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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to investigate the status and development of junior-level preservice music teachers’ concerns using Fuller and Bown’s teacher concerns model. Participants were 11 junior-level instrumental practicum students from a large American university. Data sources included a goals essay, lesson plans, teaching DVDs, self-evaluations of teaching, and a reflection on the original goals essay. Data were coded according to Fuller and Bown’s concerns categories (i.e., self, task, student impact). Analyses indicated that participants had a variety of concerns within each concern category specific to music education. Overall, there was an emphasis on task concerns, as participants appeared to be more concerned with pedagogical execution than with their personal characteristics or student impact. Rapport, content knowledge, and motivation were the most frequently coded self, task, and student impact concerns, respectively. Comparisons were also drawn between (a) written assignments to determine whether participants’ concerns changed in quantity or quality during the semester and (b) concerns identified in written assignments and concerns observed while teaching. Teaching DVDs were also analyzed for pivotal events contributing to the development of concerns. Four cases are presented representing varied developmental profiles that both support and challenge Fuller and Bown’s model.
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Research regarding the development of preservice music teachers’ concerns is important to those responsible for music teacher education curricula. Trends detected among preservice teachers can suggest the experiences that may be most essential for students as they progress through a music education degree and into the field. Insights into preservice teachers’ concerns can reveal which elements of teaching have been internalized and which are yet to be grasped. Although several theoretical perspectives have been discussed in relation to preservice teachers’ concerns in general education (e.g., Burden, 1990) and music education (see Rideout & Feldman, 2002), Fuller and Bown’s (1975) developmental model of preservice teachers’ concerns has been a particularly prominent framework employed in research.

Fuller’s (1969) conceptualization of teacher development has informed much of the research on preservice (e.g., Yourn, 2000) and student teacher concerns (e.g., Campbell & Thompson, 2007). Concerns are defined as teachers’ perceived problems or topics that are frequently the focus of teacher thought and action (Fuller, 1969; Reeves & Kazelskis, 1985). Fuller’s (1969) initial work was based on data from student teaching seminar discussions and biweekly written statements. Three primary concern categories were found: (a) self (e.g., How adequate am I?), (b) problem behaviors of students, and (c) pupil learning. Fuller then proposed a developmental conception of teacher concerns: (a) preteaching, nonconcern; (b) early teaching, self concerns; and (c) late (i.e., experienced) teaching, pupil concerns.

Fuller and Bown (1975) later developed a three-stage (i.e., self-survival, teaching situation, pupil) linear model of preservice teacher concerns. Fuller and Bown’s self-survival stage is a synthesis of Fuller’s (1969) aforementioned “self” and “problem-behaviors-of-students” phases, whereas the teaching-situation stage includes issues such as time pressures and appropriate methods and materials. In this model, preservice teachers are expected to have more self-survival concerns, whereas in-service teachers may more likely have teaching situation and pupil concerns. As teachers gain experience, concerns from the next stage are “added on” to those from the previous stage. Fuller and Bown do not specify whether the stages are distinct or overlapping, only that clusters of concerns seem to be associated with each stage and that these clusters can provide insight regarding learning to teach.

Investigations of preservice teachers’ concerns are prominent in the general education literature (e.g., Burden, 1990; Burn, Hagger, & Mutton, 2003; Kagan, 1992). Several studies have reported changes in preservice teachers that reflect the three-stage Fuller and Bown (1975) model. Calderhead and Robson (1991) investigated the experiences of 12 British preservice elementary teachers. Qualitative data gathered during the course of a year indicated that participants’ most pressing concerns were feeling like a pupil rather than a teacher (i.e., the self-survival stage). In addition, participants’ responses to video observations and projection tasks were more likely to be about the teacher’s tasks than about impact on students. Pigge and Marso (1989) found that student teachers’ concerns shifted from primarily self-survival to teacher task orientations during the course of a yearlong study of 153 student teachers from Ohio. The researchers collected data on teaching concerns via questionnaires administered at the
beginning and end of student teaching. Self-survival concerns were rated significantly lower at posttest than at pretest, whereas task concerns were rated significantly higher.

