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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perception of professional music teacher identity (PMTI) among stringed instrument teachers who are alumni of the University of South Carolina String Project (USCSP) preservice teacher education program. Using a fixed mixed method design, I first surveyed all USCSP alumni from the past 20 years using the PMTI Questionnaire. For the qualitative portion of the study, the researcher interviewed three USCSP alumnae in their post-second stage of teaching (year 11–20). All USCSP alumni identified, rated, and ranked their expertise in subject matter, didactical, and pedagogical aspects. USCSP post-second stage alumnae also identified and ranked their expertise using current and past video stimulus from their preservice teaching in 1997. The results of this study indicated that experience, knowledge of oneself, adaptability within one’s contextual environment, and reflection are the main components within PMTI development across career stages. All USCSP alumni were a combination of all three aspects - subject matter, didactical, and pedagogical expertise. Their possible changes in PMTI across career stages, however, require a receptiveness to professional development and adaptability to one’s teaching environment. Results from this study also indicated that authentic context learning environments, such as the USCSP, and video stimulus as a reflection tool help mitigate attrition across inservice teaching career stages.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Dedication ................................................................................................................................. iii  

Acknowledgements .................................................................................................................. iv  

Abstract ...................................................................................................................................... v  

List of Tables .............................................................................................................................. ix  

List of Figures ............................................................................................................................ x  

List of Abbreviations ................................................................................................................ x  

Chapter 1: Introduction .......................................................................................................... 1  

  String Project Teacher Education Model .................................................................................. 3  

  Purpose of this Study .............................................................................................................. 4  

  Research Questions ............................................................................................................... 4  

Chapter 2: Review of Literature .............................................................................................. 6  

  Introduction ............................................................................................................................ 6  

  Self-Identity ........................................................................................................................... 7  

  Career Cycle .......................................................................................................................... 12  

  Professional Identity and Career Cycles ............................................................................... 15  

  Video as Stimulus ................................................................................................................... 16  

  Video Reflection within the Career Cycle ............................................................................ 17  

  Video Reflection and Self-Identity ....................................................................................... 19  

  Summary ................................................................................................................................. 19
Chapter 3: Method ........................................................................................................21
  Mixed Methods Research .......................................................................................21
  Quantitative Data Collection ..................................................................................23
  Qualitative Data Collection ...................................................................................27
  Mixed Methods Data Analysis Procedures ..............................................................32
  Researcher’s Resources and Skills .........................................................................33
  Potential Ethical Issues ...........................................................................................34
Chapter 4: Results ......................................................................................................35
  Introduction ............................................................................................................35
  PMTI Questionnaire ...............................................................................................36
  Qualitative: Interview 1 .........................................................................................48
  Qualitative: Interview 2 .........................................................................................62
  PMTI Rank Comparison between Interview 1 and Interview 2..............................86
  Focus Group ...........................................................................................................89
Chapter 5: Discussion .................................................................................................96
  Introduction ............................................................................................................96
  Professional Music Teacher Identity: A Definition ..................................................97
  Personality ..............................................................................................................98
  Musician vs. Teacher ..............................................................................................98
  PMTI Sub-Identities ...............................................................................................100
  The Importance of Experience .............................................................................110
  Evolution of USCSP ..............................................................................................114
  Implications for Preservice Authentic Context Learning ....................................116
Implications for Inservice Professional Development .................................................118
Limitations ..................................................................................................................123
Conclusions ..................................................................................................................124
References ..................................................................................................................126
Appendix A: IRB Approval Letter ..............................................................................132
Appendix B: Pilot Study Analysis of the Professional Music Teacher Identity Questionnaire ..................................................133
Appendix C: Professional Music Teacher Identity Questionnaire ...............................140
Appendix D: Interview Questions for Present and Past Video .....................................153
Appendix E: PMTI Focus Group Questions & Information .........................................155
Appendix F: PMTI Questionnaire Cover Letter ..........................................................162
Appendix G: USCSP Alumnae Cover Letter ...............................................................163
LIST OF TABLES

Table 4.1 Analytical rating of 3 PMTI aspects .................................................................38
Table 4.2 Analytical rating of 3 influential factors ..............................................................40
Table 4.3 Holistic rating for current PMTI ........................................................................41
Table 4.4 Rank order for current PMTI ..............................................................................42
Table 4.5 Generalized same or different rank comparison of PMTI .................................43
Table 4.6 Specific same or different rank comparison of PMTI ........................................44
Table 4.7 Holistic rating for beginning career PMTI ..........................................................46
Table 4.8 Rank order for beginning career PMTI ...............................................................47
Table 4.9 Interview 1: Rank order for current and beginning career PMTI .....................61
Table 4.10 Interview 2: Rank order for current and beginning career PMTI .....................87
Table B.1 Likert-scale analysis of 3 PMTI aspects ............................................................133
Table B.2 Likert-scale analysis of 3 influential factors .......................................................135
Table B.3 5-Star rating for current PMTI .........................................................................136
Table B.4 Rank order for current PMTI ............................................................................137
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 4.1 Generalized same or different rank comparison of PMTI........................................45

Figure 4.2 Specific same or different rank comparison of PMTI........................................45

Figure E.1 Demographics of post 2\textsuperscript{nd} stage (11–20 yrs.)
   PMTI Questionnaire alumni \((n = 13)\) ..................................................................................155

Figure E.2 Demographics of post 2\textsuperscript{nd} stage (11–20 yrs.)
   Video alumni \((n = 3)\) ........................................................................................................156

Figure E.3 School demographics of post 2\textsuperscript{nd} stage (11–20 yrs.)
   PMTI questionnaire alumni \((n = 13)\) ..................................................................................156

Figure E.4 School demographics of post 2\textsuperscript{nd} stage (11–20 yrs.)
   Video alumni \((n = 3)\) ........................................................................................................157
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACL................................................................. Authentic Context Learning
NSPC............................................................. National String Project Consortium
PMTI............................................................ Professional Music Teacher Identity
PTI............................................................... Professional Teacher Identity
SES............................................................... Socioeconomic Status
USC............................................................. University of South Carolina
USCSP ......................................................... University of South Carolina String Project
USCSP-PMTIQ Alumni ......................... University of South Carolina String Project-
                                      Professional Music Teacher Identity Questionnaire Alumni
USCSP-PSS Alumnae................................. University of South Carolina String Project-
                                      Post-Second Stage Alumnae
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Within the education profession, teachers have varying and continually changing perceptions of themselves as facilitators of knowledge (Beijaard, Meijer, & Verloop, 2004). For each teacher, those perceptions constitute his or her professional identities. Enveloped within professional teacher identities are “sub-identities” that interrelate and “harmonize” knowledge within a range of professional practice (Beijaard et al., 2004, p.122; Eraut, 1994).

Since the late 1980s, researchers have struggled to define the attributes of professional teacher identities (Beijaard et al., 2004). The term self-identity has implied finding meaning from the past that is continually evolving in the present (Garrett, 2013; Kerby, 1991). Conkling (2015) remarked that within the profession of music education, teachers are always in the middle of their careers, as they are actively engaged in teaching as well as in the process of evolving professionally. How teachers use knowledge acquired in the past and present is central to professional development within teacher identity (Eraut, 1994).

Inservice and preservice teachers established the most important skills and behaviors for initial teaching success; this development initiates the perceptions of professional teacher identities (Teachout, 1997). Early researchers defined effective teaching characteristics with descriptors such as personality, success, and experience, but they failed to consider the contextual teaching environment (Borich, 2000). Although
findings on effective teaching are extensive, researchers have just begun defining teaching behaviors within diverse contextual teaching environments (Borich, 2000; Conway, 2012; Eraut 1994; Teachout, 1997).

As music teachers actively engage in various types of teaching experiences, reflection on their teaching has the potential to be a powerful and necessary tool for professional development (Powell, 2016). Eraut (1994) regarded teacher-knowledge development as forming new ideas, executing new ideas, and allowing time for reflection on new ideas for continued use. Teacher-knowledge development implies an individual growth process characterized by learning from experiences, but also suggested that engaging in reflective dialogue about these experiences with colleagues was vital (Beijaard et al., 2004). Bullough and Baughman (1997) stated that “comparing and contrasting stories to what others have beheld and judged important and made explicit is a powerful source of insight into who a teacher is and into how that teacher is developing” (p. 35).

Teachers’ reflection may be facilitated by viewing video recordings of themselves. Powell (2016) found that music teachers who view recordings of themselves can detect errors more accurately than from memory. Moreover, developing self-identity through repeated analysis of teaching videos has facilitated professional development (Campbell, Thompson, & Barrett, 2012). Insight regarding self-identity may guide change and an individual's belief about the teaching profession.

Although researchers examined preservice and the beginning stages of teaching in the 20th century, until the 1990s there was much less of a focus on later stages of inservice teaching (Bullough & Baughman, 1997; Eraut, 1994; Oder, Dick, & Patry,
In music education, there has remained lack of focus on the various stages of teaching (Conway, Christensen, Garlock, Hansen, Reese, & Zerman, 2012). Campbell et al. (2012), while studying preservice and inservice teachers’ perceptions, argued that thoroughly analyzing present and past teaching experiences is necessary for music teachers' professional development. Beijaard, Verloop, and Vermunt (2000) found that "teachers’ perceptions of their professional identity affect their efficacy and professional development as well as their ability and willingness to cope with educational change and to implement innovations in their own teaching practice" (p. 750).

**String Project Teacher Education Model**

Studying music educators in varying stages of their teaching careers, with similar preservice experiences has the potential to offer insight regarding teacher-identity. Teacher education models have necessitated practical applications of professional practice for preservice teachers to establish commitment and reflective practice (Conkling, 2015). One example of that type of teacher-education model has been the University of South Carolina String Project (USCSP). The USCSP, in existence for 43 years, has provided stringed instrument instruction to approximately 300 students in the community each year, from ages 9–80. This teacher education model not only provides undergraduate and graduate students preservice teaching opportunities, but the USCSP is also the model for the National String Project Consortium String Projects (NSPC) across the United States.

Byo and Cassidy (2005) evaluated the overall influences of 13 NSPC sites; they surmised that preservice teachers received a professional and financial benefit as well as engaging in authentic teaching. They believed this authenticity gave preservice teachers a
rewarding and positive environment in which to develop teaching strategies. Although the stringed instrument teacher retention rate of USCSP graduates has been 75% over a span of a 30-year career (Barnes, 2013), preservice stringed instrument teachers may not always fully recognize the importance and the impact of the String Project experience until they have finished the program or begun their teaching careers (Barnes, 2010). With such a high teacher retention rate, this authentic teacher education model could provide a rich source of data for understanding professional music teacher identity among stringed instrument teachers.

**Purpose of this Study**

With the intent of increasing understanding of professional music teacher identity, the purpose of this fixed mixed methods study was to investigate the perception of professional music teacher identity among stringed instrument teachers who are alumni of the University of South Carolina String Project preservice teacher education program.

**Research Questions**

These were the research questions of this fixed mixed-methods study.

1) What are the self-defined professional music teacher identities of USCSP alumni?
   a. How do USCSP alumni rate the aspects (subject matter expert, didactical expert, or pedagogical expert) of their professional music teacher identities for their teaching practice?
   b. How do USCSP alumni rank the aspects of their professional music teacher identities for their teaching practice?
2) Have USCSP alumni changed their perceptions of their professional music teacher identities during their career cycles?
   a. Compared to the beginning of their teaching careers, what importance do USCSP alumni currently place on the aspects (subject matter expert, didactical expert, or pedagogical expert) of their professional music teacher identities?
   b. Compared to the beginning of their teaching careers, how do USCSP alumni currently rank the aspects of their professional music teacher identities?

3) What perceptions of professional music teacher identity do post-second stage (year 11–20) USCSP alumnae have when viewing a video stimulus of their current teaching?

4) What perceptions of professional music teacher identity do post-second stage (year 11–20) USCSP alumnae have when viewing a video stimulus of their preservice teaching?
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

In this chapter, I present a review of literature encompassing professional teacher identity (PTI) and the career cycle of teachers. I discuss PTI as

- a conceptual framework;
- the three aspects that characterize PTI;
- sub-identities that are affected by context;
- professional music teacher identities (PMTI); and
- preservice and inservice teachers’ perceptions of PTI.

I discuss career cycle as

- a theoretical framework;
- teacher career cycle models; and
- music teacher career cycle models.

After I discuss PTI and career cycle, I examine the assimilation of the two constructs.

Finally, I discuss the use of video reflection as a stimulus for noticing PTI within various stages of the career cycle.
Self-Identity

A Conceptual Framework

PTI is defined as the ongoing process of integrating the personal and professional perceptions of becoming a good teacher (Beijaard et al., 2004). In turn, teachers' perceptions of their professional identities are not fixed; their receptiveness for professional development as well as their abilities to adapt to their professional environments are an ongoing process (Beijaard et al., 2000; Beijaard et al., 2004).

Ballantyne, Kerchner, and Aróstegui (2012) stated that the teachers’ perceptions of PTI may differ from their actual skills and abilities. An indicator of teachers' PTI, however, is self-efficacy which is defined by self-image and self-esteem (Canrinus, Helms-Lorenz, Beijaard, Buitink, & Hofman, 2011b).

Beijaard et al. (2004) categorized 22 research studies that specifically addressed PTI. The three categories included (a) teacher professional identity formation, (b) identification of characteristics of teachers' professional identity as perceived by teachers' themselves, and (c) professional identity represented by teachers’ told and written stories (p. 109). Overall, researchers who focused on PTI used descriptive measures to enrich the field. Beijaard et al.’s (2004) comparison of these studies provided evidence, however, that many of the researchers’ objectives were not aligned, and they did not provide a clear definition of PTI.

In music education, several researchers have studied professional music teacher identity (PMTI). Austin, Isbell, and Russell (2012) explored undergraduate music students’ secondary socialization aspects within development of professional identity. They found that (a) studio teachers, (b) parents, (c) school environment, and (d) degree
program effect music identity development. Within authentic context learning, Goldie (2013) and Haston and Russell (2012) discussed the influence of preservice teachers' teaching experiences to that of music teacher identity. Goldie (2013) concluded that preservice music teachers who participated in long-term (more than two years) authentic teaching, developed strong self-efficacy within PMTI. Similarly, Haston and Russell (2012) found that preservice teachers further develop their PMTI within authentic preservice teacher environments. They experience (a) confidence in self, (b) stresses of becoming a teacher, and (c) responsibility or ownership of teaching experiences.

Ballantyne et al. (2012) analyzed preservice music teachers' perceptions of PMTI in the United States, Spain, and Australia. Authentic preservice teaching experiences affected their PMTI, but Ballantyne et al. (2012) also surmised that the roles between musician and teacher were developed during their preservice teaching years.

Isbell (2008), Russell (2012), and Natale-Abramo (2014) also discussed professional identity between musician and teacher. Isbell (2008) categorized PMTI into three constructs (a) musician-identity, (b) self-perceived teacher identity, and (c) teacher identity as inferred by others. For inservice teachers, Natale-Abramo (2014) discussed common themes that form PMTI which include (a) pedagogical beliefs, (b) the perceived lack of importance of music in the curriculum, (c) demographics of the community, and (d) gender biases. Within a study regarding inservice music teacher short and long-term career paths, Russell (2009) found implications for how teaching environments and the overall perceived importance of music programs within a community, affect music teachers’ decisions to stay, move, or leave the profession. For both inservice and preservice music educators, Campbell et al. (2012) considered a conceptual framework to
maintain and encourage self-identity. Few researchers have examined how PMTI may change across the career cycle.

Three Aspects of Professional Teacher Identity

Beijaard et al. (2000) looked at aspects of teacher identity regarding subject matter, didactical, and pedagogical expertise and offered the following definitions of these three aspects of teacher identity:

- a subject matter expert [emphasis added] is a teacher who bases his/her profession on subject matter knowledge and skills;
- a didactical expert [emphasis added] is a teacher who bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills regarding planning, execution, and evaluation of teaching and learning processes; and
- a pedagogical expert [emphasis added] is a teacher who bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills to support students' social, emotional, and moral development (p. 754).

Beijaard et al. (2000) found that subject matter experts perceived that without full knowledge of one's subject the teacher cannot be effective, nor will the students perceive them as effective. A didactical expert is a facilitator of knowledge and finds lesson planning a necessity. Pedagogical experts, on the other hand, focused on the ethical and moral aspects of teaching. Overall, Beijaard et al. (2000) and Canrinus et al. (2011b) confirmed most teachers are a combination of all three aspects. Teachers’ independence along with professional development define the profession even though they perceive different levels within the three aspects of PTI. Mishler (1999) identified this combination of PTI aspects as "a chorus of voices, not just as the tenor or soprano
soloist" and implied that the better the relationship of the aspects, the better the "chorus of voices sounds" (p. 8).

Sub-Identities

The teaching environment within a school or classroom contains multiple facets, or contexts, that convey sub-identities of PTI (Beijaard et al., 2000; Natale-Abramo, 2014). Cooper and Olson (1996) suggested influences on PTI include (a) historical, (b) sociological, (c) psychological, and (d) cultural factors. In teacher education programs, the role of the educator has been seen as a facilitator of his or her student learning environment (Campbell et al., 2012). With experience, inservice teachers’ perceptions of their school environment may improve (Conway et al., 2012). Thus, teachers’ PTI is continuously influenced by their contextual environment (Canrinus, Helms-Lorenz, Beijaard, Buitink, & Hofman, 2011a).

Professional Music Teacher Identity

Researchers who have examined professional music teacher identity (PMTI) do not concur on a definition of the term (Beijaard et al., 2004; Haston & Russell, 2012). Music teachers not only have defined themselves as teachers, but also musicians. Combining these two professions may not be perceived as equal within professional identity development (Natale-Abramo, 2014; Russell, 2012). Such dedication to one’s art form has been one of the reasons why musicians choose to become teachers (Cooper & Olson, 1996). Ballantyne (2005) suggested that perceived success as an able musician affects PMTI. Russell (2012) found preservice music educators perceived themselves as musicians based on others' perceptions; inservice music teachers, however, perceived themselves as teachers first. Ballantyne et al. (2012) discussed the identity between
musician and teacher as fluid based on contextual situations; professional skills required for one class may require more of a musician identity or teacher identity. Preservice teachers, conversely, found this fluidity of identity as a source of tension; they believed they must assume only one of the roles (Ballantyne et al., 2012).

In addition to being a musician and educator, music teachers have multiple sub-identities. Russell (2012) included a "holistic identity concept" of professional roles for music educators that included being an (a) educator, (b) ensemble leader, (c) creative businessperson, (d) entertainer, (e) internal musician, and (f) external musician (p. 156–157). In a "multi-dimensional model," Bouuij (1998) identified music educators as (a) all-around musician, (b) pupil-centered teacher, (c) performer, and (d) content-centered teacher (p. 25). It is evident that there are multiple sub-identities of PMTI, but the changes from preservice experiences to inservice experiences is not clear.

**Preservice Experiences: Authentic Context Learning**

Campbell et al. (2012) discussed how encouraging preservice teachers’ development of PTI enabled them to become lifelong learners. Preservice music teachers stated that "factual knowledge was secondary to field experiences" and a shift from knowledge receiver to purveyor occurred during authentic context experiences (Ballantyne et al., 2012, p. 217). Preservice teachers’ authentic context learning (ACL) experiences has been beneficial to identity development (Haston & Russell, 2012). Ballantyne et al. (2012) suggested that authentic experience for preservice music educators positively affects their PMTI development regarding their effectiveness in various contextual teaching environments. Furthermore, preservice teacher ACL experiences helped implement subject matter obtained in coursework, thus harmonizing
musician and teaching pedagogies. Ballantyne et al. (2012) stated that preservice teachers regarded these experiences as positive to further develop their PMTI. Haston and Russell (2012) also implied that preservice teachers in an ACL environment gained confidence and a sense of responsibility for student learning. Stress about becoming a music teacher was also a factor, but over time, confidence regarding becoming a music teacher increased (Haston & Russell, 2012). One effective ACL model that not only incorporates various teaching contexts and environments, and may also promote PMTI development, has been the String Project (Ferguson, 2003).

**Inservice Stages**

As preservice teachers gain a sense of responsibility and confidence in teaching through ACL experiences, inservice teaching PTI may evolve at various points of time within varied contextual experiences and teaching environments (Pillen, Beijaard, & den Brok, 2013). Pillen et al. (2013) suggested that the first few years of teaching fosters the development and proficiency for developing PTI. On the other hand, Canrinus et al. (2011b) found that teachers’ perceptions of PTI were similar from first stage to final stages of teaching but suggests that longitudinal research is needed to determine the "stability" of the three aspects throughout the career cycle as well as research through a "more development-oriented lens" (p. 128). More educators should benefit from studying cultivation of PTI aspects throughout their careers (Thompson & Campbell, 2010).

**Career Cycle**

**Theoretical Frameworks**

Prior to 1975, the teacher career cycle was categorized in two stages, preservice and inservice (Eros, 2009). Cochran (1975) suggested that the two stages become a
"continuum" or "closed-loop process" (p. 6). Developmentally, Fuller and Bown (1975) theorized about three stages of teacher development, while other researchers considered the teaching career model as a life cycle (Steffy, Wolfe, Pasch, & Enz, 2000) or career cycle (Fessler & Christensen, 1992). Steffy et al. (2000) developed a six-stage model within the “life cycle” that included (a) novice teacher, (b) apprentice teacher, (c) professional teacher, (d) expert teacher, (e) distinguished teacher, and (f) emeritus teacher. Fessler and Christensen (1992) categorized the teacher "career cycle" in eight phases that include (a) preservice, (b) induction, (c) competency building, (d) enthusiastic/growing, (e) career frustration, (f) career stability, (g) career wind down, and (h) career exit (p. 36).

