per semester ______

was there a follow-up discussion or analysis? Yes No

Did you

just watch. follow an observation guide. script.

or keep some other formal record. description __________________________

context __________________________

Notes:
Interview Form

Name ____________________________ Date ____________

School ___________________________

**a Percussion methods course**

Classification when you took the course Fr. Soph. Jr. Sr.

Tutoring

number of students per semester ______

frequency of sessions ______

Microteaching

number of experiences - per semester ______

type and amount of feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>extensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

context ____________________________________________

Observations

number of experiences - per semester ______

was there a follow-up discussion or analysis? Yes No

Did you just watch, follow an observation guide, script, or keep some other formal record.

description _______________________________________

context __________________________________________

Notes:
### Interview Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**School**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a String methods course</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classification when you took the course Fr. Soph. Jr. Sr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tutoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number of students per semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>frequency of sessions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Microteaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number of experiences - per semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>type and amount of feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>extensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**context**

**Observations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>number of experiences - per semester</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>was there a follow-up discussion or analysis? Yes No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Did you just watch, follow an observation guide, script, or keep some other formal record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**context**

**Notes:**
Interview Form

Name ___________________________ Date __________

School ___________________________

**an Instrumental methods course**

Classification when you took the course Fr. Soph. Jr. Sr.

Tutoring

- number of students per semester ______
- frequency of sessions ______

Microteaching

- number of experiences - per semester ______
- type and amount of feedback
  - 0 none
  - 1 some
  - 2 extensive

context ___________________________________________________________________

Observations

- number of experiences - per semester ______
- was there a follow-up discussion or analysis? Yes No

Did you just watch, follow an observation guide, script,
or keep some other formal record.

description __________________________________________________________________

c context __________________________________________________________________

Notes:
Interview Form

Name ___________________________ Date __________

School ___________________________

**a Vocal methods course**

Classification when you took the course Fr. Soph. Jr. Sr.

Tutoring
  number of students per semester ______
  frequency of sessions ______

Microteaching
  number of experiences - per semester ______
  type and amount of feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>extensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

context ______________________________________

Observations
  number of experiences - per semester ______
  was there a follow-up discussion or analysis? Yes No
  Did you just watch, follow an observation guide, script, or keep some other formal record. description

context ______________________________________

Notes:
### Interview Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name ___________________________</th>
<th>Date __________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School __________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### a Choral methods course

**Classification when you took the course**

Fr.  Soph.  Jr.  Sr.

**Tutoring**

- number of students per semester
- frequency of sessions

**Microteaching**

- number of experiences - per semester
- type and amount of feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>none</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- context ____________________________________________

**Observations**

- number of experiences - per semester

- was there a follow-up discussion or analysis?  Yes  No

 Did you

- just watch.
- follow an observation guide, script.
- or keep some other formal record.

- description ____________________________

- context __________________________________

**Notes:**
Interview Form

Name ____________________________  Date ____________

School ____________________________

Conducting course(s)

Classification when you took the course  Fr.  Soph.  Jr.  Sr.

Tutoring
number of students per semester
frequency of sessions

Microteaching
number of experiences - per semester

type and amount of feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>some</td>
<td>extensive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

context ______________________________________

Observations
number of experiences - per semester

was there a follow-up discussion or analysis?  Yes  No

Did you just watch, follow an observation guide, script,
or keep some other formal record.

description __________________________________

context ______________________________________

Notes:
**Interview Form**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**a Combined methods/conducting course**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification when you took the course</th>
<th>Fr.</th>
<th>Soph.</th>
<th>Jr.</th>
<th>Sr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Tutoring**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of students per semester</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of sessions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Microteaching**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of experiences - per semester</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type and amount of feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 none</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 some</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 extensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of experiences - per semester</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>was there a follow-up discussion or analysis?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Did you just watch.**

- follow an observation guide, script,
- or keep some other formal record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**context**

**Notes:**

---
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Interview Form

Name ____________________________ Date ____________

School ____________________________

Internship/Practicum

Classification when you took the course Fr. Soph. Jr. Sr.

Tutoring
number of students per semester ____________
frequency of sessions ____________

Microteaching
number of experiences - per semester ____________
type and amount of feedback

0 none 1 some 2 extensive

context __________________________________________

Observations
number of experiences - per semester ____________

was there a follow-up discussion or analysis? Yes No

Did you just watch, follow an observation guide, script, or keep some other formal record.
description ______________________________________

context __________________________________________

Notes:

### Interview Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name ___________________________</th>
<th>Date __________</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School __________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Early Field Experiences that were independent of any courses**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification when you took the course</th>
<th>Fr.</th>
<th>Soph.</th>
<th>Jr.</th>
<th>Sr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Tutoring**

- number of students per semester: ______
- frequency of sessions: ______

**Microteaching**

- number of experiences - per semester: ______
- type and amount of feedback:
  - 0: none
  - 1: some
  - 2: extensive
- context: __________________________

**Observations**

- number of experiences - per semester: ______
- was there a follow-up discussion or analysis? Yes No
- Did you:
  - just watch,
  - follow an observation guide, script,
  - or keep some other formal record.
- description: _________________________
- context: ___________________________

**Notes:**
Interview Form

Name ___________________________ Date ___________

School ___________________________

**Lab. course**

Classification when you took the course Fr. Soph. Jr. Sr.