Other researchers have reported findings that do not support Fuller and Bown’s (1975) model (e.g., Gore & Zeichner, 1991). Weinstein (1990) reported no significant changes among 38 elementary preservice teachers’ beliefs when investigating the effects of an introductory practicum experience. When participants began, they were concerned about self-related issues, such as interpersonal skills, and remained so after a 7-week, 21-hr field experience. The mixed findings suggest that more studies are necessary to determine how the Fuller and Bown model can be applied to preservice teacher development. It is not clear whether development from self-survival to task to student impact concerns can be expected across a semester teaching experience.

Although less common, studies incorporating Fuller and Bown’s (1975) model can also be found in music education (e.g., Bennett, 1982; Coleman, 1999; Drafall, 1991). Similar to the general education literature, mixed findings have been reported. Broyles (1997) examined the development of 12 music student teachers’ concerns from three Oklahoma universities. Data sources included questionnaires, journals, and video observations. All participants were found to have fewer self-survival concerns and more student impact concerns by the end of student teaching. Yourn (2000) investigated the teaching concerns of 18 Australian preservice music teachers. Data from interviews, journals, mentor evaluations, researcher field notes, and focus group meetings indicated that participants were most concerned with task-related issues, such as classroom management and general knowledge of teaching. Yourn suggested that the participants may have underestimated their teaching when reporting their concerns.

Campbell and Thompson (2007) surveyed the concerns of 1,121 preservice music teachers from 16 American universities. Participants were categorized developmentally according to the music education course they were currently enrolled in: introductory, methods, field experience, or student teaching. Regardless of the Fuller and Bown (1975) category examined, women and participants intending to teach at the elementary level had significantly higher mean ratings than men and participants intending to teach at the secondary level, respectively. In addition, all groups of participants regardless of gender, future intentions, and current music education course ranked student impact concerns the highest, followed by self-survival and task concerns in descending order. The results were not congruent with Fuller and Bown’s model, as preservice teachers had more concern for their impact on students rather than about self- or task-related issues. The lack of significant differences by course level is also inconsistent with the developmental trajectory hypothesized by Fuller and Bown. The researchers suggested that the cross-sectional data, the tendency to report “idealized” concerns, and the general rather than domain-specific (i.e., music) nature of the survey instrument may be reasons for the inconsistencies. More research is needed that examines changes in preservice music teachers’ concerns over time with multiple, context-specific data collection methods to determine whether the Fuller and Bown model can be useful for understanding development.
The purpose of this study was to investigate the status and development of junior-level preservice music teachers’ concerns using Fuller and Bown’s (1975) teacher concerns model. Research questions included the following: (a) What concerns are most common among the participants, and do these concerns change during the course of a semester practicum? and (b) Are the concerns or shifts in concerns congruent with Fuller and Bown’s three-stage model of teacher development?

Method

Participants in this study were 11 students from a junior-level instrumental practicum course (5 band, 6 strings) at a large American university. Three were instrumental general-degree track students, and the rest were instrumental-only track. In this course, students are required to complete 25 hr of secondary ensemble teaching. Students previously completed a 25-hr practicum aligned with the course Introduction to Music Education. During this prior practicum, students gained experience teaching small groups and occasionally full ensembles.

Data were collected in spring 2009 and functioned as both practicum course assignments and data for this study. The researchers served as the practicum course instructors. Data sources included a goals essay in which students identified self, task, and student impact concerns; two lesson plans; two teaching DVDs; two self-evaluations of teaching; and a reflection on the original goals essay. The self-evaluations consisted of 9 questions focused on teacher qualities (e.g., vocal-facial inflection, personal idiosyncrasies), rehearsal structure, pacing, relationship of lesson plan to actual teaching, error detection and diagnosis, and teaching strategies. The 10th question asked students to either write about their most pressing concern (Self-Evaluation 1) or discuss whether their most pressing concern was still the same or different (Self-Evaluation 2).