Specific to music teachers, Baker (2005) constructed five phases of music teaching career cycle that included

- Phase 1, age 21–25;
- Phase 2, age 26–35;
- Phase 3, age 36–42;
- Phase 4, age 43–53;
- Phase 5, 54–and beyond (p. 265).

Eros (2013) categorized the career cycle of music teaching in three stages. The first stage included preservice and the first few years of teaching (years 0–5). The second-stage included approximately years 6–10 and Eros characterized them as no longer in “survival mode” (Eros, 2013, p. 63). Conway and Eros (2016) suggested the “specific topic of post-second stage teachers has not been addressed;” they believed this stage occurs approximately within years 11–20 (p. 10).
Whether informal or formal, teachers live through a variety of experiences and contextual influences that affect them over time (Caninus et al., 2011b; Hoekstra, Brekelmans, Beijaard, & Korthagen, 2009). Hoekstra et al. (2009) suggested that "lifelong learning is becoming the standard," therefore, understanding the cyclical process of teaching is important and necessary (p. 663).

**Teacher Career Cycle**

Fessler and Christensen (1992) established a career cycle with eight cyclical phases that are "dynamic and flexible, rather than static and fixed" (p. 25). Furthermore, it is a framework for policy reform that is based on personal and organizational environmental factors. The career stages are:

- **Preservice**– period of preparation,
- **Induction**– first few years of employment,
- **Competency building**– improve teaching skills and abilities,
- **Enthusiastic and growing**– high level of competence that involves enrichment,
- **Career frustration**– job satisfaction is waning,
- **Stability**– stagnant or plateaued teachers,
- **Career wind-down**– preparation to leave the profession, and
- **Career exit**– teacher leaves the job (p. 40–42).

The contextual aspects in the teachers' environment promote an "ebb and flow" (p. 42) of the career cycle.
Music Teacher Career Cycle

Few music education researchers have focused on multiple stages of the career cycle (Campbell & Thompson, 2007; Eros, 2013; Goldie, 2013). While researchers have studied first stage music teachers (Conway, Hibbard, & Rawlings, 2015), and second stage music teachers (Conkling & Eros, 2016; Eros, 2009, 2013), there are no studies regarding post-second stage teaching (Conway & Eros, 2016). Hancock (2016) indicated, from the 2003–2005 national music teacher status report, that 80% of all music teachers continued to teach in their school, while 10.9% moved to other schools, and 9.1% left the teaching profession (p. 429). Professional growth or stagnation may occur throughout a teacher's career, but efforts to capture this development has become necessary to reflect upon lifelong learning and to mitigate attrition.

Professional Identity and Career Cycle Stages

When do the changes in professional identity occur? Canrinus et al. (2011b) discussed the difficulty of answering such a question due to the processing of professional identity. The action of processing is influenced by development, construction, and shaping of identity (p. 128). With various experiences and different contextual influences, teachers' perceptions of PTI change over time (Canrinus et al., 2011b). Beijaard et al. (2000) discovered that teachers perceived that 69% of PTI changed throughout the career cycle. PTI may transform when teachers change schools. Policy reform could also influence teachers’ PTI (Canrinus et al., 2011a). Thus, it is imperative to study the impact of PTI looking at past preservice and present inservice teachers’ career cycles (Canrinus et al., 2011a; Thompson & Campbell, 2010).
**Video as Stimulus**

Video recording has been a popular and effective stimulus for teacher reflection. Only in the past decade, however, have researchers published studies involving video as a stimulus for teacher reflection (Tripp & Rich, 2012). From an analytical standpoint, both inservice and preservice teachers detected errors more accurately with video (Brophy, 2004; Powell, 2016). Overall, video recording has become a powerful resource that has enriched multimedia professional development opportunities (Brophy, 2004; Kurz, Llama, & Savenye, 2008; Tripp & Rich, 2012).

LeFevre (2004) cautioned that video is not a curriculum, it is a valuable stimulus that teachers can use to guide theory into practice. Multiple researchers stated that the reflective use of video stimulus in teacher education is a way to bridge the perceived gap between theory and practice (Beck, King, & Marshall, 2002; Brophy, 2004; Hewitt, Pedretti, Bencze, Vaillancourt, & Yoon, 2003). Newhouse, Lane, and Brown (2007) warned that it is "unlikely that merely viewing a video of a teacher and class in action will lead to significant impact on teaching capability" (p. 53). Rather, teachers’ video reflection has had a purpose of enhancing one’s teaching by creating specific goals within the observation (Newhouse et al., 2007). Beck et al. (2002) further implied that bridging the gap between theory and practice helps apply theoretical, conceptual, and pedagogical knowledge regarding applications for teacher education. Video stimulus has helped relay the various complexities of the classroom environment from many perspectives. Interpretation or reflection has aided preservice and inservice teachers in understanding, assimilating, and changing their contextual circumstances.
Researchers implied that video reflection within the authentic context of teaching is vital (Beck et al., 2002; Powell, 2016). Teachers used video-tape as a stimulus for self-evaluation of teaching (Capizzi, Wehby, & Sandmel, 2010). Beck et al. (2002) stated that the use of video develops detailed mental representations for authenticity, dual coding, and interpretation.

Researchers define authentic video footage as

- cues,
- stimuli,
- topics for discussion, and

Tobin et al. (2009) used the approach of “multivocal diachronic ethnography” to focus on the use of video stimulus across time and cultures (p. 21). The multivocal diachronic ethnography approach allowed for “joy of catching a glimpse of oneself in the midst of practice and of getting to relive and ponder fleeting moments from the daily life” (Tobin & Hsueh, 2007, p. 91). Using video as stimulus allowed teachers to watch footage as a “non-verbal question” that stimulates a personal response and “critical reflection” from the viewer (Tobin & Hsueh, 2007, p. 78–9).

**Video Reflection within the Career Cycle**

**Preservice Teachers**

Video reflection has greatly affected the curriculum and methods of preservice teacher education, thus connecting theory into practice (Hewitt et al., 2003; Newhouse et al., 2007). It has been a vital link between knowledge and practice and a means for (a) self-
evaluation, (b) teacher effectiveness, (c) personal identity, (d) task orientation, and (e) student focus (Calandra, Gurvitch, & Lund, 2008; Capizzi et al., 2010; Newhouse et al., 2007). Capizzi et al. (2010) found that video stimulus offered an opportunity to observe and evaluate preservice teachers in a situational context apart from observing in a live setting. Powell (2016) noted that video reflection for preservice teachers is more task oriented; there was less reflection of self and students. Preservice teachers have been encouraged by their supervisors to self-evaluate and self-reflect on the positive and negative outcomes after initial teaching experiences. This self-reflection and evaluation encouraged transferability as they enter inservice teaching (Capizzi et al. 2010).

**Inservice Teachers**

Few researchers have studied the video reflection practices of inservice teachers, regardless of research on preservice teachers’ video reflection. Definitively, researchers, surmised that video reflections can capture and authenticate the complexity of the classroom environment (Kurz et al. 2008). Monroe-Baillargeon (2002) further indicated that simultaneous events captured on video offer multiple perspectives that affect instructional decisions. Giving inservice teachers the opportunity to carefully observe, evaluate, and reflect on themselves or other effective teachers, has had the potential to establish collaborative professional development partnerships, but also meaningful reflections (Newhouse et al., 2007). Van den Bergh, Ros, and Beijaard (2015) asserted that regardless of developing teachers' own knowledge and practices, a variety of feedback for inservice teachers is vital for professional development. Many researchers and teacher educators have believed in the fundamental importance of inservice teacher reflection, but researchers have not conducted empirical studies on the impact of video
reflection as a tool for professional growth. Teachers who have reflected on their past and present professional practices could affect future professional practices (Brophy, 2004).

**Video Reflection and Self-identity**

Campbell et al. (2012) argued it is necessary for teachers to thoroughly analyze both present and past teaching experiences to "begin to conceptualize for themselves the complexity of teaching as well as explicitly ‘own’ their personal development as future music educators” (p. 76). Overall, self-identity and repeated analysis of teaching video stimulus allows teachers insight as a learner (Campbell et al., 2012). This orientation of self-identity has guided change, but also beliefs of the teaching profession.

**Summary**

In this chapter, my purpose was to discuss a review of literature for professional teacher identity (PTI), career cycle of teachers, and video stimulus as a reflection tool. Examining the synthesis of PTI within multiple career cycles while using video reflection as a tool could offer insights regarding PMTI.

There are multiple researchers that studied PTI, but not all are aligned to provide a clear definition for PTI. For the purpose of this study, I defined PTI as teachers’ self-image and professional perceptions of becoming a good teacher within the ongoing process of adapting to various contextual environments (Beijaard et al., 2000; Beijaard et al., 2004; Ballantyne et al., 2012; Canrinus et al., 2011b). In music education, some researchers have studied PMTI. Many researchers focused on musician identity versus music teacher identity. There is, however, a lack of research to help define PMTI, especially within the context of inservice teachers throughout their teaching career.
Within the career cycle of teachers, I discussed several researchers' concept of a life cycle or career cycle. Since few music education researchers addressed the music career cycle, I used Eros’ three stages for this study. Focusing on multiple stages of music teachers’ careers could provide insight on perceived changes in PMTI.

Using video as stimulus is a powerful resource for professional development (Brophy, 2004; Kurz, Llama, & Savenye, 2008; Tripp & Rich, 2012). Video reflection allows preservice and inservice teachers an opportunity to self-reflect and evaluate, thus helping to develop PMTI. Researchers, however, have yet to study the relationship of video reflection to self-identity of teachers.
CHAPTER 3

METHOD

Mixed Methods Research

The purpose of this fixed mixed methods study was to investigate the perceptions of professional music teacher identity (PMTI) among stringed instrument teachers who are alumni of the University of South Carolina String Project (USCSP) preservice teacher education program (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). Mixed methods research is:

- a research design with philosophical assumptions as well as methods of inquiry.
- As a methodology, it involves philosophical assumptions that guide the direction of the collection and analysis of data and the mixture of quantitative and qualitative approaches. . . . As a method, if focuses on collecting, analyzing, and mixing both quantitative and qualitative data in a single study. . . . Its central premise is that the use of quantitative and qualitative approaches in combination provides a better understanding of research problems than either approach alone (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007, p. 5).

Creswell & Plano Clark (2018) stated that using an explanatory sequential design has two “distinct interactive phases” (p. 65) which starts with quantitative data and is followed by the qualitative data which further illuminate the quantitative results. The qualitative results “shed light on why the quantitative results occurred and how they might be explained (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018, p. 77).
I have used both quantitative and qualitative methods to best answer the research questions using a purposefully-selected subset of participants for the qualitative stage of data analysis (Creswell, 2003; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). For the quantitative portion, I surveyed generalized aspects of professional music teacher identity over all career cycles with USCSP alumni. For the qualitative portion, I focused on post-second stage career cycle (year 11–20) cases regarding perceptions of PMTI. Creswell (2003) suggested that using a mixed method design can “neutralize or cancel the biases” in using only one method (p. 15).

I sought evidence for how stringed instrument music educators perceived their PMTI by rating and ranking their excellence as:

- a subject matter expert [emphasis added] is a teacher who bases his/her profession on subject matter knowledge and skills;
- a didactical expert [emphasis added] is a teacher who bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills regarding planning, execution, and evaluation of teaching and learning processes; and
- a pedagogical expert [emphasis added] is a teacher who bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills to support students' social, emotional, and moral development (Beijaard et al., 2000, p. 754).

I compared the results from teachers in three music career cycle stages which included (a) years 0–4, the first stage, (b) years 5–10, the second-stage, and (c) years 11–20, the post-second stage (Conway & Eros, 2016; Eros, 2013).
Quantitative Data Collection

Participants

The alumni in the quantitative section of this study included all preservice teachers from the University of South Carolina String Project (USCSP) who graduated between 1997 and 2016, were currently teaching music, and were willing to participate in this study. I sent the survey to 90 alumni in the database, but only 59 alumni were currently teaching music or taught for less than 20 years. I used reward incentives, in the form of a $25 Amazon gift card, to encourage alumni to respond to the questionnaire.

A total of 42 USCSP alumni responded to the questionnaire (71%). Nine alumni were excluded from the study because they did not complete all the questions or because they indicated more than 20 years of teaching experience. The total number of USCSP-Professional Music Teacher Identity Questionnaire (PMTIQ) alumni was 33. Thus, the final response rate was 56%. Twenty-six alumni were females. Seven were males, with an average age of 32 (range 22–45 years). Nine alumni were in their first stage of teaching (0–5 years), 11 alumni were in the second stage of teaching (6–10 years), and 13 alumni were in the post-second stage (11–20 years) of teaching. USCSP-PMTIQ had an average of 8.97 years of teaching experience (range 1–19 years). Regarding their education, 45% obtained a master’s degree, 18% obtained a master’s+30 degree, and 3% obtained a doctorate.

Instrument: Questionnaire

USCSP-PMTIQ alumni responded to a questionnaire translated and revised from Beijaard et al. (2000) survey. Beijaard et al.’s sent their questionnaire to teachers with four or more years of experience in varying subject areas at twelve secondary schools in
the Netherlands (p. 755). They sought to rate, justify, and narrate the aspects of professional teacher identity (PTI) using a questionnaire, in four sections (p. 754–5). The authors believed that the three aspects of PTI included being a subject matter expert, a didactical expert, and a pedagogical expert. They also stated that biographical, contextual, and experiential factors influenced the aspects of PTI. After answering demographic questions, the participants rated, justified, and narrated their perspectives of the three aspects for their current teaching as well as for their teaching at the beginning of their career. Participants then answered 18 Likert-scale questions that compared the three PTI aspects to their rating in the previous section. Finally, the participants answered 24 Likert-scale questions that compared influential factors to their perspectives of PTI. Using an item-total reliability test, Beijaard et al. (2000) found the three aspects and influential factors of PTI as acceptable (p. 755).

**PMTI Questionnaire: Pilot Study**

After I translated the questionnaire and adjusted for wording, I formatted it within SurveyMonkey (an online survey tool). Before administering the PMTI Questionnaire pilot study, I conducted an interview with a USCSP alumna using the PMTI Questionnaire. I strengthened the wording and restructured the section order based on feedback from my advisor, USCSP alumna, and students in a graduate research class at USC.

The participants in the pilot study were stringed instrument teachers from Nevada and Virginia (N = 18). After obtaining approval from fine arts coordinators in each district, I distributed the PMTI Questionnaire via email. Participants had two weeks to answer the questionnaire.
The structure of the pilot PMTI Questionnaire included four sections:

- **Section 1** - 16 demographic items;
- **Section 2** - 18 Likert-scale questions in which participants analytically compared the three PMTI aspects (subject matter expert, didactical expert, or pedagogical expert);
- **Section 3** - 28 Likert-scale questions in which participants analytically compared the three influential factors (contextual, environmental, or biographical); and
- **Section 4** - 19 items in which participants rated, ranked, and justified current and beginning of career PMTI.

In Section 2, I asked participants to indicate to what extent the statements applied to themselves as a teacher/music educator for the three PMTI aspects. Response options on the four-point scale included the following anchors: 1 (never), 2 (sometimes), 3 (often), and 4 (always). In Section 3, I asked participants to what extent they agreed with influential factors about their job. Response options on the four-point scale included the following anchors: 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (somewhat disagree), 3 (somewhat agree), and 4 (strongly agree).

In Section 4, I asked participants to rate and rank their expertise regarding the three PMTI aspects for their current music teaching. I included the definitions of the three aspects. First, I asked the participants to rate holistically using a 5-point rating scale, the three aspects of their PMTI. The more stars the participants marked, the higher the rating for each aspect. Next, I asked participants to configure the three aspects in rank order, from most to least important. After each participant rated holistically and ranked his or
her perceived PMTI for their current teaching, I asked each participant to justify his or her answers. Lastly, I asked each participant to state if their teaching was the same or different from the beginning of his or her teaching career to his or her current stage. If participants marked different, then they were asked to rate holistically and rank their perceived PMTI at the beginning of their career and justify the differences. To conclude the questionnaire, all participants provided a narrative regarding the most important thing they had learned throughout their career regarding being a subject matter expert, a didactical expert, and a pedagogical expert.

After analyzing the pilot study, I wished to establish content validity; I asked three university music education professors, as expert judges, to analyze the statements in section two and three of the PMTI Questionnaire. I provided those expert judges with definitions of the three PMTI aspects and the three influential factors. Based on the definitions, the judges assigned an aspect or influential factor to each statement. For section two, I reworded four questions and changed the aspect selection, based on the judges’ analysis, for four questions to increase reliability and content validity. For section three, I reworded three questions, deleted one question to have an equal number of influential factors, and changed the aspect selection, based on the judges’ analysis, for two questions to increase reliability and content validity. I provided an analysis of the PMTI Questionnaire pilot study in Appendix B.

**PMTI Questionnaire: Current Study**

In the revised questionnaire, there were also four sections. In section two there were six subject matter and pedagogical aspects, but only five didactical aspects. I deleted one of the didactical items because of problematic wording. I altered the third
section so that there are nine items for each of the environmental influences (a) contextual, (b) experiential, and (c) biographical. I also modified the last section of the PMTI questionnaire for the target population so that all USCSP-PMTIQ alumni rated holistically and ranked current and past teaching. In Appendix C, I provided the PMTI Questionnaire, formatted from SurveyMonkey. I also indicated, in Section 2 and 3 of Appendix C, the aspect or influential factor for each question.

After I received IRB approval (Appendix A) for this study, I distributed the PMTI Questionnaire link via email and the USCSP alumni Facebook page. I allowed alumni three weeks to take the survey. After 10 and 14 days from distribution, I sent an email reminder regarding the reward incentive, a $25 Amazon gift card. After three weeks, I still wanted a higher response rate, so I extended the deadline two more weeks. A total of 42 USCSP alumni responded to the questionnaire (71%), however, nine alumni were excluded from the study because they did not complete all the questions or because they indicated more than 20 years of teaching experience. The total number of USCSP-PMTIQ alumni was 33 (56%). Once the response rate was higher than 50%, I closed the survey, distributed the incentive, and began to analyze the data.

**Qualitative Data Collection**

**Participants**

The second part of this study was a phenomenological examination of USCSP post-second stage (year 11–20) career stringed instrument teachers’ professional identity in the present and past using current and past teaching video stimulus (Creswell, 2003). The post-second stage alumni were chosen based on a collection of past video recordings from Barnes’ (1998) research study. Barnes recorded 18 USCSP preservice teachers
while teaching group classes or private lessons. I chose to focus on six alumni teaching group lessons since the current teaching video would take place in a string orchestra classroom environment. I purposefully selected three of the six alumni using the following criteria: (a) all had similar preservice teaching experience at the USCSP, (b) all had similar current career cycle stage as stringed instrument music teachers, (c) all had master's degrees, (d) all were female, and (e) all were middle school teachers. The names of these alumni, changed to protect confidentiality, are Caroline, Megan, and Polly. For concision, I will refer to them collectively as University of South Carolina String Project-Post-second stage (USCSP-PSS) alumnae.

**Instrument: Video as Stimulus**

For current video stimuli, I asked the University of South Carolina String Project-Post second stage (USCSP-PSS) alumnae (N = 3) to produce a 15-minute video that exemplified their current teaching. Each elected to record a middle school class of students during the first few weeks of the 2017 school year. Although I asked for a 15-minute current video of their classroom teaching, USCSP-PSS alumnae provided longer video stimuli. Each deviated slightly from this and the videos ranged from 21–34 minutes. Barnes (1998) recorded the past videos of the alumnae at the USCSP at three points during the 1997–98 academic year. For past video stimuli, I used Barnes’ (1998) first recording from the 1997 academic year (fall). The alumnae’s past video was an average of 12 minutes long.

Brophy (2004) stated that some researchers allow alumni to video more than one time before an interview to allow them to “have clearer memories of, and less need to negotiate about, what is shown on the video” (Brophy, 2004, p. 297). Tripp and Rush
(2012) found that within teacher video reflection, discussions with another person were regarded as an “essential aspect of the reflection process” (p. 683). USCSP-PSS alumnæ in the current study had the opportunity to watch their current and past video stimulus before reflecting on the stimulus. After the initial watching of the current or past video stimulus, USCSP-PSS alumnæ reflected and provided a narrative on their video with the researcher present.

**Qualitative: Pilot Study**

To gain insight into the phenomenological process, I began by verbally administering the PMTI Questionnaire to a USCSP alumna with four years of teaching experience. I found that verbally administering the questionnaire allowed the alumna to reflect on personal aspects of her teaching within each question and provided rich data regarding teaching experiences and professional identity. To maintain consistency, I interviewed the same USCSP alumna to refine the second set of interview questions for the current and past video stimulus. This alumna not only had current teaching video from 2017, but also USCSP preservice teaching video from 2011. The alumna first viewed the current video and then watched the past video. After each video viewing, the alumna answered questions regarding the three aspects of PMTI. After watching both videos, the alumna reflected on how her PMTI had changed over time and also discussed what was not shown in the video. This pilot study allowed me to construct questions for pertinent data regarding the three aspects of PMTI. I changed and added some questions to the current study based on these pilot interviews. Overall, the alumna indicated that it was “good to self-reflect and pause in a way.” Her reflection provided professional
development through positive reassurance and a boost to her esteem regarding her teaching.