Tutoring
- number of students per semester ______
- frequency of sessions ______

Microteaching
- number of experiences - per semester ______
- type and amount of feedback
  - 0 none
  - 1 some
  - 2 extensive

context ____________________________

Observations
- number of experiences - per semester ______
- was there a follow-up discussion or analysis? Yes No

Did you
- just watch.
- follow an observation guide, script.
- or keep some other formal record.

description ________________________

context ___________________________

Notes:
Interview Form

Name ___________________________ Date __________

School ___________________________

Any other course that included Early Field Experiences

Description of course(s):

Classification when you took the course

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fr.</th>
<th>Soph.</th>
<th>Jr.</th>
<th>Sr.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Tutoring

- number of students per semester
- frequency of sessions

Microteaching

- number of experiences - per semester
- type and amount of feedback
  - 0 none
  - 1 some
  - 2 extensive
- context __________________________________________

Observations

- number of experiences - per semester
- was there a follow-up discussion or analysis? Yes No
- Did you just watch, follow an observation guide, script, or keep some other formal record, description
- context __________________________________________

Notes:
Interview Form

Name ____________________________    Date __________

School ____________________________

Non-curricular experiences

Have you ever:

Taught Private Lessons?    Yes  No

Describe:

Directed an Ensemble
  (such as a church group or fraternity choir)
  Yes  No

Describe:

Led a Peer group
  (such as ensemble section leader or drum major)
  Yes  No

Describe:
Interview Form

Name ___________________________ Date __________

School __________________________

Non-curricular experiences
music teaching - not required by the school
  (Such as drum instructor for HS marching band)
  Describe:
  Yes  No

non-music teaching
  Describe:
  Yes  No

tutoring - not required by a course
  Describe:
  Yes  No
Interview Form

Name ________________________

School ________________________

Non-curricular experiences
Other

Describe:

Date __________

Yes  No
Summary
Interview Form

Name ________________________________ Date ____________

School ________________________________

Curricular Summary

Tutoring ______
number of students x frequency of sessions

Microteaching Total ______ with feedback ______

Observations Total ______ with follow-up ______
observations where student:
  just watched ______ followed observation guide ______
  scripted ______ other formal record ______
  description of other ______
Summary
Interview Form

Name ____________________________ Date ____________

School ____________________________

Non-Curricular Summary

The following designations will be used to quantify these non-curricular experiences: 0 = none, 1 = some (short duration, up to a few months), 2 = moderate (six months to two years), 3 = extensive (longer than two years).

Giving Private Lessons
Ensemble directing - church group, fraternity choir
Peer group - ensemble section leader, drum major
Music teaching - not required by the school
Non-music teaching
Tutoring - not required by a course
Other
Description of other:

Total Index ____________
Appendix D

Video Tape Cover Letter
Dear «First Name».

Thanks for agreeing to participate in this student teaching research project. Enclosed in this package is a video tape, a return label, and postage.

As I mentioned on the phone, I need a video sample of you teaching an ensemble class (band, orchestra, or choir). Try to record yourself during the next two weeks. The class can be any level (beginner to advanced) and should be at least five or more in size. Ideally, a full class period should be recorded, but if you are doing part of period (for example, you have 20 minutes of an advanced choir to work on a specific piece) that is ok.

Use the enclosed postage and label to return the video. You should be able to mail it back in the same box that it came in. If possible, include a note that tells me the best times to contact you for the interview.

As a reminder, your identity will remain anonymous. If you have any questions or concerns, feel free to call me at 505-646-2304, daytime or 505-382-0444, evenings. You can also reach me via email at gfant@nmsu.edu.

Thanks again for your help and I look forward to talking with you soon.

Sincerely,

Greg Fant
Appendix E
Background Data
# Background Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Undergrad years</th>
<th>Major Instrument</th>
<th>Minor Instrument</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Clar.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4 + 1 grad</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4 + 1 grad</td>
<td>oboe</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tpt</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Perc</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>T-bone</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tpt</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tpt</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Violin</td>
<td>Viola</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Cello</td>
<td>Bass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tpt</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>T-bone</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sax</td>
<td>Keyboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>Piano/Flute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4 + 1 grad</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Tpt</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Perc</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Oboe</td>
<td>Bsn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Perc</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Flute</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clar.</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tpt</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Sax</td>
<td>clar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grad</td>
<td>Oboe</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Clar</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Flute</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Tpt</td>
<td>Euph</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sax</td>
<td>other wws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Perc</td>
<td>Sax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>Flute</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Horn</td>
<td>Tpt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Perc</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>J</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>T-bone</td>
<td>Voice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F
Subject Scores
## Subject Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Bergee score</th>
<th>Hamann score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>38.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>34.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>40.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>34.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>36.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>35.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>45.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>33.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>35.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>31.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>25.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>29.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>32.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>36.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>39.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>31.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>34.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>33.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>36.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>33.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>24.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>29.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>33.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>41.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>36.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>42.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>32.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>33.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>32.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>39.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>39.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>39.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>38.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>30.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>35.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>35.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>40.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>35.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>30.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>35.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G
Curricular Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Tutoring</th>
<th>Microteaching total</th>
<th>Observation Total</th>
<th>EPE Composite</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject Number</td>
<td>Microteaching with feedback</td>
<td>Observation with follow-up</td>
<td>Total experiences with feedback or follow-up</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>176</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H
Non-Curricular Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Private Lesson</th>
<th>Ens. Direct</th>
<th>Peer Leader</th>
<th>Music Teach</th>
<th>Non Music</th>
<th>Tutor</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I
Microteaching Context
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Microteaching peer total</th>
<th>Microteaching peer, with feedback</th>
<th>Microteaching school total</th>
<th>Microteaching school with feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
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