An a priori (Miles & Huberman, 1994) or deductive (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999) coding approach, based on Fuller and Bown’s (1975) three categories (self, task, student impact), was used to code all documents and teaching DVDs. However, low inference codes (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999) for each category were created rather than using codes from previous research. Codes determined for the self category reflected the participants’ concerns for themselves as teachers and their personal characteristics (e.g., organization, humor, identity). Codes in the task category reflected concerns with strategy implementation, knowledge, and contextual classroom issues (e.g., classroom management, repertoire familiarity, class size, student age level). Last, student impact codes were based on statements that revealed a concern for the students’ knowledge, skill, or affective development (e.g., motivation, enjoyment, learning). (See Tables 1, 2, and 3 for a complete list of codes and code definitions.)

An intercoder agreement process (Creswell, 2007; Miles & Huberman, 1994) was used to generate codes. This included the use of a coding summary table, independent coding of multiple essays by both researchers to check for agreement, and the creation and refinement of a codebook (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999). An intercoder agreement rate of 90% was established after using this process to code three different essays. The
**Table 1.** Self Concern Code Distribution by Participant and Overall Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Practicum goals essay</th>
<th>Reflection on practicum goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te</td>
<td>General teacher concern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeO</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeH</td>
<td>Humor</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeC</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeR</td>
<td>Rapport</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TelID</td>
<td>Identity</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TelINDEC</td>
<td>Indecision</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TelPERS</td>
<td>Personality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeEV</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TeA</td>
<td>Adapting</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: # = frequency of statements.

**Table 2.** Task Concern Code Distribution by Participant and Overall Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Practicum goals essay</th>
<th>Reflection on practicum goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ta</td>
<td>General task concern</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaK</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaIS</td>
<td>Instrument-specific pedagogy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaREP</td>
<td>Repertoire</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaGR</td>
<td>Student group size/configuration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaREAL</td>
<td>Real-world relevance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaT</td>
<td>Time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaF</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaREH</td>
<td>Rehearsing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaC</td>
<td>Conducting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaD</td>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaPC</td>
<td>Pacing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaE</td>
<td>Error detection</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaG</td>
<td>Goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaPL</td>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaLRP</td>
<td>Long range planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaLEV</td>
<td>Student age/grade level</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaAB</td>
<td>Student ability level</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TaQ</td>
<td>Questioning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
researchers contacted each other with coding questions that emerged during coding of the remaining essays to maintain high intercoder agreement. Codes used once by one student were determined to be less robust and after discussion were recoded.

Teaching DVDs were analyzed using an evaluation form that tracked evidence of positive, neutral, or negative progression according to Fuller and Bown’s (1975) sequence from self, to task, to student impact concerns. Evidence of a positive progression included responding to an unplanned event, whereas evidence of a negative progression included not responding to an unplanned event, use of an incomplete teaching cycle, or having an unbalanced proportion of teacher talk versus student activity. Accompanying lesson plans were categorized as either task or student focused. Although all lesson plans included reference to tasks, a focus on students was indicated through questioning and/or planning to provide feedback.

Finally, an individual characterization form was completed after completing the analysis of all documents and DVDs. This included a category and code frequency summary for the goals essay, reflection essay, and self-evaluations; a code distribution analysis for written documents; a summary of the lesson plan characterizations; a summary of the progression analysis for each DVD; and a summary of analytical memos (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982) created during coding.

Several strategies were used to increase the validity of the findings, including the use of low inference codes (LeCompte & Schensul, 1999), a predetermined intercoder agreement process (Creswell, 2007; Miles & Huberman, 1994), peer debriefing, source (e.g., comparing essay and self-evaluation code frequencies and distributions) and method (e.g., comparing text and video data) triangulation (Stake, 1995), checking for researcher effects (Miles & Huberman, 1994), and checking the meaning of outliers (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Possible researcher effects were mitigated by introducing students to the research project at the end of the semester and analyzing data after grades were submitted. The researchers engaged in checking the meaning of outliers by noting the presence of unique codes or essay contents for particular students.