**Data Collection: Interviews**

I conducted two interviews with USCSP-PSS alumnai. In the first interview, I used FaceTime and captured the narrative via Screencast-O-Matic (Version 2.0). I administered the PMTI Questionnaire (Appendix C) translated and revised from Beijaard et al.’s (2000) study on professional teacher identity. I used the PMTI Questionnaire as a narrative tool for alumnae to self-identify their analytical and holistic ratings as well as ranking the three aspects of their professional music teaching.

For the second interview, I conducted a structured open-ended interview, in person, with each USCSP-PSS alumna using current and past video stimulus. We first watched the current teaching video to describe and analyze the subject matter, pedagogical matter, and didactical matter that exemplifies their teaching. After we watched the current video, I asked each USCSP-PSS alumna to describe what she saw regarding subject matter, didactical, and pedagogical aspects. I then asked each to describe her strengths and weaknesses in the video regarding those three aspects in addition to any other influences each noticed. I also asked each USCSP-PSS alumna if they felt the video was a good representation of how they perceived themselves as a teacher and if there was anything missing that could also represent their PMTI. Finally, I asked each to rank their PMTI based on the current video stimulus. With each participant and I discussed this ranking versus the ranking from the PMTI Questionnaire in the first interview. I also asked them to consider if the video was an accurate representation of their perceived PMTI.
After conducting narrative inquiry on the current video stimulus with each participant, each participant and I watched past video stimulus from the fall of 1997, respectively. Each USCSP-PSS alumna described and analyzed the subject matter, pedagogical matter, and didactical matter from the past video stimulus using the same series of questions. With each I also asked six questions regarding both current and past video stimulus. For the first two questions I asked each USCSP-PSS alumna to describe similarities and differences in the present and past video. I then asked each, based on the video, if she thought their PMTI had evolved. Individually, alumna then discussed the influence of video stimulus regarding professional development and PMTI. Finally, I asked each alumna if she had developed or changed their PMTI based on watching present and past video. I provided the questions for the current and past video stimulus (Interview 2) in Appendix D. I uploaded the shared videos via secured cloud servers. I used Screencast-O-Matic (Version 2.0) on my MacBook and a video recorder to record each interview. I also took notes of the interviews. I used a MacBook for us to watch the current and past video.

**Data Collection: Focus Group**

The last component of the qualitative portion was a focus group with USCSP-PSS alumnae via Google Hangout and captured via Screencast-O-Matic (Version 2.0). I based the focus group structure on data analysis from the quantitative and qualitative portions of this study. Alumnae discussed the generalized overall aspects of professional teacher identity from the statistical analysis of the questionnaire and related it to their perceived changes of PMTI as seen in the video stimulus. I provide the focus group discussion questions in Appendix E.
Mixed Methods Data Analysis Procedures

PMTI Questionnaire

For the close-ended statements of the PMTI Questionnaire, I analyzed the data using descriptive and inferential statistics. I used the statistics software SPSS (Version 24). I used nonparametric analyses that included (a) Spearman-Brown split-half reliability coefficient for correlations, (b) Guttman split-half reliability for internal consistency, (c) Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA, and (d) Chi square to compare group frequencies. For the open-ended statements on the questionnaire, I analyzed the data using exploratory methods of provisional coding and NVivo software (Version 11.4.3), qualitative data analysis software.

Interviews and Focus Group

Once I interviewed each USCSP-PSS alumna, I transcribed the recordings using NVivo software (Version 11.4.3). For the first and second interview, I used exploratory and affective methods of coding to analyze the narrative. Using multiple methods of coding, known as an eclectic coding, will “synthesize the variety and number of codes into a more unified scheme (Saldaña, 2016, p. 293). After I transcribed each interview, I asked each alumna to member check and verify the narrative from Interview 1 and 2. Once they verified the narrative, I continued to code for theoretical conclusions. After I had a written analysis of theoretical conclusions I sent the qualitative section of Chapter 4 to each alumna. Megan found the wording of one section as misleading and clarified her wording. I edited this section based on her clarification.

I coded the second interview separately for each USCSP-PSS alumna’s current and past video using the following nodes (a) didactical aspect, (b) pedagogical aspect, (c)
subject matter aspect, (d) video stimulus, and (e) ranking. For the past video, I also included beginning teaching reflection as a node since USCSP-PSS alumnae were reflecting on video stimulus from the fall of 1997. After coding the current and past video narratives for each alumna, I found themes based on the coded nodes from the subject matter, pedagogical, and didactical aspects. I used a separate set of nodes for perceived changes in PMTI that included (a) differences from past to present, (b) evolution, (c) professional development, (d) reflection, and (e) similarities from past to present.

The narrative from USCSP-PSS alumnae in the focus group allowed me to compare the quantitative and qualitative data. The alumnae verified thematic material from the interviews and discussed results from USCSP-PMTIQ alumni’s quantitative data.

**Mixed Method Comparisons**

Using an explanatory sequential design, I was able to provide further perspectives from the quantitative data regarding PMTI between career stages. PSS-alumnae’s narrative from the questionnaire, interviews, and the focus group further allowed for focused conceptualization of PMTI among USCSP alumni between all music career cycle stages. The focus, however, was on the post second stage of music career cycle due to the past and present video stimulus.

**Researcher’s Resources and Skills**

I am a 2001 undergraduate alumna of the USCSP. I found incredible value in the authenticity of preservice teaching experiences that the USCSP provided. Without this experience, I would not have become the teacher I am today. My preservice teaching
experiences influenced my professional identity as a teacher. My preservice teaching experiences were among the most influential for my PMTI.

I am also a post-second stage stringed instrument teacher who taught orchestra for 11 years in a secondary school with over 300 orchestra students in a diverse school in Northern Virginia. Within this experience, I grew professionally as an educator and musician, but also maintained the foundations and fundamentals that I learned as a preservice teacher.

**Potential Ethical Issues**

I had a long-term association with some of the USCSP-PSS alumnae because we were in our undergraduate programs at the same time. Our personal experiences and personal lives may not be analogous, but we all started from similar professional experiences in preservice teaching. Our later professional experiences may not be the same either, but I had a working understanding of the USCSP authentic context model. My experience teaching in the public schools helped me relate to the alumnae in their current situations and helped guide interview questions that related to the present and the past. I have changed in my PMTI, but my identity is not the same as all USCSP alumni. We can each be unique, but also share commonalities.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Introduction

Using a fixed mixed method model, I found generalized perceptions of the University of South Carolina String Project (USCSP) alumni’s professional music teacher identity (PMTI) over a career cycle using the PMTI Questionnaire (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2018). I subsequently followed with the qualitative portion in which I focused on USCSP-post-second stage (year 11–20) career cases. USCSP alumni analytically and holistically rated and ranked their perceived PMTI as:

- a *subject matter expert* [emphasis added] is a teacher who bases his/her profession on subject matter knowledge and skills;
- a *didactical expert* [emphasis added] is a teacher who bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills regarding planning, execution, and evaluation of teaching and learning processes; and
- a *pedagogical expert* [emphasis added] is a teacher who bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills to support students' social, emotional, and moral development (Beijaard et al., 2000, p. 754).
I compared the results of the PMTI Questionnaire with the three music career cycle stages which included (a) years 0–4, the first stage, (b) years 5–10, the second-stage, and (c) years 11–20, the post-second stage (Conway & Eros, 2016; Eros, 2013).

**Research Question 1: What are the self-defined professional music teacher identities of USC String Project alumni?**

**PMTI Questionnaire**

**Section 1: Demographics**

The University of South Carolina String Project-Professional Music Teacher Identity Questionnaire (USCSP-PMTIQ) alumni’s ($N = 33$) gender was 79% female and 21% male with an average age of 31.97. The age range was 22–45. Only 27% of alumni had children. The alumni’s main instrument included violin (48%), viola (6%), cello (33%), and bass (12%). The highest degrees held for the alumni included undergraduate (33%), master’s (45%), master’s +30 (18%), and doctoral (3%). USCSP-PMTIQ alumni attended additional colleges and universities across the United States (between 1992–2017) which included eight from the South, four from the Northeast, and three from the Midwest and West. Types of degrees obtained included: (a) Bachelor of Music or Science in Music Education, (b) Master of Arts in String Pedagogy and Teaching, (c) Master’s in Education, Music Performance, Music Education, and Technology Education, (d) Performance Certificates, (e) Ph.D. in Music Education, and (f) Teacher Leadership.

Those participants who were in their first stage (year 0–5) of their career cycle, USCSP-PMTIQ alumni’s ($n = 9$) average age was 25. None had children. Eleven percent of the alumni had their master’s or master’s +30 degree. Those participants who were in their second stage of their career cycle (year 6–10), USCSP-PMTIQ alumni’s ($n = 11$)
average age was 31. Three alumni had children. Sixty-four percent held their master’s degree. Those participants who were in their post-second stage of their career cycle (year 11–20), USCSP-PMTIQ alumni’s \((n = 13)\) average age was 38. Six alumni had children. Fifty-four percent held their master’s degree, 38% had master’s +30 degree, and 8% had a Ph.D.

Forty-five percent of USCSP-PMTIQ alumni continued to perform in outside music ensembles. These included traditional ensembles such as symphonies or chamber groups, but some also participated in non-traditional types such as a bluegrass and rock bands. Some of the alumni’s professional duties related to the arts included theatre technical directors or Tri-M sponsors. Many had duties specific to the school, but 45% of alumni had no professional duties.

The maximum number of years a USCSP-PMTIQ alumni taught at a specific school was 17, however, most averaged five years per building. Most alumni have taught in public schools (94%) and in a suburban environment (73%). A few alumni have taught in rural (15%) or urban (12%) environments. The socioeconomic status (SES) of the alumni working in schools varied. Thirty percent of the alumni working in schools had 0–20% of students on free or reduced lunch while another 30% of alumni working in schools had 60–80% of students on free or reduced lunch.

For participants who were in the first stage of their career cycle (year 0–5), five of the USCSP-PMTIQ alumni currently teach in a school where 60% or more of the population of students were on free or reduced lunch. For participants who were in the second stage of teaching (year 6–10), five of the USCSP-PMTIQ alumni currently teach in a school with 40%–80% of the population of students were on free or reduced lunch.
For participants who were in the post-second stage of teaching (year 11–20), five of the USCPSP-PMTIQ alumni currently teach in suburban and urban schools where 40%–80% of students were on free or reduced lunch.

Out of all USCSP-PMTIQ alumni, 97% taught orchestra, but 36% also taught guitar, piano, choir, and higher education. None taught band. Although most alumni taught in a large group setting, 30% also taught private lessons after school hours.

**Research Question 1a: How do USC String Project alumni rate the aspects (subject matter expert, didactical expert, or pedagogical expert) of their professional music teacher identities for their teaching practice?**

**Section 2: Analytical Rating of PMTI Aspects**

USCSP-PMTIQ alumni \((N = 33)\) answered 16 Likert-type questions about PMTI and one question that asked for a list of three aspects of past university experiences that influenced teaching. In Table 4.1, I present the analysis for the analytical rating of the three aspects.

Table 4.1

*Analytical rating of 3 PMTI aspects.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Stages</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Didactical</th>
<th>Pedagogical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alumni in All Stages</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.48 (.33)</td>
<td>3.40 (.31)</td>
<td>3.73 (.26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Stage (0–5 yrs.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.44 (.30)</td>
<td>3.33 (.31)</td>
<td>3.52 (.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Stage (6–10 yrs.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.56 (.39)</td>
<td>3.45 (.31)</td>
<td>3.77 (.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Second Stage (11–20 yrs.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.45 (.30)</td>
<td>3.40 (.33)</td>
<td>3.83 (.18)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
USCSP-PMTIQ alumni, regardless of experience, perceived the pedagogical aspect highest (93%). With increased experience, however, alumni in the second and post-second stage indicated a slight decrease in ratings for the didactical (1%) and subject matter (3%) aspects. I conducted a Guttman’s split-half coefficient analysis for the internal consistency of the analytical rating of aspects \((n = 16)\) at \(\alpha = .58\). Although the reliability of the analytical rating of aspects is modest, it did increase by .13 from the pilot study. I also conducted a Kruskal-Wallis test to determine whether the ratings for each mean aspect varied as a function for whether alumni were in their first, second, or post-second career stage. Results indicated there was a statistically significant difference between the pedagogical mean rating and the career stages, \(H(2) = 8.55, p = .014\). A post hoc analysis of the comparison of the three career stage groups indicated a significant difference from participants in the first stage to the participants in the second stage \((H(1) = 4.57, p = .03)\) and participants in the first stage to participants in the post-second stage of teaching \((H(1) = 7.87, p = .01)\). There was no significant difference from the participants in the second stage to participants in the post-second stage.

USCSP-PMTIQ alumni supplied categorical data regarding their three most influential university experiences. Eighty-two percent identified the USCSP as the most important aspect of their university experience. Specifically, alumni noted that the USCSP was a “practical experience” and a “hands-on teaching experience.” Alumni also discussed that the music education curricula methods courses (24%), pedagogy classes (24%), and student teaching experience (21%) were somewhat influential. Twenty-four percent indicated that performing ensembles such as the “orchestral experience” and “chamber music experiences” were somewhat influential. Alumni also indicated that
applied lessons (18%), applied lessons on secondary instruments (18%), and conducting (6%) somewhat influenced musicianship.

**Section 3: Analytical Rating of Influential Factors**

For the analytical rating of influential factors, USCSP-PMTIQ alumni answered 27 Likert-scale questions regarding their job as a stringed instrument teacher. In Table 4.2, I indicate the analysis for the analytical rating of the three influential factors. All USCSP-PMTIQ alumni perceived experiential factors as most influential (90%), followed by biographical factors (83%), and contextual factors (80%). I conducted a Guttman’s split-half coefficient analysis for the internal consistency of the analytical rating of influential factors ($n=27$) at $\alpha = .72$. Thus, the internal reliability for the analytical rating of influential factors was acceptable (Nunnally, 1978).

Table 4.2

**Analytical rating of 3 influential factors.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Stages</th>
<th>Influential Factors</th>
<th>Contextual Factors $M (SD)$</th>
<th>Experiential Factors $M (SD)$</th>
<th>Biographical Factors $M (SD)$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants in All Stages</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.21 (.47)</td>
<td>3.60 (.21)</td>
<td>3.33 (.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Stage (0–5 yrs.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.22 (.49)</td>
<td>3.56 (.24)</td>
<td>3.28 (.52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Stage (6–10 yrs.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.28 (.47)</td>
<td>3.60 (.19)</td>
<td>3.44 (.48)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Second Stage (11–20 yrs.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.14 (.51)</td>
<td>3.63 (.27)</td>
<td>3.26 (.60)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4: Holistic Rating of PMTI

USCSP-PMTIQ alumni rate holistically their current PMTI using a five-point rating, referred to in the questionnaire as the 5-star rating scale. In Table 4.3, I indicated the alumni’s current analysis for the holistic ratings of their perceived subject matter, didactical, and pedagogical expertise. Currently all USCSP-PMTIQ alumni rate holistically pedagogical matter as 88%, subject matter as 87%, and didactical matter as 81% of their PMTI. With experience, all participants current perception of their pedagogical expertise decreased by 8%, their subject matter expertise increased by 7%, and their didactical expertise only increased by 2%.

Table 4.3

Holistic rating for current PMTI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Stages</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Didactical</th>
<th>Pedagogical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants in All Stages</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.33 (.69)</td>
<td>4.06 (.93)</td>
<td>4.42 (.87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Stage (0–5 yrs.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.22 (.66)</td>
<td>4 (.87)</td>
<td>4.56 (.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Stage (6–10 yrs.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.18 (.75)</td>
<td>4.09 (1.04)</td>
<td>4.64 (.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Second Stage (11–20 yrs.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.54 (.52)</td>
<td>4.08 (.95)</td>
<td>4.15 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Question 1b: How do USCSP alumni rank the aspects of their professional music teacher identities for their teaching practice?

Section 4: Ranking of PMTI

USCSP-PMTIQ alumni ($N = 33$) ranked, from most important to least important, their current PMTI based on the subject matter, didactical, and pedagogical aspects. In Table 4.4, I indicated the analysis for the current ranking of PMTI.

Table 4.4

*Rank order for current PMTI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Stages</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Subject Matter Mean</th>
<th>Didactical Mean</th>
<th>Pedagogical Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants in All Stages</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Stage (0–5 yrs.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>1.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Stage (6–10 yrs.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>1.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Second Stage (11–20 yrs.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Currently, all USCSP-PMTIQ alumni ranked subject matter first, but ranked the pedagogical aspect second. Regardless of experience, alumni ranked the didactical aspect third. First ($n = 9$) and second stage ($n = 11$) alumni ranked pedagogical aspects first, followed by the subject matter aspect. The post-second stage alumni ($n = 13$), however, ranked subject matter first, followed by the pedagogical aspect.
Research Question 2: Have USCSP alumni changed their perceptions of their professional music teacher identities during their career cycles?

Section 4: Question 8

I asked USCSP-PMTIQ alumni (N = 33) to indicate whether their rank of PMTI was the same at the beginning of their career compared to their current teaching. Table 4.5 and Figure 4.1 indicate the generalized answers. The generalized answers were the alumni’s indication of “same” or “different” to this question. Table 4.6 and Figure 4.2 indicate the specific rankings for beginning career and current PMTI. For the specific answers, I compared the alumni’s responses for current and past rankings of PMTI.

Table 4.5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Stages</th>
<th>Rank Comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Generalized Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants in All Stages</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Stage (0–4 yrs.)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Stage (5–10 yrs.)</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Second Stage (11–20 yrs.)</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.6

Specific same or different rank comparison of PMTI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Stages</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Specific Same</th>
<th>Specific Different</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants in All Stages</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Stage (0–4 yrs.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Stage (5–10 yrs.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Second Stage</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Also, in question 8, the generalized comparison of the same or different ranking of PMTI from beginning to current teaching was minimally different. Sixteen alumni indicated it was the same, and 17 alumni indicated it was different. In the first stage \((n = 9)\), five alumni indicated that their rank from beginning to current teaching was the same and four different. In the second stage \((n = 11)\), five alumni indicated that their rank from beginning to current teaching was the same and six different. In the post-second stage \((n = 13)\), six alumni indicated that their rank from beginning to current teaching was the same and seven different. I conducted a Chi-square test to compare group frequencies between alumni that indicated that their PMTI ranking did or did not change. I found no relationship between experience and perceived change of PMTI \(\chi^2(2, N = 33) = .249, p = .88\).
Figure 4.1 *Generalized same or different rank comparison of PMTI*

Figure 4.2 *Specific same or different rank comparison of PMTI*
Research Question 2 a: Compared to the beginning of their teaching careers, what importance do USCSP alumni currently place on the aspects (subject matter expert, didactical expert, or pedagogical expert) of their professional music teacher identities?

Section 4: Holistic Rating of PMTI

Using a 5-point rating scale, USCSP-PMTIQ alumni rated their beginning career PMTI. In Table 4.7, I indicate the alumni’s beginning career analysis for the holistic rating of the three aspects.

Table 4.7

*Holistic rating for beginning career PMTI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Stages</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Subject Matter M (SD)</th>
<th>Didactical M (SD)</th>
<th>Pedagogical M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants in All Stages</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.61 (.66)</td>
<td>3.76 (.94)</td>
<td>3.39 (1.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Stage (0–5 yrs.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.44 (.88)</td>
<td>3.89 (1.05)</td>
<td>3.56 (1.59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Stage (6–10 yrs.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.64 (.67)</td>
<td>3.55 (.93)</td>
<td>3.36 (.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Second Stage (11–20 yrs.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.69 (.48)</td>
<td>3.85 (.90)</td>
<td>3.31 (1.32)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

USCSP-PMTIQ alumni indicated an increase in becoming a pedagogical expert (20%) and a didactical expert (6%), regardless of teaching stage. With experience, all alumni indicated the most growth within pedagogical aspects; the highest increase was for alumni in the second stage (26%). Second stage alumni also indicated there was an 11% growth within the didactical aspect. Post-second stage alumni indicated, however, a very slight decrease in their didactical expertise. Regarding the subject matter aspect, even though USCSP-PMTIQ alumni initially rated this as the most important (92%), with
experience, there was a slight decrease (5%). I conducted a Spearman’s rho correlation between the current and beginning of career holistic ratings for the three aspects; results indicated a strong, positive correlation for only the subject matter aspect ($r_s = .45, p = .010$). I conducted a Kruskal-Wallis test to determine whether the current and beginning of career holistic rating for each aspect varied as a function of whether alumni were in their first, second, or post-second career stage. The results were not significantly different.

**Research Question 2b:** Compared to the beginning of their teaching careers, how do USCSP alumni currently rank the aspects of their professional music teacher identities?

**Section 4: Ranking of PMTI**

USCSP-PMTIQ alumni ($N = 33$) ranked their beginning career PMTI based on the three aspects. Table 4.8 indicates the analysis for the beginning career ranking of PMTI.

Table 4.8

*Rank order for beginning career PMTI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Stages</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean Subject Matter</th>
<th>Mean Didactical</th>
<th>Mean Pedagogical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants in All Stages</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Stage (0–5 yrs.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Stage (6–10 yrs.)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Second Stage (11–20 yrs.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regardless of experience, USCSP-PMTIQ alumni indicated the rank order for PMTI at the beginning of their career as a subject matter expert, a didactical expert, and a pedagogical expert. Currently, all alumni indicated the rank order for PMTI as a subject matter expert, a pedagogical expert, and a didactical aspect.

**Qualitative: Interview 1**

After I analyzed the generalized perceptions of PMTI using the PMTI Questionnaire for USCSP-PMTIQ alumni within all career cycles (year 1–20), I then used the PMTI Questionnaire again for the qualitative part of this study. I asked three USCSP alumnae in their post-second stage of teaching (year 11–20) to provide reflective narrative regarding their perceptions of PMTI during Interview 1. I administered the PMTI Questionnaire via FaceTime to each of the three USCSP-post-second stage (USCSP-PSS) alumnae. From the transcribed and coded data of Interview 1, USCSP-PSS alumnae added depth to the quantitative data from USCSP-PMTIQ alumni. For the analysis of Interview 1, I combined all three USCSP-PSS alumni narratives instead of focusing on their individual analysis. I chose this format because it aligns with the quantitative part of this study.

**Research Question 1: What are the self-defined professional music teacher identities of USCSP-PSS alumnae?**

**Section 1: Demographics**

From Barnes’ (1998) research study, I purposefully selected three of the six alumnae using the following criteria: (a) all had similar preservice teaching experience at the USCSP, (b) all had similar current career cycle stage as stringed instrument music teachers, (c) all had master's degrees, (d) all were female, and (e) all were middle school teachers. Because I knew I would not be able to find alumni from elementary, middle,
and high school orchestras, I chose to focus on middle school teachers. I also believed that focusing on similar characteristics, such as school level and gender, might offer more similar insight regarding teachers in the post-second stage music career cycle. The names of these alumni, changed to protect confidentiality, were Caroline, Megan, and Polly. The three USCSP-PSS alumnae’s average age was 40. Caroline taught for 12 ½ years while both Megan and Polly taught 17 years. All three alumni had children under the age of 18 that range from toddlers to middle school-age. They all had master’s degrees, two in music education and one in music performance.

Currently, USCSP-PSS alumnae taught middle school orchestra at one or two schools. Caroline taught at her school for five years within a suburban community with 20–40% of the student population on free or reduced lunch. Megan taught at her schools for two years within an urban community. While one school has 20–40% of the student population on free or reduced lunch, the other school has only 0–20%. Polly taught at her school for six years within a suburban community with only 0–20% of the student population on free or reduced lunch. All of their orchestra classes were heterogeneous, a combination of violin, viola, cello, and bass players. Megan and Caroline’s classes were divided by student grade level while Polly’s classes were by music ability level. The alumnae’s other roles within the school and their field included being a Tri-M Sponsor, president of the state orchestra division music educators’ association, and department chair. Outside of school, they continued to play their string instruments, but did not regularly perform in the community due to work and family time constraints. Caroline stated her reasoning for not performing in the community as much was “to spend more time with my own children.”
Research Question 1a: How do USCSP-PSS alumnae rate the aspects (subject matter expert, didactical expert, or pedagogical expert) of their professional music teacher identities for their teaching practice?

Section 2: Narrative of PMTI Aspects

For Section 2 of the PMTI Questionnaire, I determined the overall effect that the subject matter, didactical, and pedagogical aspects had on USCSP-PSS alumnae’s perceptions of PMTI. Caroline, Megan, and Polly provided a reflective narrative on the three PMTI aspects. We discussed the six subject matter aspect questions which involved the alumnae’s perceived knowledge and importance of music skills, specifically for teaching orchestra. For the five didactical aspect questions, we focused on how the alumnae taught orchestra to students. Finally, we discussed the six pedagogical aspect questions regarding their social-emotional interactions with students.

Subject Matter Aspect

Caroline, Megan, and Polly reflected on their past educations and how they may have influenced their current PMTI. Caroline said everything, “every source…all comes together” regarding past education. Polly stated:

We’re lucky having gone to USC. Having String Project…makes a huge difference. It helps to build your confidence early which I think is what a lot of young teachers don’t have…so when I started teaching, I felt like I had already had three or four years of teaching experience. I think that made a humongous difference.

Megan mentioned the lack of learning how to teach upper-level or high school orchestra literature, but Caroline further implied that the “better musician you are the better teacher you can be for your students.”
USCSP-PSS alumnae also discussed subject matter aspects regarding resources they use in the classroom and seeking professional development opportunities which affect their current PMTI. Currently, Caroline, Megan, and Polly used various types of resources in their classroom. Beyond a variety of supplemental method books and string literature, they also used technology that reinforces learning musical techniques through performance practice. USCSP-PSS alumnae found that these technology resources help them teach new material, communicate with parents and students, assess skills, create composition and improvisation projects, and practice sight-reading. Regarding professional development, USCSP-PSS alumnae also continued to discuss repertoire and techniques with their colleagues. Caroline stated that she “steal[s] everything from anybody I can.” Polly stated that it is “helpful to be able to pick the brains of people [that] are basically doing the same day that I’m living....” She also mentioned that learning from guest conductors at regional or county events allowed you to “come back with new stuff and you try it; sometimes it works, sometimes it does not.” They all also attended state and national conferences on a frequent basis.

Finally, Caroline, Megan, and Polly discussed the importance of imparting their subject matter to students. Caroline confided that even though she combined all her musical experiences to provide knowledge to students, she continues to learn teaching strategies, even after twelve years of teaching. Megan stated, “I think everything I learned [in] music somehow will affect how I teach, but I don’t know that I’m going to deliver…everything I learned.” Megan confirmed that the subject matter has to be important for the student’s learning.
**Didactical Aspect**

USCSP-PSS alumnae’s discussion of the didactical aspects included (a) past influential factors of teaching methods, (b) types of teaching styles, and (c) the effect of reflection. Regarding past influences that affected didactical approaches to teaching, all three alumnae stressed the importance that the USCSP had on developing their teaching methods. Polly stated that the USCSP helped “establish your own environment” while Megan confirmed that it was “hands-on, not sitting in a classroom.” Caroline also reflected that the USCSP gave her a “chance to try to be in front of kids and make mistakes…but I think that was [an] invaluable experience in college.” Polly also mentioned that the USCSP did not necessarily show young teachers the long-term progression of skills regarding beginning to advanced stages of string playing. She suggested that these skills were established during student teaching. Both Megan and Polly mentioned that graduate school further encouraged growth in didactical skills within authentic teaching environments. Caroline stated that summer camp experiences contributed to her didactical applications within authentic context environments.

Caroline said, “There are 1,000 ways to teach something… one thing is gonna work for some, and it’s not gonna work for others, so I have many, many ways.” USCSP-PSS alumnae confirmed that they use a variety of teaching methods every day to encourage student skill development. Megan specified that focusing on modeling and ear training had always been effective; she has recently applied technology and visual tools to enhance students’ growth. Polly’s and Caroline’s didactical strategy was to have students create goals and provide tools for students to become independent musicians. Further instilling independence, Caroline specified that focusing on questioning and
encouraging student feedback encouraged a depth of knowledge and growth. Caroline stated, “One of my main goals is...by the time they leave me, I don’t want them to need me.” Therefore, she has grown into the mindset that becoming a facilitator of learning encouraged a student-centered focus instead of controlling every aspect of the classroom.

Finally, USCSP-PSS alumnae informally reflect on a consistent basis, which affected the strategies they use to teach their students. Caroline stated, “sometimes I end the class and I’m like ok that went well, and that didn’t, and this is...how I’m gonna change that for tomorrow.” Polly also mentioned that informal reflection was “the stuff that keeps you up at night.” Megan’s formal reflection was quite rigorous; she was required to submit a plan and reflect with an administrator three times a year. Polly, however, did not positively favor formal reflection. She stated, “I think that is where our system is broken...I don’t [understand] trying to cram everything into a box, it just doesn’t work...we are expected to vary our instruction, kids can’t all be crammed in the same box, but the teachers are crammed into the same box.”

**Pedagogical Aspect**

USCSP-PSS alumnae discussed how their interactions with students affected the classroom environment and the social-emotional development of students. They all perceived themselves as role models for how students interact, but Caroline also indicated that demonstrating respect and kindness were key factors for positive student interactions. While alumnae tried to encourage positive student interactions, they admitted that this was a challenge to their classroom environment. Both Caroline and Megan were apt to be approachable by students. Caroline stated that she was “super approachable, maybe too much, [students] talk about anything and everything with me.”
Contrastingly, Polly stated she does not “necessarily want to hear all of their woes…I mean I’m here…I don’t want to be your best friend. I’m your teacher.” When planning instruction, however, they strongly consider the social-emotional development of their students. Caroline mentioned encouraging success in students’ ability and confidence in their playing.

USCSP-PSS alumnae discussed developing confidence in middle school-aged children within the pedagogical aspect questions. Polly discussed that for groups of students who had confidence issues, she worked on developing their potential by getting out of their “comfort zone” while also encouraging “emotional maturity.” Caroline stated that if students are “not confident, they will quit.” She further relayed that teaching students coping mechanisms when they make mistakes is necessary.

Teaching middle school students how to play and flourish on their instruments was only part of the alumnae’s job. Polly surmised that there are “lot[s] of different factors in…so many lessons- social skills, conflict issues, responsibility, organization.” Caroline stated that she wanted to teach the “human aspect.” Within the two or three years that they teach their students, the alumnae want them to be prepared for high school and transform as a person, not just a musician.

**Section 3: Narrative of Influential Factors**

In Section 3 of the PMTI Questionnaire, we focused on how biographical, contextual, and experiential factors had the potential to affect PMTI. Each factor had nine questions to which USCSP-PSS alumnae responded with a reflective narrative. They reflected on biographical factors pertaining to people in their past or present. We discussed contextual influences pertaining to the environment in which they currently
teach or have taught in the past. Lastly, we discussed experiential factors that focused on the overall alumnae’s experiences teaching music which influenced their PMTI development.

**Biographical Influences**

People who have influenced USCSP-PSS alumnae included family, colleagues, and former teachers. Megan and Polly mentioned their parents helped build their confidence, but Caroline and Megan also stated that becoming a parent increased their flexibility and communication with other parents. They reflected how other colleagues helped guide concerns regarding their work ethic. Caroline stated, “there’s always something you can complain about…you can choose to see the positive or the negative…so I try to hang out with people that are more positive…their energy helps me with my teaching positively.” Regarding former teachers influences, the alumnae characterized them as “great,” “positive,” and having “charisma” and “high energy.” Caroline stated that she had some teachers she did not like, but “I always tried to take what I wanted to be from the strengths from each individual teacher.” The alumnae agree, however, that their unique personalities are their PMTI, not the impact of former teachers’ demeanors. As Polly stated, “I am me.”

Polly and Caroline identified with being more than just a music teacher which included teaching life skills. Caroline stated, “I love teaching music, but sometimes what I do more is teach kids how to think…because if they can’t do that, they’re not gonna make music or be able to survive life.” Megan identified with being a music teacher because her skill-set and the subject matter were music.
USCSP-PSS alumnae’s past music experiences influenced their PMTI. While Polly perceived that “it’s my overall experience that shaped how and why I teach,” Megan was influenced by performing and improvising at a young age. Megan stated, “having to be on it and changing gears and stuff you learn a lot…[it] gave [me] flexibility in school situations.” Caroline mentioned that she wished she has learned more music at a young age and continued to play and review material throughout her music performance development. Currently, they all saw value in continuing to perform on their musical instrument. Polly stated, “I think it’s important you keep your chops up…you know you’re preaching to your kids about how important the music is…you should also be playing in some capacity.” Megan also confirmed, as the other alumni mentioned, that raising children affected the time allowable for performing in the community.

**Contextual Influences**

The influential factors in USCSP-PSS alumnae’s teaching environments included (a) colleagues, (b) administrators, and (c) the community. While some of these factors were positive, there were also negative influences. Collaboration with colleagues varied among USCSP-PSS alumnae. While Polly agreed that cooperation was somewhat significant, Caroline and Megan strongly agreed that collaborating with colleagues positively influenced their teaching. Megan stated that it was “good for kids to see that we’re friends and not enemies, the band and chorus people, we all get along.” Caroline also stated that “teaching can be a lonely thing even though you’re surrounded by people all day long.” All alumnae agreed that making administrators’ aware of the relevance of their programs and feeling supported by administrators influenced their contextual teaching environment. Caroline conveyed that as soon as she walked through the front
door of a school she could immediately feel how the administrator influenced the environment. USCSP-PSS alumnae mentioned the importance of giving and receiving respect to their administration. Regarding the importance of collaboration with administrators, Caroline stated that “some principals you have to ‘win over’…they just don’t have experience with a good orchestra program and what it takes to have a good orchestra program, so we have to teach them…in a respectful way.” Polly further stated, “I think that sometimes we’re afraid to speak up to our administration about things that don’t work…and sometimes rightfully so…because sometimes administrators don’t really want to hear your opinions.” Megan’s collaboration with her administrator was influential because he gives her specific and practical feedback within her evaluations; he was a former band director. Regarding the community, alumnae mentioned various ways their students interact with the community to share their musical abilities that included small ensembles for events in the school and outside of the school, traveling, and auditioning for honors orchestras. Because they teach middle school, the opportunities provided in the community are perhaps greater for high school programs due to the age and lack of independence for middle school-aged students. Within the school community, Polly also mentioned that the reputation of her program was known for being “high quality” and that this factor helps with recruitment and retention.

USCSP-PSS alumnae also discussed resources for professional development, student enrichment, and students with disabilities. Megan and Polly mentioned the various opportunities to vary instruction, collaborate, and use technology in the classroom. Megan also incorporates enrichment activities and projects for her students during their flex time that include preparation for honors orchestras. Unfortunately,
alumnae discussed that professional development within the school was rarely effective. Caroline stated, “every now and then there is something, and I do try my best to get some golden nugget out of what we’re talking about…usually, it has nothing to do…but I try to relate.” Regarding professional development through the teacher evaluation system, Megan’s experience was positive because her evaluator was a former band teacher; she stated, “I am very grateful that I have good evaluators who have written comments and asked me to elaborate…but I don’t think everybody gets that.” Caroline and Polly agreed that they have not received effective evaluations from the administrators. Polly stated that the evaluation system “does not define who I am as a teacher” while Caroline conferred that “a lot of times the evaluators have no idea what I’m doing…the current system isn’t really helping me become a better teacher…administrators don’t have time anyway…so we are just jumping through these hoops, and it doesn’t help.” Finally, for students with disabilities, USCSP-PSS alumnae positively reflected that they receive resources from their schools to enrich the needs of these students.

**Experiential Influences**

With experience, USCSP-PSS alumnae developed their PMTI. Regarding teaching style, Polly mentioned that her personality and past experiences helped her become the success she is today as a teacher. For Polly, one specific experience regarding chair auditions that resulted in a child quitting orchestra and a disgruntled parent, made her reassess her PMTI. Caroline and Megan discussed how their teaching style has changed from the early stages and is still developing currently. Caroline specifically talked about how she never used to allow students to listen to a piece before they played
it and how she would over-explain a skill or talk too much. For Megan, having a student with a visual impairment made her more aware of differentiation with students.

With experience, USCSP-PSS alumnae’s management of their classroom environment has also developed. Regarding classroom management, Megan stated, “years of experience, trial and error, and some mistakes along the way…have taught me what not to do next time.” Polly also mentioned that humor and just practicing teaching influences classroom management. The alumnae’s strategies for implementing new techniques varied. Regarding lesson plan preparation, the alumnae use a variety of methods for organization and reflection. Megan taught at two schools and revised her weekly lesson plans on a daily basis. She stated, “that’s my problem I have too many things going on… I’m not gonna remember…but I’m not even in the same building…you just completely forget when you leave the room.” Polly mentioned having a “skeletal framework,” but she also enjoyed “adapting to what happens.” She did not write formal lesson plans and stated, “I can have a detailed lesson plan that I spent 45-minutes writing…then it doesn’t work out and what was the point of that.”

USCSP-PSS alumnae established strengths and weakness in their teaching through experience. Their awareness of what the students were doing in class and how they approached difficult skills were positively affected by experience. Caroline stated, “I keep asking myself…what are they getting? What are they not getting?…I’m adjusting on the spot to what they need.” Polly confirmed this statement by stating that she finds “the source of what the problem is and approach[es] it from all different areas.” The alumnae had unique descriptions of their overall strengths and weaknesses as a teacher. Caroline regarded her perfectionism and ability to relate to students as a means to create
high standards for her students. Sometimes, however, she felt that relating to students was a distraction from classroom learning. She also implied that her personality of being a perfectionist facilitates the desire to control all situations. Megan perceived her greatest strength as a teacher as being a good listener and sequential and logical beginning strings teacher. She regarded classroom management as her weakness. Polly’s strength was her ability to adapt to the classroom environment, but her weakness was her sometimes brash personality. Regarding her personality, she stated, “my personality I think can be a detriment or an attribute depending on…the kids in front of you, but you can’t really change who you are.” Polly also shared that with time and experience students were also evolving. She discussed that a former student wrote her a thank you note that stated, “I just want to thank you for always being tough enough on me.” Polly continued by saying, “it just kind of validates they don’t get it all the time,” and it may take time for students to evolve and develop just like the teachers.

Research Question 1b: How do USCSP-PSS alumnæ rank the aspects of their professional music teacher identities for their teaching practice?

USCSP-PSS alumnæ ranked, from most important to least important, their current PMTI based on the subject matter, didactical, and pedagogical aspects. Although Megan and Polly ranked the didactical aspect in first place, and Caroline and Megan also ranked the pedagogical aspect in second place, all three alumnæ ranked the subject matter aspect differently regarding perceived importance for PMTI.

Research Question 2b: Compared to the beginning of their teaching careers, how do USCSP-PSS alumnæ currently rank the aspects of their professional music teacher identities?

USCSP-PSS alumnæ ranked their PMTI at the beginning of their career based on the three PMTI aspects- subject matter, didactical, and pedagogical. The alumnæ ranked
the pedagogical aspect in third place for the beginning of career PMTI. For the didactical aspect, Caroline and Megan ranked this in second place. For the subject matter aspect, Megan and Polly ranked this in first place.

Research Question 2: Have USCSP-PSS alumnae changed their perceptions of their professional music teacher identities during their career cycles?

Table 4.9 indicates the three alumnae’s perceptions of PMTI for current and the beginning of their career.

Table 4.9

*Interview 1 - rank order for current and beginning career PMTI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Participant</th>
<th>Current Subject Matter</th>
<th>Beginning of career Subject Matter</th>
<th>Current Didactical</th>
<th>Beginning of career Didactical</th>
<th>Current Pedagogical</th>
<th>Beginning of career Pedagogical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the beginning of their career USCSP-PSS alumnae perceived subject matter as the most important aspect. While one alumna currently perceived the subject matter aspect as the most important, two alumnae currently ranked the didactical aspect as most important to PMTI. Comparatively, Caroline’s perceived current PMTI ranked the didactical aspect in first place, but it was in third place at the beginning of her career. Megan ranked the subject matter aspect in first place at the beginning of her career, but currently it is ranked third. Polly, too, ranked the subject matter aspect in first place at the beginning of her career, but currently the didactical aspect is ranked in first place. Polly mentioned
teaching experiences and reflection within those experiences have affected her perceived changes in PMTI. Caroline discussed how analytical she was when she first started teaching and the importance of knowing the students and caring for their well-being developed over time.

**Qualitative: Interview 2**

I used Creswell and Plano Clark’s (2018) sequential explanatory model to focus on individual cases of PMTI perceptions. For the open-ended Interview 2, USCSP-PSS alumnae provided “diverse perspectives” and gave validation to the generalized quantitative data and reflective narrative from Interview 1 regarding PMTI evolution. Following Creswell’s (2003) model, three USCSP alumnae in their post-second stage of teaching \((n = 3)\) participated in a phenomenological examination of their PMTI evolution using past and present video stimulus (p. 216). Their narrative in Interview 2 provides insights for the following research questions:

- What perceptions of PMTI do USCSP-PSS alumnae have when viewing a video stimulus of their current teaching?

- What perceptions of PMTI do USCSP-PSS alumnae have when viewing a video stimulus of their preservice teaching?

- What are the self-defined professional music teacher identities of USCSP-PSS alumnae?

For the following analysis of Interview 2, I formatted each alumna’s reflective narrative in the following order (a) current video stimulus, (b) past video stimulus, and (c) the changes of PMTI based on a comparison of current and past video stimulus. At the conclusion of the three USCSP-PSS alumnae’s analysis for Interview 2, I discussed the
change of their ranking of PMTI based on the current and past video stimulus as well as a comparison of their generalized ranking from Interview 1.

**Interview 2: Caroline**

**Current Video Stimulus**

**Themes**

Caroline’s current video stimulus included these themes (a) creating a positive learning environment, (b) philosophies of teaching pedagogy, (c) strategies for student learning, and (d) high expectations for students within daily informal assessments. Caroline promoted a positive learning environment by encouraging affirming relationships with students and herself. From recruiting, to encouraging students to participate in the classroom, she was “aware of being positive with them and knowing each individual…and [making sure] they’re happy.” The students’ engagement in their learning was one of Caroline’s main goal for teaching; she stated, “that’s one of my peeves, I really want every single person to buy in and to be doing what we’re doing.” Caroline also gave her students leadership roles in the classroom; for example, one student was in charge of leading the tuning process. Overall, she created a positive environment for her students within a group setting, but she also paid attention to individual student needs. Creating opportunities for success encouraged her students’ growth as musicians and Caroline confirmed, “everything’s going the way I like it.”