Table 3. Student Impact Concern Code Distribution by Participant and Overall Frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Practicum Goals Essay</th>
<th>Reflection on Practicum Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>General student concern</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGR</td>
<td>Student group size</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SM</td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI</td>
<td>Individual student impact</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SL</td>
<td>General learning concern</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLIK</td>
<td>Students liking the teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENJ</td>
<td>Students enjoying music</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: # = frequency of statements.
Findings

Analyses of the sample’s coded concern statements from the practicum goals essay and reflection on the practicum goals essay assignments are presented in Table 4. Task concerns were the most frequently cited overall for both the original goals essay and the reflection essay. There was reduction of self concerns and an increase of student impact concerns from the original goals essay to the reflection essay. The sum and mean comparisons for task concerns indicated a decrease from the original goals essay to the reflection essay. In addition, the task concern category had the most widely distributed set of concerns with 19 codes as compared to 10 and 7 codes found in the self and student concern categories, respectively (see Tables 1, 2, and 3).

Frequency analyses of the codes in the self-concern category revealed that rapport and personality were two of the most commonly cited issues. Adapting to the practicum setting was also a relatively frequent concern found in the original goals essay responses. No other self concerns were cited by more than 4 participants. Adequate levels of knowledge about teaching, familiarity with repertoire, and conducting-related issues were task concerns cited by at least 5 participants in both the original goals essay and the reflection essay. Instrument-specific pedagogy and student group size or configuration were relatively common issues cited in the original goals essay, whereas time use and planning were relatively common in the reflection essay. Being able to motivate students and having an impact on individuals were the student impact concerns cited by the most participants in both the goals essay and the reflection essay.

Presented in the following sections are four cases representing varied developmental profiles that both support and challenge Fuller and Bown’s (1975) linear model. A maximum variation sampling strategy (Miles & Huberman, 1994) was used to select the four cases.

Simon

Simon, an instrumental-general (trumpet) major completed his practicum at a relatively new high school. Simon exhibited a positive development trajectory across the practicum experience. Although primarily evidenced in his writing, the increase in quantity
of student impact concerns and slight decreases in self and task concerns are consistent with the developmental trajectory described by Fuller and Bown (1975; see Table 5).

Although task concerns were most prominent in Simon’s original practicum goals essay, there was a good deal of variety in each of the concern categories. Simon’s task concerns included knowledge and analysis of repertoire, pacing, efficient use of time, lesson planning, rehearsing and conducting, and error detection, and Simon’s student impact concerns dealt primarily with the challenges inherent in teaching a large ensemble and motivating students.

When I am working with smaller groups I am very easily able to see how my students are responding . . . whereas, when in a large ensemble I have trouble “reading” the students.

The self concerns cited by Simon included issues related to developing student rapport, personal organization skills, personality, and personal indecisiveness about prioritization of content.

Simon’s lesson plans, DVDs, and self-evaluations did not reveal much evidence of developmental change. Both lesson plans were reflective of task concern foci, as they lacked detailed procedures or descriptions of how the students could be engaged. The observed instances during which Simon diverged from his lesson plans often entailed his stopping the ensemble and having the students play with little or no instructions and no significant amount of feedback. Interestingly, Simon referred rather specifically to his lack of student impact concerns in his second self-evaluation: “Sometimes I wonder if I am not in my own world and not truly observing what my students are doing.”

Although an increased awareness of student impact concerns was not necessarily evident in Simon’s teaching, the decreased quantity of self and task concerns, along with an increase in the distribution of task concerns in the reflection essay, suggests a change in his thinking. The specific student impact concerns focused on motivating students, teaching large ensembles, teaching students how to practice, and engaging all students more actively in rehearsal in thought and action, as indicated in the following statement:

If my students do not understand the information then there is no point to move on, yet I find that I never seem to lose the whole class, but rather just a few students at a time.
Simon continued to have a variety of task concerns in his reflection essay. Task concerns included lesson planning, pacing, efficiency, knowledge of repertoire, and error detection. Interestingly, Simon also wrote about his perceived improvement on several of the task concern issues cited in his original goals essay.

I learned valuable lessons about my teaching which helped me to better myself in efficiency, teaching strategies, and preparedness.

The only self concerns cited in the reflection essay were ability to develop student rapport and organization. Simon often wrote about these issues in light of his improvements and newly discovered insights: “What I have really come away with in my perception of my own teaching is how I need to organize myself and manage my time in order to be more efficient.”

Simon’s development indicates changes in thinking and self-perception. His concern for student impact intensified during the course of the practicum experience, as evidenced in his reflection essay and second self-evaluation. However, it seems the changes that may have occurred in Simon’s disposition and attitude had not necessarily translated to his approach to lesson planning or observed teaching during the course of this study.

**Alvin**

Alvin, a saxophonist and instrumental major, completed his practicum at an established, middle class high school approximately 30 min from campus. Alvin exhibited evidence of increased concern for student impact but also cited growing concerns in the self and task categories (see Table 6). His development did not necessarily follow a trajectory through stages, but rather, it reflected an increased awareness of issues as they were experienced.

I was not concerned with my ability to develop a rapport with kids coming into this practicum. However, after seeing my mentor teacher’s feedback sheet, I realized it will be something I do have to work on . . . I made connections to a couple people . . . but as a whole, I feel like I left out some of the students.

In his original practicum goals essay, Alvin’s self concerns included ability to develop rapport and how that might affect classroom management: “I develop rapport with

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Original goals essay</th>
<th>Reflection essay</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6. Overall Frequency of Concerns: Alvin**

Simon continued to have a variety of task concerns in his reflection essay. Task concerns included lesson planning, pacing, efficiency, knowledge of repertoire, and error detection. Interestingly, Simon also wrote about his perceived improvement on several of the task concern issues cited in his original goals essay.

I learned valuable lessons about my teaching which helped me to better myself in efficiency, teaching strategies, and preparedness.

The only self concerns cited in the reflection essay were ability to develop student rapport and organization. Simon often wrote about these issues in light of his improvements and newly discovered insights: “What I have really come away with in my perception of my own teaching is how I need to organize myself and manage my time in order to be more efficient.”

Simon’s development indicates changes in thinking and self-perception. His concern for student impact intensified during the course of the practicum experience, as evidenced in his reflection essay and second self-evaluation. However, it seems the changes that may have occurred in Simon’s disposition and attitude had not necessarily translated to his approach to lesson planning or observed teaching during the course of this study.

**Alvin**

Alvin, a saxophonist and instrumental major, completed his practicum at an established, middle class high school approximately 30 min from campus. Alvin exhibited evidence of increased concern for student impact but also cited growing concerns in the self and task categories (see Table 6). His development did not necessarily follow a trajectory through stages, but rather, it reflected an increased awareness of issues as they were experienced.

I was not concerned with my ability to develop a rapport with kids coming into this practicum. However, after seeing my mentor teacher’s feedback sheet, I realized it will be something I do have to work on . . . I made connections to a couple people . . . but as a whole, I feel like I left out some of the students.

In his original practicum goals essay, Alvin’s self concerns included ability to develop rapport and how that might affect classroom management: “I develop rapport with
them and then have to sacrifice other aspects of my teaching because they don’t respect my authority as much.” However, his essay indicated he was predominantly concerned with task-related issues, such as pacing (e.g., talking too much), error detection, and to a lesser extent, familiarity with repertoire. Although Alvin cited some student concerns, they were mostly superficial (e.g., “I want them to think that music is cool”).

Analyses of Alvin’s first practicum DVD, accompanying lesson plan, and self-evaluation also indicated a predominance of task concerns. For example, he often failed to provide directions, feedback, and an opportunity for students to apply the feedback he provided, a point noted in his first self-evaluation. However, there was some evidence of student impact concerns represented by Alvin’s using additional instructional strategies (for example, using teacher modeling to demonstrate style) not contained in the lesson plans.

Although Alvin’s lesson plan and self-evaluation for his second practicum DVD were also relatively task-focused, there was much more observable evidence of student impact concerns. All of Alvin’s departures from his lesson plan resulted from his ability to informally assess the students’ progress, followed by the use of clear instructions, teacher modeling, specific and detailed feedback, and multiple trials for the students to apply feedback.