Caroline’s perceived strength in didactical and subject matter aspects (PMTI) was evident within her discussion of a pedagogy of teaching and strategies for student learning. While watching the current video, Caroline pointed out and modeled her knowledge of subject matter by showing and relaying concerns for students regarding
rhythmic counting, bow distribution, posture, and left-hand finger placement for violin and bass. Her teaching pedagogy philosophies were strongly focused on sequencing of skills. She mentioned the need for review and students re-playing concert selections to encourage performance practice. I also noticed that she had the technique book memorized and she stated, “that can really slow you down if you don’t have it memorized.” Caroline was also emphatic about when to model and play with students versus when to watch and listen while students were practicing skills. She stated:

I think you have to be careful when you play with them. I think listening to them is the most important thing. I mean [the students] are not listening to your playing unless you try to get them to visually do something, but they [cannot hear] your intonation.

Regarding teaching strategies, Caroline was diligent to have multiple ways of teaching students. She mentioned that she had lesson plans with clear goals for her students; didactically, she “like[d] the way [she’s] executing it.” She is also adaptive; Caroline discussed that when a strategy does not work, she provides other options.

Caroline mentioned multiple times that she was continually assessing her students’ learning. She stated, “I’m evaluating them the whole time…I’m reacting to what they’re doing…how many of the kids are getting this and is this good enough.” With constant assessment, Caroline revealed her high expectations for her students and said:

I don’t like lowering the bar. I’m trying to get them to have a successful experience, what I think is successful, which is a solid foundation, but [also]
trying to have some musical experience in a positive way. I think that’s coming across, I just always want more.

She also admitted that sometimes she had to make the decision to not fix everything all at one time, she had to maintain the focus of what the goal of the learning strategy is for each class period.

**Video as Stimulus**

We discussed the current video stimulus regarding Caroline’s process for choosing her current video. She recorded two different classes before choosing the selection for this study. She mentioned that she also “wanted to get it done, too.” Before submitting her video, she watched some of both classes and noted “I was picky,” and after choosing the selection she submitted she stated, “I’m doing a good job and I needed to see that.” Caroline also discussed that her technically driven teaching also reflected on the type of video she chose to share for this study. Instead of choosing a rehearsal of concert music she chose to show a video of them learning and practicing technical skills on their instruments. She mentioned that when teaching concert music, it is “less predictable, more reactive, less planned in a way, [or] less of my control.” Caroline also conveyed that watching a video of different types of her teaching might change how she reflects on her PMTI.

We also discussed aspects of PMTI not shown in the video stimulus. Caroline mentioned that pedagogical aspects such as building long-term relationships with students were not conveyed in the video stimulus. She stated that her relationship with students is “one of my strengths.” Also, Caroline mentioned that the video stimulus did not show her diligent efforts to communicate with parents.
For future implementation, Caroline reflected that “maybe I need to video more because it’s different than I thought.” The main issue for Caroline was not the act of videotaping her teaching; it was taking the time to reflect and analyze her teaching which would be “kind of a luxury.” She reflected that she is constantly evaluating herself and is very critical, but the current video stimulus was “better than I expected it to be, which was surprising.” Finally, the researcher reflected on the affect that current video stimulus has on the alumna. I noticed that while the current video stimulus conveyed multiple examples of PMTI aspects, Caroline’s comments while watching the current video were pedagogically and didactically driven. She was not concerned with herself but analyzed the students’ performance and talked about their strengths and weaknesses or personalities.

**Past Video Stimulus**

**Themes**

The themes related to Caroline’s past video stimulus included (a) creating a positive learning environment, (b) process-driven teaching, (c) pacing, and (d) negative perspectives of missing PMTI aspects. Caroline from past to present still created a positive learning environment for her students. Regarding her past video stimulus, she stated, “I was positive and trying to have good relationships, and I obviously care about them…I was smiling and laughing.” She also mentioned that they were engaged and participated in instruction. Caroline saw that it was difficult to remember from the past video if she created an environment structured for positive interaction regarding seating and accommodations for students. She noticed that the classroom noise level was high, but that they still seemed engaged; only a few students were off-task.
Caroline often discussed that the past video stimulus was “very much process.” She stated, “I was very focused on getting them to do what was in the book…we’re gonna do this and no matter what we are going to go through the whole process.” She talked about how she knew the subject matter or material but did not always focus on the long-term knowledge; it was more about the process. Along with the process of the class, Caroline mentioned that she was establishing a concise and clear tempo before beginning songs. She also noticed that the strategy of practicing note reading and tracking notes was also a good method for teaching. The only slightly negative perspective Caroline discussed regarding process was not always being aware of or assessing what the students were learning. She stated, “I think that’s hard as a young teacher. You are so in the moment of what you are doing; it’s hard to think about what’s next.”

Caroline’s pacing of the class was another topic of discussion while watching the past video stimulus. Similar to her process-driven classes, she stated, “that was probably my strategy…we’ll just keep on truckin’.” She mentioned that her pacing was “slow” and “choppy” and that her “tool belt of strategies” was not developed. The final activity of the past video stimulus involved taking a written quiz on the parts of the instrument. The lack of time management was evident during this portion of the class because there was no clear strategy for how to pass out materials and deal with students who did not have required materials. At the end of watching the past video, Caroline was curious about wasted time regarding this incident. She rewound the video and timed the lack of instructional time as three minutes and forty-five seconds.

Finally, Caroline mentioned a few negative perspectives of subject matter, didactical, and pedagogical aspects of her PMTI after watching the past video stimulus.
Regarding the subject matter aspect, she noticed that she did not discuss posture or model on her instrument. Didactically, she mentioned that did not use any technology and gave no feedback to students. Although she instilled a positive environment with the students, which is a pedagogical aspect, she also negatively felt that her tone of voice was harsh; she stated, “I’m yelling.”

**Video as Stimulus**

Overall, Caroline’s reaction to the past video stimulus was predominantly within the pedagogical aspect of her PMTI. She wanted to connect with the students even though the video stimulus was nineteen years ago. She reflected, “Hope I remember some of the kids…I think I probably will… Oh, I remember that kid…I don’t remember his name, but I remember his face.”

**PMTI Changes: Current and Past Video Stimulus**

**Similarities & Differences**

Caroline discussed five similarities in her current and past teaching that included (a) lesson planning, (b) singing in the classroom, (c) active participation, (d) a counting system, and (e) positive interactions with students. She still had written lesson plans, and in the past, she stated, “I remember having notes on what we were going to be doing, which was valuable.” She mentioned, and we noticed in both videos, that she and the students sang quite often in her classroom to encourage their aural skills. Regarding active participation, Caroline stated, “less talking and more them doing…they were playing a lot…that was good.” In both current and past videos, Caroline stressed the importance of student participation and the “buy-in” of every child. Although her level of relationship with students has increased, Caroline discussed that she was still positively
interacting with students in the past video stimulus. She stated, “I mean I’m at a different level of engagement with kids, but I was interacting with them and looking at what they were doing.”

Caroline discussed three differences in her current and past teaching that included (a) her awareness of assessing students’ performance abilities, (b) her accumulation of strategies for teaching, and (c) her pacing. In past teaching, Caroline stated, “I was just driving right on through no matter what.” Currently, she noticed that her awareness of the students and how she is constantly assessing their actions influences her facility of student learning. Her ability to reassess student learning, in the moment of teaching, has increased due to her multitude of teaching strategies. She noticed a lack of time management and pacing in her past video, and stated, “my pacing and the flow of everything is so much better now.”

**Professional Development**

Caroline’s professional development, regarding PMTI, from reflecting on current and past video stimulus was positive but, she “reflects so much already…that this [experience] was just natural.” In seeking professional development from others, she noted, “teaching is a really hard job, and not many other people are going, ‘hey, good job’…I’m being tough on myself and…[should] think…of going wait, that’s going well.”

As Caroline continues to have high expectations for herself and maintain a work-life balance, she discussed the issue of sustainability. She stated, “I want to be one of those teachers who makes it 30 plus years…I don’t know if I can keep on this pace and be sane and have the family.” Overall, Caroline’s professional development is self-driven through constant reflection and high demands of her teaching excellence.
Reflection

Caroline’s reflections of her current and past video were beneficial, and she stated, “I have grown a lot which is awesome, which is what I wanted to see…so I am happy about that…I’m encouraged.” Since Caroline reflects constantly, she felt as this practice of watching the current and past video stimulus was “extra.” In the past, she was just as analytical of her teaching as she is in the present. She stated, “I was aware of what I wanted to be, but I couldn’t quite get it to be that way yet.” She also mentioned her curiosity with the past video and that her experience teaching at the USCSP would take her on the path to becoming a better teacher. She stated, “through this experience [at the USCSP] I [felt like] I was going to be a better student teacher, a normal student teacher…and by the time I got a job, I would have more.” She further mentioned that all preservice teachers should have this authentic teaching experience.

Reflecting on the USCSP experience, Caroline discussed the positive and negative attributes to having a master teacher. During this period, USCSP hired an orchestra teacher who taught in a local school. The master teacher taught one of the beginning classes, and then the preservice teachers would model their class on this lesson. USCSP no longer has a master teacher; they currently have two graduate students with teaching experience that observe and provide feedback to teachers. The director also currently provided curriculum and lesson plans to the preservice teachers who teach group classes. Caroline’s feelings regarding the influence of the master teacher was conflicted. She stated, “I would’ve been modeling after the master teacher, so I’m sure I didn’t come up with that stuff…but, it’s still me.” She remembers modeling the master
teacher’s lessons but could not remember how much of the lesson was her strategies or the master teacher’s.

**Interview 2: Megan**

**Current Video Stimulus**

**Themes**

The themes related to Megan’s current video stimulus included (a) creating a positive learning environment, (b) how personality affects a learning environment, (c) mentoring students, (d) differentiation, and (e) sequencing of skills. Megan perceived that her classroom had “high energy,” “they’re in a safe, pleasant place,” and there was a “definite buzz in the air.” She regarded the students’ noise level as part of their learning and they “seem to be about the task…that’s why I have a hard time stifling it.” Megan felt conflicted about the students being quieter in class. She conveyed that she admired teachers that had “no nonsense” rehearsals. She felt that sometimes too much talking “drags the pace down more than it probably could.” After an observation by an administrator, however, Megan stated, “she just said it was a fun class…she would want to be there…it was a good class.” Her personality seemed to affect this positive learning environment. She used humor and stated, “I think I’m kind…so as far as the [pedagogical aspect] part, I don’t think even when they goofed up, I don’t think I crushed anyone’s souls.” The combination of Megan’s “light” personality and positive learning environment effected retention. She stated, “I think that’s why I have such large classes.” Megan participated in lots of different sports while growing up and referred to herself as a coach. She stated:
I just love the coach aspect…[students] coming to me after school whether they’re getting help…[or] when they come at the end of the day to get their instrument and you get the 10-minute unload of the day…it’s a really special time to me…I look forward to that every day.

Megan discussed mentoring or coaching students as more influential to student growth than “a regular class that meets twice a week.” She mentioned that the video did not show this mentoring relationship with students outside of the large rehearsal. She had workshops before and after school and stated, “individual coaching, [is] face time with the kids…one on one or small group” affected the students’ musical growth.

Megan’s mentoring of students also conveyed her use of differentiation. In the background of the current video stimulus, you could hear another group of students practicing a more advanced piece, *Rigadou*. Megan disclosed that all the sixth-grade students were in one class, but that there were seven advanced students who were not beginners. She created a digital lesson for these students during her planning time so that they were able to continue to develop their musical growth.

Finally, Megan discussed the importance of sequencing skills to impart knowledge to students. She stated that her sequencing, in the current video stimulus, was “logical…the execution went the way that I had planned.” She further detailed that, “first we did it, then I told them what we had just done…and then they saw it…on paper…so I think the sequence of it was good.”

**Video as Stimulus**

Megan discussed video as stimulus regarding positive and negative aspects. Positively, she regarded video stimulus as a means for student and self-assessment.
Negatively, she discussed how the video did not convey the cultural diversity of her students. Megan stated:

I have a diverse group of students and I don’t know how much you could see that. Both ability, socioeconomic, and racially…it’s hard when you see the back of 20 heads and you don’t even see half the class…that isn’t identifiable.

Perhaps if Megan had more video equipment or changed the position of angle of the video, the diversity of her students would be visible. Megan positively reflected that the vantage point of the current video stimulus facilitated her assessment of posture. She stated, “watching their bows, it’s cool…I’m teaching extensions right now…it never occurred to me to try taping that…[it] would be a really good idea.” Megan often used video stimulus of run-throughs of concert pieces as a means to assess her conducting and the overall performance. Throughout her watching of the current video stimulus, Megan constantly assessed her teaching performance. During the initial watching of the video she took notes and stated they were “mostly for myself…things I saw that I would try to not do again.” She also mentioned which strategies she would or would not use again in her teaching. Megan stated, “I would have omitted [that] now that I’ve seen it…the whole different parts…it was too hard to assess who ‘got it’…it didn’t accomplish anything.” She further discussed what she would do differently next time to formulate a better assessment strategy.
Past Video Stimulus

Themes

The themes related to Megan’s past video stimulus included (a) informal assessment, (b) pacing and clarity of presentation, (c) missing materials, and (d) lesson planning. Overall, Megan’s past video stimulus was difficult to watch and analyze. She stated, “the teaching itself…I’m struggling to find things I’m impressed with really.” Regarding informal assessment, Megan noted that she gave “false praise” in the past video and that perhaps it was because she thought “I was going to move on no matter what” and did not know how to implement transitions between skills and songs. She also perceived a lack of assessment because she did not know her subject matter. She stated, “it took me a long time to get away from the front [of the room]…[I] like to check on people…I think it all goes back to I didn’t know the music, so I felt like I needed to hover over that book.”

Megan’s greatest concern for her past video stimulus was pacing and clarity of her presentation. The past video was ten minutes long and she calculated that for the last five and a half minutes she was explaining a music theory concept. The students were not playing their stringed instruments. She remarked that she felt “embarrassed” and stated, “I feel like I presented too much information…why are we doing so much theory right away when they need to play?” Within students’ minimally playing during the 10-minute video, Megan also discussed her lack of clarity regarding presentation of the subject matter. She stated, “I just talk and talk and talk…[but] I was not clear on wat I was trying to say.” She positively remarked that her voice carried throughout the classroom and she sounded “relatively confident talking to the kids.” She also mentioned, however, that she
said “cool” approximately 50 times. Overall, Megan reflected that “I expected to be much smoother…I really thought that by this point [at String Project] I had some way of forming sentences that came across coherent[ly].”

Megan was also concerned for the students’ missing materials. She noticed that multiple students did not have books on their stands. She stated, “I don’t understand what I thought was going to happen…nobody threw them a book or had them share or went over to them…no wonder they don’t know what I’m talking about.” At this point Megan exclaimed that she was “getting mad” regarding the fact that she failed to help the students with their lack of materials. She further noted, “I don’t seem to care…and I don’t know if I don’t care because I don’t have a book to provide them…or I am not aware because I didn’t move from the front [of the room].”

With concerns for missing materials, pacing, and clarity, Megan questioned her prior preparation for teaching this past class at the USCSP. Because of the master teacher, Megan felt that the “model was helpful”, but that she did not have enough time to prepare for the lesson. Usually teachers watched the master teacher and then immediately after taught their class. She stated, “so I know for sure I didn’t go home and learn the lesson before-hand.” She further reflected that she “should not have your nose in the book…especially when you are watching position and stuff.”

**Video as Stimulus**

Megan only had curiosity for the past video stimulus. She stated, “this is gonna be mind-blowing” and “I can’t even imagine what it is.” She reflected that she remembered recording her student teaching, but not her String Project experience.
PMTI Changes: Current and Past Video Stimulus

Similarities & Differences

Megan reflected on the similarities and differences of her current and past video stimulus. Regarding similarities, she discussed that she still maintains “positive energy” learning environment for her students. She stated that the overall difference between her current and past video stimulus was “[the] past didn’t seem to have a clear objective…we didn’t accomplish [the tasks at hand.]” Megan’s discussed how her current video stimulus is planned and organized and it is “pretty evident what we’re trying to do.” Concerning her lack of clarity in the past video stimulus, Megan stated that “I talk a lot in both videos, but I think my talking in the current one was useful.” Megan also noticed the way she chose to group students by gender during an activity in her past video. She stated, “people don’t want to be profiled by gender…I would never, now, call girl versus boy in grouping.”

Professional Development

Megan’s professional development involved self-assessment of her teaching. She commented that for diagnosing student learning she needs to “continue to walk around…and pay more attention when I walk…just try to catch every single kid and not let anybody fall through the cracks.” She also reflected that, “it would behoove me to talk less and try to get them to…just [be] more physical.”

Reflection

Regarding reflection, Megan discussed that she was currently “much more aware of what the children are doing…I have a much better, faster way of gauging whether something is going to be an enjoyable activity for them.” From the past video stimulus,
she noted the difference, “I opened a can of worms” when trying to discuss too much information in one class setting. She also reflected that she currently plans more and walks around the classroom throughout class. Thus, the past situation of students not having materials “would not happen” now. Megan regarded experience, time, and paying attention to students were the most influential in changing her teaching strategies.

Interview 2: Polly

Current Video Stimulus

Themes

The themes related to her current video stimulus included (a) teacher and student assessment strategies, (b) posture and physicality of playing a string instrument, (c) a structured yet adaptive teaching environment, and (d) effects of teacher personality. Throughout Polly’s observation and reflective narrative of the current video stimulus, she focused on assessment strategies that included teacher and student feedback, problem-solving, and accountability. Polly stated, “kids…are really eager, like little sponges” which makes them amenable to specific feedback regarding their playing, and “that helps encourage them…[they receive] instant feedback.” Polly also encouraged peer assessment and discussed how students learn to give feedback. At the beginning of the year, she stated, “they are so afraid to talk to each other…and they say that was good…I don’t think they’re used to giving feedback.” She encouraged them “not to be mean, but…to be honest…[and] if they weren’t doing it, then tell them when they were not doing it.” Polly’s overall goal for her students was to problem-solve within peer assessment and stated, “if [a student] can identify it on someone else then [they are] more likely to recognize it on [themselves].” She also stressed the importance of teaching
students to be accountable; she had an honor code for the students. She used this honor code for students’ electronic assignments regarding practicing and playing tests. Polly surmised, “Could you lie? Absolutely. Will I be able to tell, probably…[and] the whole point of it is just really goals and reflections.” Polly was adamant, while watching the current video stimulus and afterwards in her reflection, about the importance of feedback.

While watching the current video stimulus, Polly focused on the posture and physicality of her students. The video stimulus allowed her to notice weak muscles for the thumb and pinky shapes of students playing the violin. She mentioned, “you’d think they’d be stronger in 7th grade, too, but, like really, it’s still very weak.” Polly was very demanding about correct instrument position and stated, “I do harp on posture all year…I don’t ever stop thinking about posture.”

Polly also discussed that regardless of the current video stimulus, each of her orchestra classes had a structured environment. She stated, “there’s still the same structure, and there’s still…only 45 minutes of class…so keeping them moving and keeping them playing with no down time [is necessary.]” This structured environment maintained students’ attention and Polly noted, “I think that being able to keep the focus moving is also a strength.”

Within Polly’s structured teaching environment, she discussed her ability to adapt strategies for maximum student learning. She stated:

I think I’ve always been able to adapt…hearing it and knowing how to switch what I am doing…to address an issue rather than beating a dead horse and realizing hey this is not working. I am able to re-direct…which I think is pretty crucial for what we do.
Thus, even though all Polly’s orchestra classes were disciplined and required re-direction for maximum student learning, she concluded that, “they were laughing and interacting and talking… and they’re in an environment where they feel safe.”

Polly was aware that her personality could affect how students perceive her as a supportive teacher. After watching her current video stimulus, she stated:

I don’t smile a lot… I’m very serious… I have a sense of humor, and there are jokes here and there, but my personality is very sarcastic, dry, type of humor and I think sometimes I should smile, at least look, happy.

She discussed that it took time for her middle school-aged students to get to know her sarcastic personality. She was aware that her personality “can be perceived as rude,” but also was intentional about not upsetting new students who may not understand the sarcasm. Overall, she stated, “I always kind of feel like for the rest of your life you are around different personalities, and shouldn’t you have to learn to interact with them?”

**Video as Stimulus**

Polly’s discussion regarding the current video stimulus was about the lack of space in her teaching environment. She liked to move around and adjust posture concerns, but with her large-class sizes, she was unable to move from the podium. Thus, she had to adapt to her environment so that students noticed and gave feedback to their stand partners.

**Past Video Stimulus**

**Themes**

The themes related to Polly’s past video stimulus included (a) pacing within a structured learning environment, (b) the perception of weaker approaches for the three
PMTI aspects, and (c) student motivation. Polly observed, while watching the past video stimulus, that, “even though it was 20 years ago, early on, I had good pacing, there was never the down time.” She also discussed how she was able to respond to students’ playing as soon as they were done with each song. She indicated she had a plan of action for the lesson. Regarding student interaction, Polly noticed that the class was “a little more laid back,” but surmised that they were also elementary students versus her current middle school-aged students.