The quantity of concerns increased in all three categories in Alvin’s reflection essay. Many of the concerns written about in his reflection essay were not stated previously in his original goals essay and therefore represented new issues. Alvin had become highly sensitized to such self concerns as personality and enthusiasm in the classroom: “The biggest teaching thing I need to work on is being energized in class.” The focus of his task concerns shifted during the course of the semester from pacing to his knowledge of repertoire and conducting abilities, as indicated in the following statement: “I do not feel that I am a strong conductor.” Interestingly, both the quantity and sophistication of Alvin’s student impact concerns increased. He discussed issues related to intrinsic versus extrinsic student motivation, the need to inspire students through conducting, and a desire to encourage students to be more independent musicians (e.g., “They feel they need to play a certain phrase in one breath because I say so, not for any sort of musical reason”).

The changes in Alvin’s concerns across the practicum experience suggest positive growth toward a more aware and sophisticated teacher. However, a clear trajectory toward student impact concerns was not found. It seems that Alvin’s developmental trend was to discover new concerns in each area rather than move from one concern category to another. In addition, these new concerns were sometimes realized with increased levels of sophistication.

**Mandy**

Whereas some students demonstrated growth in the quantity and depth of concerns for each area, others seemed to focus on one area of concern. This was the case for Mandy; her essays, lesson plans, self-evaluations, and teaching DVDs were clearly oriented...
toward task concerns (see Table 7). Mandy, an older student in her mid-30s, was a cellist. She taught Grades 7 and 8 strings in a more racially and economically diverse district approximately 30 min from campus.

Mandy’s original goals essay and first self-evaluation included a majority of comments focused on such task concerns as pacing, conducting, knowledge about age-appropriate music terminology, and providing appropriate feedback to students. Mandy made a connection between pacing and classroom management: “If my pacing were more energetic, I doubt I’d have as many classroom management issues.” She also identified specific conducting concerns, including nonverbal communication and use of varied facial expressions.

Mandy’s teaching DVDs, lesson plans, and reflection essay demonstrated a continued focus on task concerns, with additional task concerns (rehearsal strategies and level of the students) identified in the reflection essay. Although there were some observed examples of responding to student needs through the use of additional strategies and analogies not included in lesson plans, Mandy seemed flustered during instruction by how to respond to basic rhythmic accuracy and articulation issues.

It is possible that Mandy’s prior teaching experiences enabled her to spend less time on self concerns, as indicated by the confidence she had in her personality and ability to establish rapport with students. At the same time, it seemed her development was confined to an expansion of task-related concerns rather than increased student impact concerns. Also, this placement provided unanticipated challenges: “I realize that a big part of my teaching philosophy is a musical ‘No Child Left Behind’ which became a huge burden when faced with at least 10 students who acted like they don’t want to learn!”

### Nanette

Nanette, a graduate student earning teacher certification, was an instrumental-general music student who also completed her placement at an established middle class high school approximately 30 min from campus. Her identity as an elementary general music teacher, coupled with her significant prior experience teaching beginning cello and piano students, contributed to her initial focus on task concerns related to teaching high school–age students. However, during the course of the semester, age-related concerns were mitigated by positive interactions with students, accomplishments, and ability to apply pedagogical knowledge from prior teaching to the high school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Original goals essay</th>
<th>Reflection essay</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Te</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ta</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>+3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>−1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
orchestra setting. Consequently, during the course of the practicum, there was a substantial reduction in the number and distribution of task concerns, which seemed to allow for new concerns to emerge in all three categories (see Table 8).

In the original goals essay, Nanette’s concerns seemed to emerge from her elementary general music teacher identity (“I think of myself as a general music teacher first and orchestra teacher second”) and lack of experience teaching high school students. More than half of Nanette’s concerns articulated in the original goals essay were focused on such aged-related task concerns as instrument-specific pedagogy, age-appropriate repertoire, and discipline. Nanette expressed concern with disciplining high school students: “I feel that my so-called ‘authority’ diminishes as students reach high school . . . My classroom management options need to radically change.” Other concerns included establishing rapport (“I do not feel as comfortable teaching older students”) and motivating students (“I need to find out how student motivation changes [with older students] so that I can implement appropriate strategies”).