Polly observed all three PMTI aspects in her past video. For the didactical aspect, she stated, “the planning, execution, evaluation, teaching that’s obviously much weaker.” Instead of adapting to instruction she observed, “just a lot of playing through things…just not stopping to correct.” She stated:

That adapting really quickly thing is not as [developed]…I mean as soon as they stopped playing I was ready to say something and correct it, but [this] is not what I would do now…[now] if I heard something wrong I stop them when [I] hear it…it didn’t seem like…I was evaluating as it was happening…I was evaluating when it was done.

She positively noted that she walked around frequently to evaluate student performance, but there was less “fixing of things.”

Finally, Polly observed student motivation strategies from her past video stimulus. On the bulletin board was a pizza pie chart. She discussed that this tool was used as a motivation to practice for her students and said, “if everybody each week had something, we earned a slice of pizza on the wall, but if they made it to the full pizza then they got
pizza…I don’t know that they ever made it to the full pizza.” This form of motivation helped her to relate to individual students and their weekly actions.

**Video as Stimulus**

Polly’s response to the past video stimulus was one of wonder and stated, “I think this was cool and a little weird to see yourself 20 years ago…your 20-year-old self.” She noticed the motivational tool of the pizza on the board and reflected that she still had the pie chart in her teacher files. She also noticed that she was teaching a homogeneous violin class instead of her current heterogeneous orchestra classes.

**PMTI Changes: Current and Past Video Stimulus**

**Similarities & Differences**

Regarding similarities and differences in Polly’s current and past teaching, she stated, “it looks the same to me…the things that I talk about, the way that I address them.” She did notice, however, that she has changed with experience and her “planning, execution, evaluation…has grown stronger.” She stated, “each year you teach you learn different ways to do it and one year it works and the next year it doesn’t…and you just learn to adapt and not be afraid to try something new.” Even though Polly’s presence and personality were similar from current to past teaching, she discussed that she was still willing to adapt and try new strategies for teaching. Otherwise, she got bored. She stated, “well my base is bigger now…I’m able to identify things quicker and adjust them…I also don’t like to be stuck in a rut…I get bored really easily…I like to mix [teaching strategies] up.”
Professional Development

Because Polly perceived her current and past teaching to be mostly the same, she discussed her professional development as “I’m doing what I’m supposed to be doing.” She noted that even at the age of 20 she was “able to do well” and thinks she continues to be on the “right path” of her teaching journey. Polly’s strong personality has greatly influenced her current and past teaching. She states, “I think I am who I am…my personality dictates my teaching.”

Polly also discussed the importance of knowing oneself within her experiences of mentoring student teachers. She reflected upon a past discussion with a student teacher and stated, “sometimes you need to work out your personal stuff before you come in here because it’s a big part of who you are and what you become as a teacher.” For this study, she noted the affect that reflecting upon her current and past PMTI has had on future student teachers. She stated it was important to impart to student teachers that, “being you…and not mimic what I’m doing…and [not] be what they think you want [me] to be.” She stated, “I’ve had so many [student teachers] that come in, and they want you to tell them what to do.” She further discussed student teachers practicing various strategies and finding comfort in teaching the how. She conveyed the importance of lessons plans, but in a manner that encouraged multiple strategies for teaching a skill versus an overall order of teaching. She stated, “I think it’s more important to come in with a game plan of like five different ways to approach the same problem. So if ‘x’ happens, give me A, B, C [for] how you are going to fix it.”
Reflection

Overall, Polly reflected that (a) experience, (b) confidence in her personality, and (c) her ability to adapt, have influenced her perceptions of PMTI. With experience, she stated, “I can tell you ten different ways I would’ve [taught] that…it’s from having done it so many times that I know now [what to do].” Her strong personality, even as a young teacher, affected how she encouraged student teachers to understand themselves and find confidence in teaching. She stated, “You can’t teach someone to be confident…unfortunately…but I can teach someone to accept their personality and their version [of themselves].” Finally, Polly further reflected that she maintained an adaptive classroom environment and stated, “even if I wrote a script, I probably would be changing it as I go…I’m good at adapting.”

PMTI Ranking

Current PMTI Reflections

Caroline

Based on Interview 2, Caroline ranked her PMTI aspects as mostly didactical, followed by subject matter, and lastly pedagogical. Caroline struggled, however, to decide whether the subject matter or didactical aspect would rank first and noted, “yes I know the subject matter, but I’m really watching and evaluation and adjusting and questioning…they are so related.” Within the context of her current video stimulus, she stated, “I think this has a lot to do with process.” Her current video stimulus showed a large quantity of didactical and subject matter knowledge. She conveyed that “I feel like I can tell that I know the subject and I know the skills they need to do, [and] what I want them to accomplish.” She shared that these two aspects had developed greatly in recent
years of teaching and noted that she could quickly diagnose issues and implement strategies to use when students were struggling.

**Megan**

Based on Interview 2, Megan ranked her PMTI aspects as mostly pedagogical, followed by didactical, and lastly subject matter. Megan’s perception of the subject matter aspect is that “it certainly can’t stand by itself.” She surmised that her didactical sequence of teaching would not be successful if the subject matter was not “under your belt already.” Megan ranked the pedagogical aspect the highest because, although she internally thought she was like a “drill sergeant” in class, after watching her video she stated, “I’m pleasantly surprised…it feels homey and comfortable…without being slack…I think [the students] were engaged…it didn’t have that pressure cooker feeling.” Although Megan sometimes had internal feelings of panic while teaching, she argued that “it’s probably bad for my blood pressure, [but] it contributes to my work ethic…and make[s] sure that we have good goals.”

**Polly**

Based on Interview 2, Polly ranked her PMTI aspects as mostly didactical, followed by subject matter, and lastly pedagogical. Her PMTI ranking strongly related to her ability to adapt within her contextual teaching environment. As an illustration, she stated, “I know their strengths and weaknesses…I know what they can handle, how much they can handle...even if I’d done that with my first-period class it would’ve been different.” Although she ranked her current teaching as having strong didactical strength, she noted that, “I think [subject matter] is probably always the strongest with people…[because] subject matter doesn’t change.”
Past PMTI Reflections

Caroline

Based on the past video stimulus, Caroline ranked her PMTI aspects as mostly didactical, followed by subject matter, and lastly pedagogical. She reflected that she still saw the three aspects in her past video stimulus and stated, “I was pleasantly surprised...I was really curious to see if I had improved or what I used to be like, because we forget.” Caroline also mentioned that she really thought she knew her subject matter as a preservice teacher. In watching the past video stimulus, however, she reflected, “what’s funny is that’s not coming across as much.” Caroline knew she needed to “rotate around the room” and “check positions,” but she did not always have strategies for facilitating student knowledge. She stated, “I [had] these ideas about what the teacher was supposed to be doing, but also feeling like I didn’t always know what to do… I see a little of all that in [the past video].”

Megan

Based on the past video stimulus, Megan ranked her PMTI aspects as mostly pedagogical, followed by subject matter, and lastly didactical. Megan felt as though she did not have “much vision” regarding the long-term planning and sequence of teaching. She discussed how student teaching helped her envision a long-term progression of sequencing for students. She stated, “you see syllabi… handbooks… how they structure their concert.” She further implied that, although “disheartening,” perhaps her commitment to teaching at the USCSP lacked vision because she did not see the long-term effects of the students’ growth.
Polly

Based on the past video stimulus, Polly ranked her PMTI aspects as mostly subject matter, followed by the didactical, and lastly pedagogical. She ranked subject matter first for the beginning of her career because “I mean as a college student you’re…subject matter is fresh in your head.” She reflected that, “you’re playing a string instrument, it doesn’t matter what group…you’re teaching the same posture, the same book, the same skills…so that is the same…maybe the way that you teach changes.” She noted that teachers get “rusty” if they are not willing to constantly evaluate their teaching and look for various strategies to teach skills.

PMTI Rank Comparison between Interview 1 and Interview 2

USCSP-PSS ranked their current and past PMTI in both interviews. In Interview 1, the alumni ranked their generalized perceptions of PMTI, while in Interview 2, they based their ranking on current and past video stimulus. In Table 4.9, I indicated the alumnae’s current and past PMTI from Interview 1. In Table 4.10, I indicate the alumnae’ current and past ranking of PMTI based on watching their current and past video stimulus.

Caroline

During Interview 1, Caroline ranked the didactical aspect in third place for her current generalized perception of PMTI, but her perception changed when watching the video stimulus. Caroline stated that “I know why I answered that way [in the first interview], it’s because I really value pedagogical [aspects] as well…I really care about my students.” In Interview 2, Caroline ranked her current and beginning PMTI the same.
Table 4.9

*Interview 1 - Rank order for current and beginning career PMTI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Participant</th>
<th>Current Subject Matter</th>
<th>Beginning of career Subject Matter</th>
<th>Current Didactical</th>
<th>Beginning of career Didactical</th>
<th>Current Pedagogical</th>
<th>Beginning of career Pedagogical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10

*Interview 2 - Rank order for current and beginning career PMTI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualitative Participant</th>
<th>Current Subject Matter</th>
<th>Beginning of career Subject Matter</th>
<th>Current Didactical</th>
<th>Beginning of career Didactical</th>
<th>Current Pedagogical</th>
<th>Beginning of career Pedagogical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caroline</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polly</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In first place was the didactical aspect. She ranked the subject matter aspect as second and pedagogical third. Regarding her pedagogical strengths, Caroline felt that she was “definitely supporting [the students] emotionally” but she did not perceive this aspect as “number one.”
Megan

The rank of Megan’s PMTI changed between Interview 1 and 2 for both current and past teaching. Subject matter continued to rank in third place for Megan’s perceived current PMTI in both Interview 1 and 2. For Interview 1, however, she perceived subject matter and then the didactical aspect as more important. Regarding generalized ranking in Interview 1, Megan ranked pedagogical last. From the video stimulus in Interview 2, Megan perceived the pedagogical aspect as most important in rank for both current and beginning teaching. She generally perceived that the pedagogical aspect was least important in the beginning of her career for Interview 1, but after watching past video she surmised that it became the most important aspect. She stated that it “seem[ed] odd because it is so against how I generally would feel about this,” regarding her pedagogical aspect ranking change.

Polly

Polly is entirely consistent regarding her perceived ranking of PMTI between Interview 1 and 2 for both current and beginning teaching. She ranked her perceived current and beginning PMTI aspects the same both times. Between past and beginning teaching, however, she perceived the subject matter aspect as most important in beginning teaching, but currently views the didactical aspect as most important. Regarding the perceived change of the subject matter aspect to didactical aspect importance she stated, “it’s the same material, just a different way of approaching it.” From current to beginning teaching she perceived the pedagogical aspect as least important to her teaching. Overall, in watching the current and past video stimulus she noticed that, “It’s funny…there’s a lot of things that have not changed.” Polly regarded
her teaching as “pretty consistent…it’s stronger now, obviously, but I think I’m still the same kind of teacher…just [a] more experienced version of myself.” Polly stated that she has always been “authentic” and “comfortable” with her current and beginning teaching: “I just kind of respond and do it…and that’s impulse…I just do something because [I have always felt] confident about it and how to do it.”

**Focus Group**

For the last part of the qualitative portion of this study, USCSP-PSS alumnae provided narrative for the focus group data and questions (Appendix E). In the focus group, the alumnae not only verified thematic material from each section of the PMTI questionnaire in Interview 1, but also discussed the results of the quantitative data from the USSP-PMTIQ alumni. That narrative was helpful informing theoretical conclusions of the current study.

**Section 1: Demographics**

From the quantitative portion of the PMTI Questionnaire, I asked USCSP-PSS alumnae to discuss the results of the demographics of all USCSP-PMTIQ alumni and their schools. They discussed the fact that none of the alumni taught band. Caroline stated, “maybe that’s one of the reasons we’re still around…I think that people are asked to do too many things.” They also discussed that although band teachers apply to string positions, they may or may not be qualified depending on the level they are teaching. Caroline, Megan, and Polly also discussed how some of the alumni taught homogeneous classes. Megan wanted a homogeneous class to teach beginning students, but her school’s schedule would not allow for this type of class. Caroline stated, “it’s tough, we’re really pushed to have volume…they want lots of kids in your class[es]…they want more for
their buck.” The three alumnae also discussed how the amount of time they taught students each week affected their students’ progress.

Section 2 & 3: Current Analytical and Holistic Ratings of 3 PMTI aspects

After reviewing the definition of the three PMTI aspects, as well as reading the quantitative data from the analytical and holistic ratings from the PMTI Questionnaire, I asked Caroline, Megan, and Polly to share their thoughts on the quantitative analysis. Regarding the fact that USCSP-PMTIQ alumni perceived that their pedagogical aspects rated the highest, Polly stated, “I think every teacher thinks or wants to be in that category.” Caroline agreed that to be a pedagogical expert was “more encompassing” of “our role” as a teacher. She further stated, “you should be a caring person about the students that you are teaching…and [care about] what kind of people they are going to become.”

USCSP-PMTIQ alumni also indicated that, with teaching experience, their perceived holistic rating of didactical and subject matter aspects decreased slightly. From Caroline’s perspective, she stated, “I think you’re so focused on the subject [matter] when you first start teaching…and later you’re thinking how to teach.” Megan and Polly concurred that, with experience, one focused less on subject matter and didactical aspects. Polly stated, “those things…become second nature as opposed to your main focus…and then you’re about to do more of the pedagogical stuff.” Megan felt, with experience, you started to focus on the pedagogical aspect, and stated, “you start to get a vibe for what the spark is…they (the students) keep signing up…you have all the other factors that make your class enjoyable.”
Focusing on USCSP-PSS in Interview 1, I asked each alumna if they saw themselves as mostly a teacher or a music teacher. Two alumnae saw themselves as mostly teachers and one alumna saw herself as a music teacher. Megan and Polly did not feel that either were “mutually exclusive.” Polly stated, “a music teacher is more than just a teacher…I feel like to be a music teacher there is so much more going on…most music teachers are doing exponentially more than a classroom teacher.” The alumnae also discussed how they were event and financial planners. Polly noted that music teachers usually were able to teach students for multiple years and build relationships that a classroom teacher was not always able to do.

Next, I asked Caroline, Megan, and Polly to discuss the 5-point, holistic ratings of USCPS-PMTIQ alumni. Both Caroline and Polly stated that they were “not surprised” that the ratings were so close regarding the subject matter, didactical, and pedagogical aspects. Polly stated, I think that all of those things are so intertwined and related…it makes sense.”

When I asked why the pedagogical aspect was perceived as the most important, even at the beginning stages of teaching, all USCSP-PSS alumnae conveyed the similarities and differences of their current and past video stimuli. Caroline stated:

I’m surprised that [pedagogical aspects] would be higher because I really focused on what I was teaching…I feel like I’ve changed since the beginning because I used to put more emphasis on the other two (didactical and subject matter aspects)…I was very principled…and now I’m all about looking at the kids and constantly asking what do they need.
Polly, conversely, said, “I think that my thoughts as a teacher back then haven’t really changed a whole lot to now because I’ve always been pretty comfortable with how I taught…so for me that makes sense that they stayed the same.”

I also asked USCSP-PSS alumnae to discuss why USCSP-PMTIQ alumni rated the subject matter aspect more highly at the beginning of the careers. Megan stated, “it’s the least subjective…you can see it…it’s tangible…whether they (the teachers) are good at the other stuff or not.” Polly stated that the subject matter is “fresh” in your memory at the beginning of your career, too. The results of USCSP-PMTIQ alumni’s PMTI also showed, with experience, subject matter’s rating decreases. Caroline and Megan had two varying perspectives regarding this statement. Caroline stated that she still continued to learn subject matter and stated, “I was surprised by that…I feel like we know more, but maybe we don’t value it as much…we put subject [matter] on the back burner.” Megan, subsequently, regarded subject matter as, “the actual technical playing, and I would definitely say mine’s decreased because I can’t play and grow right now, I don’t have that kind of time.” Although Caroline viewed the subject matter aspect differently, she did agree that “it’s super common for people that are in education to lose skill as a musician or maybe develop new skills…I’m a better conductor than I used to be.”

USCSP-PSS alumnae agreed that their perceptions of their holistic ratings for PMTI during Interview 1 “made sense”. Polly stated that it’s the “whole experience” of teaching that shows the importance of all three aspects. Caroline agreed that we develop PMTI by “focus[ing] on the other things more and we have gotten better at them.”

For the final discussion of this section, I asked USCSP-PSS to convey how they could mentor future teachers. They discussed that future teachers should focus on (a)
knowing themselves, (b) developing confidence, (c) time management, (d) professional goals, and (e) the class structure within your personality as a teacher.

Section 4: Analytical Rating of 3 Influential Factors

After I shared the results of the influential factors (biographical, contextual, and experiential) from USCSP-PMTIQ alumni, Caroline, Megan, and Polly believed that experiential influences were most beneficial. Caroline stated, “we definitely learn by teaching.” Polly confirmed that “the experiences you had and what you took and learned from…that makes total sense…it is the most influential.”

Although personality was not a factor within the PMTI Questionnaire, it became a theme in the discussion with USCSP-PSS alumnae in Interview 1 and 2. Polly shared that with confidence in teaching, “you can let your personality be seen.” Caroline confirmed that “comfort” in teaching the subject matter helps “let your personality show through.” She concluded that, “I think personality is huge…if you don’t have a personality that kids are going relate [to], then it’s not going to work.”

Section 5: Ranking of PMTI

For the ranking of PMTI, I asked USCSP-PSS alumnae to compare their current and past PMTI rankings to USCSP-PMTIQ alumni in the quantitative portion of this study. Polly again discussed how the PMTI aspects “intertwine” and “go hand-in-hand.” She noted that that it was difficult to “say one was more important than the other.” USCSP-PSS alumnae also discussed how influential factors affected their PMTI rankings. All three talked about their focus of certain PMTI aspects changing when they changed schools or schedules changed at their current school. They also discussed financial burdens for student instrument and music needs.
Section 6: How does PMTI change over the course of a career?

I asked USCSP-PSS alumnae if they have changed and during which stage of their career cycle they had changed the most. Although Polly saw many similarities in her past and current teaching she stated, “I definitely evolved…but I think that a lot of my style and everything was the same and it was kind of creepy…it wasn’t as refined…so, yes, I’ve become…a more competent teacher…but it was still me…it was the same.” Caroline stated that teachers’ changing perceptions were like students learning and stated, “I think we all changed…just like the kids…sometimes we don’t see how much we’ve changed because we see ourselves day to day…but definitely things have changed for the better.” Alumnae agreed that watching video stimulus of their current and past teaching helped them better define their PMTI.

For Polly, a situation with a parent and student regarding playing tests influenced her teaching philosophy. Caroline’s PMTI changed based upon her school environment, her personal life, and various musical experiences that she has had for the past twelve years. Megan agreed about the influence of school environment. She stated, “I think there are too many [situations]” and that various experiences influenced her PMTI.

Finally, Caroline, Megan, and Polly discussed their ideal professional development for stringed instrument teachers. Polly stated, “Ideally I would love it to actually apply to me…or just be left alone.” Caroline confirmed that she would like professional development to be “relevant,” but that her ideal professional development would be “a lab with kids…like having them try new things…that would be cool.” Megan also perceived that active participation in professional development would be influential. She stated that she would enjoy “watch[ing] teachers teach…and I know
somebody’s got a great idea…if I could just see somebody…does it.” Although Caroline and Megan would enjoy active professional development, they also discussed that this takes energy and time in an already full schedule of work and life.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the perception of professional music teacher identity among stringed instrument teachers who are alumni of the University of South Carolina String Project (USCSP) preservice teacher education program. In this chapter, my intention, based on the triangulation of results from the mixed methods analysis, was to present a discussion encompassing (a) professional music teacher identity (PMTI), (b) the post-second stage career cycle of music teachers, and (c) video reflection as a tool for professional development. Following were the research questions of this mixed-methods study:

1) What are the self-defined professional music teacher identities of USCSP alumni?
   a. How do USCSP alumni rate the aspects (subject matter expert, didactical expert, or pedagogical expert) of their professional music teacher identities for their teaching practice?
   b. How do USCSP alumni rank the aspects of their professional music teacher identities for their teaching practice?
2) Have USCSP alumni changed their perceptions of their professional music teacher identities during their career cycles?
   a. Compared to the beginning of their teaching careers, what importance do USCSP alumni currently place on the aspects (subject matter expert, didactical expert, or pedagogical expert) of their professional music teacher identities?
   b. Compared to the beginning of their teaching careers, how do USCSP alumni currently rank the aspects of their professional music teacher identities?

3) What perceptions of professional music teacher identity do post-second stage (year 11–20) USCSP alumnae have when viewing a video stimulus of their current teaching?

4) What perceptions of professional music teacher identity do post-second stage (year 11–20) USCSP alumnae have when viewing a video stimulus of their preservice teaching?

Research Question 1: What are the self-defined professional music teacher identities of USCSP alumni?