In contrast, Nanette’s teaching and accompanying lesson plans were clearly student focused, with significant attention given to providing feedback and asking questions. During both teaching episodes, Nanette added instruction not included in the lesson plans, including the use of analogies, using peer evaluation of instrument technique, and asking for feedback from students sitting near the back of the cello section. When pacing was an issue, she noted that “thinking about possible student reactions to sitting for a long period of time [when creating a lesson plan] could help me pace better.”

Whereas Nanette’s teaching was student focused, her self-evaluations were almost exclusively oriented toward task concerns. For instance, conducting and rehearsal pacing were the focus of her first self-evaluation.

My most pressing concern is focusing on my conducting. I was concerned with how much I talked when something came up. It would take me awhile to get to the point and make improvement.

The continued focus on task concerns was evident in her self-evaluation of her second teaching episode, in which “conducting and pacing hindered my good ideas. I need to get my ideas across more quickly with fewer words . . . with non-verbal gestures.”

Interestingly, by the end of the semester, it seemed Nanette’s initial concerns about working with high school students were mitigated by her positive teaching experiences: “[My] negative perception of high school students being annoyed and bored
with my teaching changed when I saw a high level of respect, listening, and work ethic.” Her concerns about how to discipline were alleviated, because

I was able to find a balance between strict professionalism and humor. I found that I did not need to be a “serious” teacher in the sense of being strict or domineering. . . . They had confidence in me and tried anything I asked. I discovered I understand how to interact with high school students better than I thought.

Also, given her student-focused teaching, she now had a specific goal of “how to help students feel personally involved in bettering the ensemble.”

In summary, during the course of the practicum experience, Nanette’s growth in confidence resulted in a shift from age-related task concerns to ensemble teaching task concerns and maximizing individual student participation. Although Nanette’s development might be characterized as limited because of a decrease in quantity of concerns across the semester, the addition of task and student impact concerns, coupled with lesson plans and teaching that demonstrated a focus on students, suggest positive development.

**Discussion**

Data from the participants’ essays indicated that task concerns were the most prevalent at both the beginning and the end of their practicum experience. The variety of task concerns identified was also greater than that of self or student impact concerns. This finding is consistent with research in general education that identified task-related concerns as the most prevalent among preservice teachers (Calderhead & Robson, 1991; Pigge & Marso, 1989). However, the results are somewhat inconsistent with those of Campbell and Thompson (2007), who found that preservice music teachers rated student impact concerns higher than self or task concerns. The discrepancy between the current study and Campbell and Thompson’s may be in part attributable to methodological differences. Participants in the current study described their concerns in the context of a specific practicum, and those in Campbell and Thompson’s study rated a list of generalized concerns. Whereas Campbell and Thompson’s participants may have reported idealized concerns, the concerns reported in the current study may more closely reflect the reality of music teaching.

The task-related issues cited most by the participants in the original goals essay reflected music-specific pedagogy (e.g., repertoire, conducting, instrument-specific technique). Time usage and planning emerged as important task-related issues in the reflection essay. It seems the participants entered their practicum with concerns about relatively static abilities and knowledge, whereas they realized during the course of the practicum that the use of their abilities and knowledge was more critical. Time usage and planning were also relatively high-priority task concerns found by Campbell and Thompson (2007). The self concerns most commonly cited in both essays were related to rapport and teacher personality. Motivation was the student impact
concern most commonly reported. Similar results were reported by Campbell and Thompson, who found that garnering student respect and motivating students were among the highest rated self and student impact concerns, respectively.

Overall, comparisons between the original goals essay and the reflection essay indicated a general trajectory of change consistent with Fuller and Bown’s (1975) linear model. The quantity of self concerns cited by the participants decreased, whereas the quantity of student impact concerns increased. A growth in student impact concerns was also reported by McLaughlin (1991) among student teachers in general education. However, it is important to note that the changes detected in the current study were only small in magnitude, which is consistent with research by Weinstein (1990), who found that preservice teachers’ beliefs remained unchanged across a semester. It would be informative for researchers to examine the change in preservice music teacher concerns longitudinally.