Professional Music Teacher Identity: A Definition

Professional music teacher identity (PMTI) is defined as the continuous evolution of integrating personal and professional perceptions of becoming a good music teacher (Beijaard et al., 2004; Conkling, 2015; Garrett, 2013; Kerby, 1991). Music teachers’ perceptions of their PMTI is ever-changing dependent upon their receptiveness to professional development, and ability to adapt within their contextual environment.
Personality

A teacher’s personality directly affects PMTI. USCSP-PSS alumnae (Polly, Caroline, and Megan) discussed this influence throughout our interviews. Polly stated, “my personality dictates my teaching.” Caroline and Megan agreed that their unique personalities defined their PMTI. Canrinus et al. (2011b) regarded self-image and self-esteem as an indicator of PMTI. Confidence and authenticity of self are necessary factors for PMTI development and overall teaching success. Thus, to be authentic, one must know oneself. This concept, however, does not imply that one may or may not change over time. For the three PMTI aspects, depending upon influential factors, there may be a stronger focus at times on one aspect more than the other. A USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus stated that “planning” was a part of their personality regarding the didactical aspect of teaching. For the pedagogical aspect, a USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus stated, “show them you are human- that you make mistakes, that you have a sense of humor.”

Musician vs. Teacher

Stringed instrument music teachers’ identity includes being a teacher and a musician. Multiple researchers have discussed the role of being a musician versus a teacher regarding professional identity development within their contextual environment (Ballantyne et al., 2012; Isbell, 2008; Natale-Abramo, 2014; Russell, 2012). For this study, USCSP-PMTIQ alumni agreed that being a musician is part of teaching, but they do not always agree to what extent it is important. USCSP-PMTIQ alumni discussed (a) the dual importance of being a musician and teacher, (b) the importance of being a
teacher, and (c) the importance of subject matter regarding musicianship. Many USCSP-PMTIQ alumni indicated the importance of continued performance as a musician so that their students had a good role model. Regarding dual importance, a USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus stated, “understanding the subjects of BOTH music AND education are important.” Another alumnus discussed that regardless of current or past teaching, “I have tried to deliver the most authentic music education experience through my performance and teaching skills.” Regarding the importance of teaching, a USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus noted that even if a teacher is an expert in subject matter, as a musician, it does not mean that they are capable of teaching the subject. Another USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus stated, “you can be an expert of a subject in knowledge, but if you can’t demonstrate the concepts to the students, you have nothing.” Regarding the importance of musicianship, an USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus stated, “anyone can teach, but you have to know your subject matter.” While identifying as a musician and teacher is necessary for PMTI, there appears to be various interpretations of the balance between the two roles. Contextual situations may require the importance of one over the other, but regardless they are both influential within PMTI.

USCSP alumni regarded both the role of music and teacher as important; others discussed the difference between being a teacher and a music teacher. While a USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus indicated that it was important to teach music, not just teach, several other alumni considered themselves teachers more than music teachers. For USCSP-PSS alumnae, Caroline and Polly also viewed themselves as teachers first, but Megan perceived herself as more of a music teacher. With the overwhelming number of responsibilities for teachers in education, the act of teaching music, at times, is not at the
forefront for stringed instrument teachers. Looking at this issue from the perspective of music as a means for other learning, a USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus stated, “I view myself as an educator…[for students] to become independent learners, which will best serve them after they graduate…I achieve this through the tool of music.”

**PMTI Sub-Identities**

Prior researchers found that biographical, contextual, and experiential factors directly affect PMTI development (Austin et al., 2012; Beijaard et al., 2000; Goldie, 2013; Haston & Russell, 2012). USCSP-PMTIQ alumni perceived biographical factors as influential (83%). USCSP-PSS alumnae mentioned family, positive teachers in their childhood, and preservice teaching experiences as influential to their biographical factors. Although, biographical factors are perceived as influential, USCSP-PSS alumnae agreed that their personalities outweigh other peoples’ influences from the past or present. Therefore, other people influence our teaching, but they are not the greatest indicator of PMTI. Teachers’ PMTI must be reflective of their personality and self-identity, not the mirror-image of others.

USCSP alumni indicated the effects of becoming a parent as influential to the PMTI sub-identity. One USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus stated, “having my own kids ha[s] shaped my interactions with students.” While raising children may influence affective teaching, USCSP-PSS alumnae have a different viewpoint. Caroline, Megan, and Polly all have children under the age of 18. They agreed that being a teacher helps them be better parents. Caroline stated, regarding interactions with parents, that she was “much more forgiving of parents” now that she was one. Again, the biographical factor is only influential to the degree that it is reflective upon oneself.
The fluidity within the sub-identities is determined by teachers’ contextual situations (Bouuij, 1998; Russell, 2012). Multiple researchers have discussed the influences that the contextual teaching environment had on teachers’ PMTI sub-identities (Beijaard et al., 2000; Canrinus et al., 2011a; Natale-Abramo, 2014). USCSP alumni perceived contextual factors as influential (80%), regardless of career stage. USCSP-PSS alumnae regarded collaboration with colleagues and a working relationship with administrators as important within contextual influences. They also discussed how changing school or schedules within their school changed their teaching strategies and overall re-directed their focus within PMTI.

For the demographic data of the PMTI Questionnaire, I found that USCSP alumni who teach in rural schools have students with a significantly different lower socioeconomic status compared to those in suburban schools. I also discovered that over half of the USCSP alumni within the first stage of teaching (year 0–5) teach in a school where 60% or more of the population of students were on free or reduced lunch. Conway (2012) suggested that, with experience, music teachers’ adjustments to their contextual environments could improve. This study suggests that it is necessary to develop preservice teacher’s PMTI within various contextual environments to avoid attrition but also encourage their desire to teach in any contextual environment regardless of location or economic situation.

All USCSP-PMTIQ alumni indicated that experiential factors were most influential (90%), regardless of career stage. USCSP-PSS alumnae all discussed how experience influenced their changing perceptions of PMTI. Specifically, they discussed changes in classroom management, a variety of teaching strategies, a variety of methods
for organization, and reflection. Overall, USCSP-PSS alumnae discussed that their confidence and success in teaching was most influenced by experience. The current and past video stimulus verified that even when personality or good intentions regarding didactical strategies were not as successful in preservice teaching, these issues are now resolved as experienced teachers in the post-second stage of their career.

**Research Question 1a: How do USCSP alumni rate the subject matter aspects of their professional music teacher identities for their teaching practice?**

All USCSP-PMTIQ alumni rated their current subject matter as significant (87%) for their PMTI. Beijaard et al.’s (2000) study found that subject matter experts perceived an overall lack of effectiveness without this expertise. While the subject matter aspect is significant, it must intertwine with the other two aspects. Megan profoundly stated, “it can’t stand by itself.” For this study, USCSP-PMTIQ alumni noted that “mastery” of subject matter provides a basis for didactical applications and is fundamental to becoming a “great teacher.” An alumnus stated, “subject matter is the vehicle for a holistic education.” USCSP alumni concur with Beijaard et al.’s study, without mastery of subject matter the application of didactical and pedagogical aspects are not possible.

**Research Question 2a: Compared to the beginning of their teaching careers, what importance do USCSP alumni currently place on the subject matter aspects of their professional music teacher identities?**

USCSP-PMTIQ alumni rated subject matter as the most important aspect at the beginning of their career (92%). USCSP-PMTIQ alumni agreed that in the beginning of their career, it is crucial to understand subject matter. It is the “bulk of what you know” and it is “fresh” from university music education studies. There was a strong positive correlation between subject matter and experience. Between current and beginning teaching, however, there was a slight decrease in perceived subject matter importance.
Megan noted that subject matter is more “tangible” and the least “subjective” at the beginning of your career. Polly stated, “it’s the same material” and it becomes “second nature” over time, but she continues to adapt and develop different strategies for teaching the subject matter. Caroline also mentioned that at the beginning of teachers’ careers they focus on subject matter, but the didactical aspect of how to teach becomes more important, with experience. It is evident that learning one’s subject matter is imperative within preservice teachers’ education so that they have objective and verifiable skills when they begin teaching.

It is also evident that, with experience, subject matter should remain a primary focus to teaching as it becomes intertwined with didactical and pedagogical aspects of teaching. For current and past ranking, USCSP-PSS alumnae placed varying importance on the subject matter aspect. When watching their current and past video stimulus, they talked about subject matter aspects regarding their students’ performance. Caroline felt confident that she knows her subject matter, which has enhanced her overall didactical process of teaching for student success. She also shared that her subject matter knowledge has increased in the past few years from professional development and participating in her children’s stringed instrument learning. With experience, Megan, however, regarded subject matter as less important because she viewed it as her individual performance as a musician. Due to her daily schedule, her focus in not on performance, but on her job and being a parent.

Research Question 1a: How do USCSP alumni rate the didactical aspects of their professional music teacher identities for their teaching practice?

A USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus summarized the didactical aspect as, “we plan, then teach, then reflect, then adapt…over and over…this is something we do every day, every
class.” USCSP-PMTIQ alumni rated their current didactical expertise as significant (81%) for their PMTI. Although seemingly important, USCSP-PMTIQ alumni ranked the didactical aspect in third place for their current teaching, regardless of experience.

Although didactical expertise is seen as important by USCSP alumni, why is it ranked in third place? Perhaps teachers’ perceptions of who they want to be regarding PMTI and how they actually teach are different. Having video stimulus could help mitigate any uncertainty regarding perceptions of PMTI. During Interview 1, Caroline perceived the didactical aspect in third place, but the current video stimulus changed her perceptions; she mentioned that her teaching was very process-oriented but that she also really cares about her students. While process-oriented teaching was seen in the video stimulus, all the interactions with students were not captured. Polly ranked the subject matter aspect first at the beginning of her career but changed to the didactical aspect for her current teaching. Polly’s reasoning for the switch was founded on her ability to adapt the subject matter within her structured, didactical expertise. Based on current video stimulus, both Caroline and Polly ranked the didactical aspect in first place, and Megan ranked it second place. Megan and Polly also reflected on how all USCSP-PMTIQ alumni ranked the didactical aspect in third place and discussed how teachers with experience focus less on, yet become more comfortable with, subject matter and didactical aspects. If all USCSP-PMTIQ alumni had reflected on or watched video stimulus of their teaching before ranking their PMTI, it may have changed their perceptions.

USCSP-PSS alumnae regarded various strategies of teaching as a means for didactical expertise. Caroline regarded having multiple strategies and clear goals for her
students as necessary for their success. Caroline, Megan, and Polly discussed their ability to adapt their sequencing and strategies to further enhance students’ success. Their constant assessment of students was another important didactical criterion. Caroline’s high expectations of students ensued from her constant assessment of students. USCSP-PSS alumnae encouraged student-centered learning and have become facilitators of learning. Megan uses differentiation to mentor students at various levels. Polly focused on student and teacher-driven feedback and problem-solving strategies. Although all three teachers have various strategies for student excellence, they have reached didactical expertise by their willingness to adapt, try various strategies, and facilitate student-centered learning.

Research Question 2a: Compared to the beginning of their teaching careers, what importance do USCSP alumni currently place on the didactical aspects of their professional music teacher identities?

From the beginning of career to current teaching, USCSP-PMTIQ alumni indicated a slight increase in perceived importance of the didactical aspect. Also, at the beginning of their careers, USCSP-PMTIQ alumni ranked didactical expertise in second place; subject matter expertise ranked first. With experience, USCSP-PMTIQ alumni in the second stage (6–10 years) of their career cycle perceived the most growth in didactical expertise from the beginning to current teaching. It is evident that with experience in teaching in an authentic teaching environment, teachers’ didactical expertise increases. In the survival mode of the first few years of teaching, teachers in the second stage of teaching are able to experiment with various teaching strategies and assessments as they become more comfortable in their profession.
Beijaard et al.’s (2000) study found that didactical experts perceived lesson planning as necessary and had the ability to facilitate learning. USCSP alumni agree that it is necessary to plan and evaluate for student success, but they also stated, “it is not the end all be all of education,” “it’s not enough,” and it facilitates subject matter and pedagogical aspects. During the beginning of their careers, USCSP alumni established that lesson plans were important, but that their plans did not always work, and, with experience, they have found that the ability to “adapt”, “improvise”, and “expect the unexpected” is crucial. Although some USCSP alumni admitted to hating lesson plans, they discussed the value of planning and having “realistic short…and long-term goals for your students.” Regardless of the format of a lesson plan, all teachers need to have specific and measurable goals for students’ success. Preservice teachers are often write a lesson plan that focuses on sequencing and goals. While goals and sequencing are necessary for a structured class, it is also important to have multiple strategies for how to teach the goals. Preservice teachers should experiment with a variety of lesson plan formats that meet the needs of their learning how to teach as well as provide structure to student learning.

**Research Question 1a: How do USCSP alumni rate the pedagogical aspects of their professional music teacher identities for their teaching practice?**

One USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus summarized pedagogical expertise as “we are more than just teachers…we are guidance counselors, good listeners, a shoulder to cry on, and their friends when needed.” USCSP-PMTIQ alumni perceived their current pedagogical aspect as the most important aspect (93%). There was also a statistically significant difference for the pedagogical rating between the first to second career stage and post-second career stage. Thus, with experience, all USCSP-PMTIQ alumni perceived an
increase of importance of pedagogical expertise. One USCSP alumnus stated, “they don’t care how much you know unless they know how much you care.”

Beijaard et al.’s (2000) study found that pedagogical experts focused on ethical and moral aspects of teaching. The moral and ethical compass of teachers is quite strong, especially for music teachers who often teach their students for multiple years and have performances or practice outside of the school day. Orchestra is curricular and extracurricular within a school. All USCSP alumni focused their pedagogical expertise on the shaping of the “whole” child. One USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus stated, “it is vitally important that we recognize music education’s ability to shape a whole person- not just in physical acuity and musicality, but in spirit and character.” Many USCSP-PMTIQ alumni stated that it was important to teach children “life skills” and “how” to learn. One alumnus stated, “it is very important to me that through orchestra my students learn the importance of teamwork, persistence, and leadership.” Some USCSP-PMTIQ alumni noted that the subject matter could not be taught if they did not focus on the pedagogical aspect of teaching. Without teachers using their pedagogical aspects, some students not want to join the music community of Orchestra. Without teachers’ developing students’ life skills and independence of learning within pedagogical practices, didactical or subject matter aspects are not possible. Teachers have to be real and humane with students, they cannot be someone they are not.

All USCSP alumni also discussed safety and trust within contextual environments as indicators of pedagogical expertise. While USCSP-PSS alumnae agreed that they were role models for students, they discussed the need to understand the social-emotional development of their students to promote ability and confidence in their playing. As
discussed within sub-identities of contextual environments, the ability for teachers to adapt to their contextual setting mitigates attrition, but teachers are also aware that it helps alleviate student attrition, too.

**Research Question 2 a: Compared to the beginning of their teaching careers, what importance do USCSP alumni currently place on the pedagogical aspects of their professional music teacher identities?**

Although USCSP alumni, from the beginning to current teaching, perceived pedagogical aspects as important, the focus of their early teaching was on subject matter and didactical aspects of teaching. From the beginning of their career to current teaching, and with experience, USCSP-PMTIQ alumni indicated an increase (20%) in perceived importance of becoming a pedagogical expert. The highest growth occurred for teachers in their second stage (year 6–10). USCSP-PMTIQ alumni discussed that pedagogical aspects require experience in the classroom and take time. In Interview 1, USCSP-PSS alumnae ranked their perceived pedagogical expertise in third place. The video stimulus somewhat changed their beginning of career ranking. After watching past video stimulus, Megan switched her beginning of career ranking to first place, and Polly and Caroline’s ranking remained in third place.

Many teachers choose to teach because they want to shape the whole child and build life skills for their students. Several USCSP-PMTIQ alumni, however, stated that their university experiences were not able to inform pedagogical practice. One USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus mentioned that while the USCSP allows for initial student interactions, the pedagogical aspect takes time to develop. Preservice teachers begin student interactions within the authentic context environment of String Project and during student teaching. Only with experience are inservice music teachers able to build trust, eliminate
biases, and focus on student-centered learning. Preservice and inservice teachers hone that skill by having a strong philosophy of teaching and a level of maturity where they are able to focus on students rather than themselves.

Research Question 1b: How do USCSP alumni rank the aspects of their professional music teacher identities for their teaching practice?

Prior studies confirmed that most teachers are a combination of all three aspects of PMTI (Beijaard et al., 2000; Canrinus et al., 2011b). Even though teachers found differences within the perceived importance of subject matter, didactical, and pedagogical aspects, Mishler (1999) suggested that the better the relationship among them, the more effective the teacher. USCSP-PMTIQ alumni indicated the rank order for their current PMTI as a subject matter expert, a pedagogical expert, and a didactical expert. There was only a 1% difference between the subject matter and pedagogical aspect ranking, but didactical clearly ranked in last place. After watching current video stimulus, USCSP-PSS alumnae rankings were different from USCSP-PMTIQ alumni. Caroline and Polly ranked their PMTI as a didactical, subject matter, and pedagogical expert. Megan ranked her PMTI as a pedagogical, didactical, and subject matter expert. Having all USCSP alumni rank their PMTI verifies that every person’s perceived importance of the aspect regarding their PMTI varies dependent upon other influential factors and self-identity.

All USCSP alumni confirmed Beijaard et al.’s (2002) results- we are all a combination of the three aspects regarding PMTI. Caroline stated, “if you don’t know your subject matter…you can’t do all the planning and the execution and evaluation that you need.” A USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus also stated, “subject matter informs didactical and pedagogical aspects.” Caroline and Polly also stated that most teachers want to be perceived as pedagogical experts because it defines the role of what a teacher should look
like regarding compassion and commitment to students. Teachers’ PMTI, therefore, requires all three aspects to intertwine and inter-relate within experiences and influential factors to encourage teacher success and retention.

**Research Question 2b: Compared to the beginning of their teaching careers, how do USCSP alumni currently rank the aspects of their professional music teacher identities?**

USCSP-PMTIQ alumni indicated the PMTI rank order for the beginning of career teaching as a subject matter, didactical, and pedagogical expert. While USCSP-PMTIQ alumni perceived subject matter as the most important for current and beginning teaching, with experience, the importance of the pedagogical aspect increased. Also, with experience, USCSP-PSS alumnae agreed that one focuses less on subject matter and didactical aspects because there is more confidence within those aspects. The pedagogical aspect is then able to have more room for growth. Polly regarded her teaching as “authentic” and “comfortable” in the past and present but noticed that she “was a more experienced version” of herself.

**The Importance of Experience**

USCSP alumni agreed that in the beginning of their career the focus was on “what” they were teaching to students, but with time and experience, teachers change to a more “holistic” ideology of teaching.

With experience, all USCSP alumni discussed

- taking risks and developing new strategies;
- sequencing;
- internalizing instruction;
- student-centered independence in learning;
• long-term goals;
• reflection;
• adaptability within one’s contextual environment;
• creating positive classroom environments and behaviors;
• working with a diverse community; and
• a resiliency to deal with the unknown as influential to PMTI development.

These ten experiential influences could inform preservice and inservice teachers professional development that is practical and obtainable. Focusing on how to incorporate these factors within teachers’ contextual environments is imperative for retention and the elimination of teacher burn-out.

**Research Question 2: Have USCSP alumni changed their perceptions of their professional music teacher identities during their career cycles?**

A USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus perceived that all three aspects of their PMTI are equal and stated, “I do not identity with one more than the other.” Canrinus et al. (2011b) found that perceptions of teacher identity were similar between beginning and current stages of teaching. Similarly, USCSP-PMTIQ alumni indicated very minimal change in their perceived change in PMTI, regardless of experience. I also found no relationship between experience and perceived change of PMTI in the PMTI Questionnaire. USCSP-PSS alumnae disagreed with USCSP-PMTIQ alumni. While some USCSP alumni thought they had changed greatly, others perceived minimal change.

Beijaard et al. (2000) found that 69% of teachers perceived a professional identity change throughout their career. While this change was not evident in the results of the PMTI Questionnaire, USCSP-PSS alumnae agreed that with experience, the focus of the three aspects changes, regardless of PMTI rank. Polly felt that all three aspects are greatly
“intertwined and related.” Although Polly was consistent regarding rank for her current and past teaching, she still felt that, with experience, she changed regarding her competency and ability to adapt. Her personality, however, is the greatest influential factor of her PMTI. Caroline saw positive changes in her teaching; she has developed more strategies and awareness in her current teaching. She noted that her perceptions of PMTI is ongoing as she is constantly reflecting. Megan discussed that even though her pedagogical expertise is similar from past to current teaching, she has changed greatly within her didactical expertise. She also mentioned that, with experience, she has more awareness of children’s stringed instrument performance.

As a teacher who has taught for 13 years and definitely changed with experience, I was surprised by the results of this study regarding perceived changes in PMTI. I falsely assumed that all teachers change as they teach. What I have learned from this data is that while teachers’ perceived PMTI may or may not change, they still change within the three aspects. Some preservice teachers are confident in self and do not question their maturation in teaching. Regardless, they should be willing to question and reflect on better strategies for teaching or build better relationships with students. Teaching expertise within the three aspects should be encouraged throughout teaching career cycles.

**Research Question 3: What perceptions of professional music teacher identity do USCSP-PSS alumnae have when viewing a video stimulus of their current teaching?**

For USCSP-PSS alumnae, discussion of current video stimulus provided insights for how teaching experiences and reflection affected PMTI. Specifically, for the pedagogical aspect, they discussed that it developed over time. Overall, the three PMTI aspects interrelated as Caroline, Megan, and Polly reflected on their current video
stimulus. Caroline focused, pedagogically, on creating a positive learning environment but perceived her strengths in didactical and subject matter aspects concerning string pedagogy and constant assessment of teaching. Megan’s strength as a pedagogical expert included a focus on a positive learning environment and mentoring, but also included didactical strategies that incorporate differentiation and sequencing. Polly focused on how her personality affects her PMTI, but within the aspects she focused on her didactical expertise within a structured and adaptive contextual environment that encouraged self and peer-assessment. All USCSP-PSS alumnae are confident in their PMTI, but they still reflect and adapt to their contextual environment daily as they strive for expertise within the three aspects.