The four cases provide a more nuanced view of the development of preservice teacher concerns. Simon seemed more closely aligned with Fuller and Bown’s (1975) trajectory of increased student impact concerns, although his progression was not clear in observable teaching and task concerns were most frequent in his reflection essay. Alvin and Nanette are examples of “positive” development, albeit through increased awareness of a range of concerns and change in the specific task and student impact concerns during the course of the semester. In the case of Alvin, having a broad range of concerns is substantiated in other research on beginning teachers (DeLorenzo, 1992; Fuller & Bown, 1975). In comparison, Mandy might be an example of static growth, given her more narrow focus on task concerns and decrease in student impact concerns. Data collection across a longer period of time might reveal a shift toward increased student concerns.

Further analysis suggests that prior teaching experience might contribute to the uniqueness of some participants’ profiles. Nanette’s significant prior teaching experience may have contributed to a smaller increase in student impact concerns during the course of the semester, although her teaching and lesson plans were more student focused in comparison with her peers. In fact, Nanette and Simon might be construed as mirror images of each other, because Simon demonstrated an awareness of a variety of concerns in his writing and less variety in teaching, whereas Nanette demonstrated an awareness of a greater variety of concerns in teaching but less in her writing. This finding is supported by Berliner’s (1988) model of teacher development, in which novices build automated procedures and routines that allow for more focus on instruction and students.

The participants’ profiles do not necessarily reflect linear progress across stages. Fuller and Bown (1975) acknowledged that “whether these really are ‘stages’ or only clusters, whether they are distinct or overlapping, and whether teachers teach differently or are differentially effective in different stages, has not been established” (p. 37). McLaughlin’s (1991) research suggests that preservice teachers exhibit a variety of related concern clusters that do not necessarily change in a linear fashion. For example, concern clusters were found indicating equal distributions among all three
categories, predominantly strong concerns in one category, and predominantly strong concerns in two categories. More research is needed to understand how preservice music teacher concerns develop as well as how concerns are affected by context.

Several contextual factors may have contributed to the participants’ developmental profiles in the current study. Given that the participants were completing a second practicum experience, they had more teaching experience than Fuller’s (1969) student teachers. Therefore, they should be expected to be farther along a developmental progression. This interpretation is substantiated by the positive comments provided by some about their teaching skills and growth. These participants seemed to have gained confidence from prior experiences and tended to have less self concerns. Furthermore, both Simon and Alvin were concurrently teaching in an outreach band program. This may have contributed to their focus on conducting as a priority task concern as well as some concerns (e.g., student motivation, age and grade level) being more salient. In addition, the limited amount of teaching hours in comparison with full-time student teaching may have contributed to such beginning teacher concerns as management, rapport, and quantity of feedback from the mentor teacher identified in other research (Fuller & Bown, 1975) being less frequently cited in this study. In contrast, 1 participant expressed wanting to receive more feedback, as was the case described by Fuller and Bown (1975). Finally, it is necessary to consider the impact of varying placements on the particular concerns that emerged for each participant. For instance, Mandy’s placement in a more racially and economically diverse setting may have contributed to her having more task concerns.

The findings from this study suggest that music teacher educators might expect junior-level students with some prior practicum experience to focus their attention on task rather than self or student concerns. However, it is important to realize that one semester may not be an adequate amount of time to realize substantial shifts in concerns. Therefore, teacher educators might track changes in preservice concerns across several practicum experiences to foster development. At the same time, it is important for teacher educators to consider the impact of the teaching context on preservice teacher concerns, because preservice teacher concerns may vary substantially from one practicum experience to the next, especially when a student is placed in a setting in which he or she has little or no experience. Certainly, the use of varied sources, including written and teaching DVD assignments, can provide complementary information.

The use of a variety of data sources, coupled with a mixed-method approach to data analysis, was a unique feature of this study. Future research using this mixed-method approach is needed to help music teacher educators identify developmental trends during the course of a teacher preparation program. At the same time, by creating individual student profiles, music teacher educators will be able to account for unique trajectories based on students’ prior teaching experiences and practicum context. Finally, research that uses a similar design along with other developmental theories, especially those that originated from observed rather than self-reported concerns (as was the case for Fuller and Bown’s [1975] theory), might contribute to a better understanding of preservice music teacher development.
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