Research Question 4: What perceptions of professional music teacher identity do USCSP-PSS alumnae have when viewing a video stimulus of their preservice teaching?

All USCSP-PSS alumnae were intrigued by their past video stimulus from 20 years ago. From a pedagogical perspective, Caroline still was still interested in her students from her preservice teaching. Caroline focused on positive learning environments in current and past video stimulus. She also noticed that her past video stimulus was process-driven, lacked efficient pacing, and lacked feedback. She reflected that her “pacing and the flow of everything is so much better now.” Caroline is quite reflective in her teaching and felt that the past video stimulus was further justification of her growth and confidence in teaching. Caroline stated, “I think I knew I just wanted to keep getting better, and I still do.”

Megan’s response to the past video was quite negative and she noticed many issues with pacing and clarity. She shared that she may have had a lack of commitment to
her subject at such a young age, but also perceived in both current and past video stimulus that her pedagogical aspects ranked first regarding “positive energy” with students. Megan reflected that unlike the past video stimulus, her current teaching is sequenced and organized, with a clear plan of action. In the past video she tried to teach too much information at one time and that she regarded that with experience she has changed since her preservice teaching.

Polly focused on structured learning environments in current and past video stimulus. She also felt her assessment of students was weaker than her current teaching, but she still tried to motivate her students to practice. Overall, even in the past, Polly was authentic and comfortable in her teaching regarding the three PMTI aspects. With experience, however, she stated, “each year you teach you learn different ways” or strategies “and you just learn to adapt…not be afraid to try something new…and mix things up.” USCSP-PSS alumnae learned from their past video that they are stronger and more confident teachers from 20 years ago. Even though some aspects of their teaching are still the same, they all agreed that with experience, reflection, and adaptability to contextual environments, they have changed regarding their PMTI.

**Evolution of USCSP**

Not only have USCSP alumni changed from their past preservice teaching experiences, but this authentic context model has also evolved over the past 20 years. USCSP-PMTIQ alumni indicated that the USCSP was highly influential to their university experience (82%), but they rated methods and pedagogy classes along with student teaching as notably less influential (21–24%). Caroline felt that the USCSP enabled her to have experience teaching before student teaching and provided her more
confident in her first job; she stated, “it’s invaluable.” Caroline and Polly also discussed that all preservice teachers should have the opportunity to teach at a String Project. USCSP-PSS alumnae stressed the importance for the development of their teaching methods at the USCSP.

Within Caroline and Megan’s past video stimulus they discussed the possible influence of the master teacher on their teaching strategies. Caroline and Megan both discussed positive and negative influences of watching the master teacher. They could not remember how much of the lesson plan was theirs or the master teachers. Even though both Caroline and Megan were teaching beginning classes at the time, their instruction was varied. Caroline stated that she would have modeled her lesson after the master teacher, but it was still her teaching. Megan discussed how the master teacher model was helpful, but there was no time to prepare and reflect for her lesson after observing the master teacher. Megan also discussed the lack of awareness for preparing long-term goals for students at the USCSP and how student teaching facilitated this need. Overall, the master teacher may model for the preservice teachers and provide strategies for teaching, but preservice teachers still have to make it idiomatic when teaching in an authentic context environment. The USCSP model is still an invaluable and safe preservice teacher education program.

Currently there are two graduate students and a director at the USCSP who facilitate the needs of preservice teachers. They conduct the orchestras, provide managerial tasks for the program, and observe group classes. Instead of a master teacher who preservice teachers observe and then model after instruction, group class teachers are provided specific lesson plans, a curriculum, and have feedback from the graduate
assistants or director after every class. Group class preservice teachers are also required to reflect on their teaching within their methods practicum course. Many times, the group classes are also co-taught by preservice teachers. This gives them the opportunity to collaborate early in their career and learn from each other. The USCSP also established a partnership with a local elementary school five years ago. The principal of this school provides instruments and registration costs for two years of instruction at the USCSP. This collaboration has allowed preservice teachers the opportunity to work with students who live within lower socio-economic statuses and who would otherwise not be able to afford instruction.

**Implications for Preservice Authentic Context Learning**

Past research shows positive outcomes of preservice teachers’ involvement in long-term, authentic context teaching environments that include confidence and responsibility of teaching experiences that influence PMTI development (Goldie, 2013; Haston & Russell, 2012). Preservice teachers acquire skills and strategies in methods classes for how to teach subject matter and didactical aspects. One USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus stated that music education programs focus on subject matter and didactical applications. Methods classes specific to content area only cover two to four semesters of a music education’s curriculum. Preservice teachers need a combination of methods courses that encourage growth within subject matter and didactical aspects along with practical applications in an authentic context learning environment that provide opportunities to develop all three aspects of PMTI. Overall, this authentic context environment encourages preservice teachers to take risks and begin to develop their own
PMTI while modeling after master teachers and developing various strategies to teach within a structured environment.

Preservice teachers are not only defining roles of identity within their teacher identity, but also their musician identity. Ballantyne et al. (2012) concluded that a variety of authentic context experiences positively affect preservice teachers’ perception of their roles as a musician and teacher regarding PMTI development. Providing preservice teachers diverse authentic context experiences could eliminate uncertainties for teaching in rural or urban communities with students who have a variety of cultural and socioeconomic statuses. One USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus stated their USCSP contextual environment was quite different from the student population of their first school. Another USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus stated that USCSP students want to learn how to play a stringed instrument, but that in a public school setting some students are not interested in learning their instrument. Preservice teachers teaching in authentic context learning (ACL) environments will not eliminate all uncertainties in teaching. Preservice teachers’ experiences within a variety of contextual environments, however, should develop strategies and insights that mitigate attrition and encourage teaching in diverse communities throughout the country.

Preservice teachers who participate in ACL environments such as the String Projects, not only establish their PMTI, but regard reflection as necessary. Teacher reflection promotes lifelong learning (Campbell et al., 2012). As one USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus said, “music is the means in which I am able to shape the next generation.” Caroline, Megan, and Polly reflected on what future stringed instrument teachers should focus on regarding their past experiences and work with student teachers. They agreed
that preservice teachers should focus on (a) identity, (b) developing confidence, (c) time management skills, (d) professional goals, and (e) how personality influences the classroom environment. Regarding identity and confidence, Polly stated, “we’re all different people, we have different strengths and weaknesses, and [preservice teachers] have to learn to work with those rather than try to fit into some mold.” Caroline stated, regarding professional goals, “pick the sword you are gonna die on…it’s easy to get sidetracked on things that are not important.” Regarding confidence, Caroline and Polly reminded preservice teachers that they need to be kind and forgiving to themselves and not take everything personally. Megan talked about how personality and knowing oneself influences the classroom environment. She stated that preservice teachers should “structure [their] class around what [they] visualize [their] ideal classroom instead of just trying to teach them music.” The insights of these USCSP-PSS alumnae are astute. Although preservice teachers may not heed the advice of such experienced teachers until they have experiences themselves, it is valid to share these reflective insights with preservice teachers as they begin to reflect on who they are and want to become regarding their PMTI.

**Implications for Inservice Professional Development**

Several USCSP-PMTIQ alumni discussed the importance of continued professional development. Professional development for inservice teachers requires (a) self-awareness, (b) reflection, (c) collaboration with colleagues, and (d) relevancy to the music profession. Regarding self-awareness, one USCSP-PMTIQ alumnus said, “it’s okay to not know something.” Another stated, “don’t be scared to branch out of your comfort zone.” This self-awareness helps teachers collaborate with colleagues and seek
out new opportunities for professional development, whether as a musician or a teacher. Continued experiences are fundamental to professional development within teacher identity development (Eraut, 1994). Likewise, USCSP-PMTIQ alumni discussed the need for constant self-assessment or reflection to benefit students’ success. An alumnus stated, “reflecting and evaluating is vital to keeping up with changing students and society.” Thus, to remain relevant to students, teachers’ professional development is imperative. USCSP-PMTIQ alumni negatively reflected that many professional development meetings were a waste of time and not action-based. While many schools focus on test scores and action plans that constrict creativity in learning and teaching, music teachers find professional development within their schools as non-effective and difficult to implement within their contextual environment. School districts with fine arts coordinators that provide relevant professional development to music educators is necessary to mitigate teacher burn-out, reduce complacency regarding implementing new ideas in the classroom, and increase relevancy to students’ evolving educational needs. With provided professional development, inservice teachers’ must also have a willingness to reflect and adapt their teaching throughout their career to maintain their PMTI.

**Video Reflection**

Tripp and Rich (2012) stated researchers have studied research involving video stimulus and teacher reflection only since the 2000s. Few researchers have studied video reflection within PMTI. Campbell et al. (2012) argued that analyzing beginning and current teaching video stimulus experiences is necessary for significant and applicable professional development as well as PMTI development. In this study, USCSP-PSS
alumnae used current and past video stimulus as a “non-verbal question” that stimulated a “critical reflection” (Tobin & Hsueh, 2007, p. 78, 79). Megan stated that watching teaching video stimulus with reflection gives “a sense of positive calm because teachers are thinking so fast [in the moment].” Thus, without video reflection teachers may have varying perceptions of their teaching because they are not able to take adequate time to reflect in the moment. USCSP-PSS alumnae noted that watching video stimulus of current and past teaching helped them better define their PMTI. Their reflection within the three aspects was a necessary part of perceiving one’s PMTI. They noted, however, that taking the time to further reflect in the future on PMTI could be difficult within their busy schedule. Megan suggested that although current and past video stimulus was used to self-assess, it could also be used to assess students. I suggested that teachers could enhance their professional development through collaboration with colleagues. They might watch live classes via Facetime, Skype, or Google Hangout and receive feedback from each other—students and teachers. With video technology, the possibilities of professional development via self or peer-reflection and assessment is vast.

Administrators should begin to use video stimulus as an assessment tool for further enhancing inservice teachers’ professional development. Conversely, teachers should take the time to implement video stimulus as an assessment tool for reflection with self and students.

Post Second-Stage Music Educators

Conway and Eros (2016) stated the “specific topic of post-second stage teachers has not been addressed (p. 10).” While there is research on music education first stage teachers (Conway et al., 2015), and emerging for second stage teaching (Conkling &
Eros, 2016; Eros, 2009, 2013), there are no studies regarding post-second stage teaching (Conway & Eros, 2016). With regard to the lack of research for post-second stage music educators, I chose to focus the qualitative portion of this study on the PMTI perceptions of USCSP-PSS alumnae.

USCSP-PSS alumnae discussed that with experience they are seemingly ignored, but still expected to continue pursuing excellence in their field. Caroline stated, “teaching is a really hard job” and relayed that there is a lack of praise for quality teaching. Without reflection and adaption of strategies Polly stated, “people get a little rusty.” Megan discussed her rigorous assessment from administration throughout the year. With experience, USCSP-PSS alumnae have gained expertise in their field and learned to adapt to various contextual situations yet they all agree that they continue to change and seek excellence in their field. Caroline, however, was worried about sustainability as she continues to have high expectation for herself and maintain a work-life balance. She stated, “I want to be one of those teachers who makes it 30 plus years…I don’t know if I can keep on this pace and be sane and have the family.” Researchers have concerns about attrition for first and second stage teachers, but they sustainability and burn-out factor for post-second stage teachers is also a legitimate concern. Thus, post-second stage teachers need relevant professional development and opportunities to share their expertise with others.

Caroline, Megan, and Polly discussed their ideal post-second stage professional development for stringed instrument teachers. Polly stated, “Ideally I would love it to actually apply to me…or just be left alone.” Caroline confirmed that she would like professional development to be “relevant,” but that her ideal professional development
would be “a lab with kids…like having them try new things…that would be cool.”

Megan also perceived that active participation in professional development would be influential. She stated that she would enjoy “watch[ing] teachers teach…I know somebody’s got a great idea…if I could just see somebody…[model] it.” Although Caroline and Megan would enjoy active professional development, they also discussed that this takes energy and time in an already full schedule of work and life.

Administrators may not have adequate tools to provide specific feedback to post-second stage teachers. They would prefer to learn from others in their field and share strategies within their profession. While they try to collaborate with other colleagues in other fields, their expertise in stringed instrument instruction warrants string-specific professional development.

With their experience and expertise, post-second stage teachers should have opportunities to share their knowledge with colleagues not only in the post-second stage, but within various career stages. Post-second stage teachers’ strategies and advice for how to teach would be priceless information for preservice and first stage teachers. Post-second stage teachers should be given more opportunities to be cooperating teachers and mentor first stage inservice teachers. Their shared reflection of past experiences is professional development for post-second stage teachers as well as first stage teachers.

Polly discussed having a cooperating teacher and stated, “you can’t teach someone to be confident…but I can teach someone to accept their personality.” Therefore, Polly’s encouraging her student teacher to know who they are and develop their personality within their teaching was a vital part of building confidence for a preservice teacher. Post-second stage teachers should have multiple opportunities, built into their work
schedule, that allow for adequate professional development that also mentors preservice and inservice teachers. Their expertise is invaluable for our profession.

**Limitations**

Limitations of this study included (a) low internal consistency within Section 2 of the PMTIQ, (b) small sample size, and (c) a cross-sectional analysis of data within current and past perceptions of PMTI. Section 2, the analytical rating of the three aspects, of the PMTIQ had low internal consistency for the pilot study ($\alpha = .45$) and the current study ($\alpha = .58$). Section 3, the analytical rating of influential factors, had acceptable internal consistency ($\alpha = .72$). While both sections were designed to quantify perceptions of PMTI, perhaps the aspects are so intertwined and related that their correlations show low internal consistency between different aspects. Although I had over a 50% response rate for the PMTIQ, I still had a fairly small size ($N = 33$). Perhaps future studies could incorporate alumni from other String Projects, with similar preservice authentic context learning environments, across the country. A higher sample size could increase overall reliability of the PMTIQ. Finally, I conducted this fixed mixed methods study as a cross-sectional analysis of data with USCSP alumni. Although I was asked participants to reflect on current and past teaching, both in the PMTIQ and using current and past video stimulus, this was still within a fixed point in time. Looking back and reflecting upon preservice or teaching at the beginning of one’s career is important to show change and professional development, but a longitudinal study with USCSP alumni could be another way to show evolution of PMTI.
Conclusions

USCSP alumni’s perceptions of PMTI is continuous and ever-changing within personal and professional perceptions of self. Their PMTI requires receptiveness to professional development and the ability to adapt within their contextual environment. An awareness and adaptability of: (a) personality, (b) role as musician and teacher, and (c) sub-identities (biographical, contextual, and experiential influences) affected USCSP alumni’s PMTI throughout all career stages.

In music education, there remains a lack of focus on the various stages of teaching (Conway, 2012), and few researchers have focused on the career cycle within multiple stages (Campbell & Thompson, 2007; Eros, 2013; Goldie, 2013). The String Projects and other preservice ACL environments have the potential to provide researchers opportunities for longitudinal studies within preservice and inservice career stages. Knowing how music teachers continue to develop their PMTI within all career stages may offer insight on professional development strategies as well as mitigate attrition within the profession. Too often researchers focus on the time frame of teacher burn-out and attrition. We should instead provide continual means for reflection and relevant professional development across career stages.

What type of professional development is relevant to music educators? USCSP-PSS discussed how relevant professional development should include technology and active participation in developing new strategies for teaching. Technology has the potential to provide practical applications of professional development through reflection on video stimulus or streaming live footage of music teachers’ classes and rehearsals for
assessment and collaboration. This professional development should include music teachers across all career stages for increased collaboration of practical knowledge.

Regarding professional development, what importance should music teachers place on the three aspects of PMTI (subject matter, didactical, and pedagogical)? USCSP alumni discussed the importance of knowing one’s subject matter to be a successful teacher, but they also noted the importance of intertwining all three aspects. Without didactical strategies for teaching and assessment or pedagogical encouragement of students’ developing life skills, knowing one’s subject matter is only part of the whole for successful teaching. Music teachers need to reflect and self-assess if one aspect is lacking from another. Does this affect their teaching and students’ success? Perhaps not, due to experiential and contextual influences, but the process of continuous reflection regarding PMTI aspects and influential factors is necessary for music teachers.

Does music teachers’ PMTI change? While half of USCSP-PMTIQ alumni felt that it was the same at the beginning of their career compared to their current teaching, the process of changing is more complicated than just stating one’s PMTI is the same or different. USCSP-PSS alumnae provided specifics regarding changed PMTI. They discussed how experience, knowing oneself, adaptability, and reflection are necessary for changing perceptions of PMTI. Regardless of the ranking order for one’s PMTI within current or past teaching, music teachers will change with experience. Music teachers’ success lies in their understanding of how their personality affects instruction and how to constantly adapt within their contextual environment.
REFERENCES


APPENDIX A

IRB APPROVAL LETTER

OFFICE OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD FOR HUMAN RESEARCH
APPROVAL LETTER for EXEMPT REVIEW

Elizabeth Reed
School of Music
Music Education
813 Assembly Street
Columbia, SC 29208

Re: Pro00067071

This is to certify that the research study, “Professional Music Teacher Identity Evolution: A Mixed Methods Approach with Stringed Instrument Teachers,” was reviewed in accordance with 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2), the study received an exemption from Human Research Subject Regulations on 5/12/2017. No further action or Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight is required, as long as the study remains the same. However, the Principal Investigator must inform the Office of Research Compliance of any changes in procedures involving human subjects. Changes to the current research study could result in a reclassification of the study and further review by the IRB.

Because this study was determined to be exempt from further IRB oversight, consent document(s), if applicable, are not stamped with an expiration date.

All research related records are to be retained for at least three (3) years after termination of the study.

The Office of Research Compliance is an administrative office that supports the University of South Carolina Institutional Review Board (USC IRB). If you have questions, contact Arlene McWhorter at arlenem@sc.edu or (803) 777-7095.

Sincerely,

Lisa M. Johnson
IRB Assistant Director
APPENDIX B

PILOT STUDY ANALYSIS OF THE PROFESSIONAL MUSIC TEACHER IDENTITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Following are the results of the PMTI Questionnaire pilot study. For the second section of the PMTI Questionnaire, participants answered 18 Likert-scale questions regarding the three PMTI aspects (subject matter expert, didactical expert, or pedagogical expert) about their music teaching. Table A.1 shows the analysis for perceived importance of the three aspects.

Table B.1

*Likert-scale analysis of 3 PMTI aspects.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Stages</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Subject Matter</th>
<th>Didactical</th>
<th>Pedagogical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( M (SD) )</td>
<td>( M (SD) )</td>
<td>( M (SD) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants in All Stages</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3.24 (.26)</td>
<td>3.35 (.29)</td>
<td>3.84 (.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Stage (0–4 yrs.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.27 (.76)</td>
<td>3.11 (.5)</td>
<td>3.83 (.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Stage (5–10 yrs.)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.33 (.53)</td>
<td>3.67 (.3)</td>
<td>3.89 (.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Second Stage (11+yrs.)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.22 (.29)</td>
<td>3.33 (.25)</td>
<td>3.83 (.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows all participants perceived the pedagogical aspect highest, 96%. Although the overall didactical matter was at 84%, second stage teachers perceived this aspect 14%
more important than first stage teachers, and 9% more important than post-second stage teachers. All participants perceived subject matter and didactical matter similarly, with only a 3% difference. A Cronbach’s alpha analysis for the internal consistency of the Likert-scale questions \((n =17)\) was \(\alpha = .446\). One of the questions regarding the subject matter aspect asked participants to write the top three university experiences that were most influential in their teaching. Student teaching, field experience, string pedagogy, and methods were most influential. Regarding musicianship, participants noted that conducting, performing in the symphony, and private lessons were more influential in their teaching today.

The third section of the PMTI Questionnaire measured influential factors and asked participants to indicate to what extent they agreed with statements about their job. There were 28 Likert-scale questions that compared the three influential factors (contextual, experiential, or biographical). Table A.2 shows the analysis for perceived importance of the three influential factors. All participants perceived that experiential factors averaged 90%, biographical factors averaged at 83%, and contextual factors averaged 79%. Within first stage teachers, biographical factors proved varying as the average was 82%, but the standard deviation was .97. Likewise, for second and post-second stage teachers, the standard deviation ranged from .68–.69. A Cronbach’s alpha analysis for the internal consistency of the Likert-scale questions \((n =28)\) was \(\alpha = .609\).
Table B.2

*Likert-scale analysis of 3 influential factors.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Career Stages</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
<th>M (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants in All Stages</td>
<td>3.16 (.51)</td>
<td>3.59 (.29)</td>
<td>3.33 (.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Stage (0–4 yrs.)</td>
<td>3.30 (.67)</td>
<td>3.48 (.29)</td>
<td>3.29 (.97)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Stage (5–10 yrs.)</td>
<td>3.03 (.72)</td>
<td>3.48 (.29)</td>
<td>3.42 (.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Second Stage (11+yrs.)</td>
<td>3.15 (.51)</td>
<td>3.59 (.29)</td>
<td>3.33 (.70)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In section four, participants rated their current PMTI based on the three PMTI aspects out of five-star rating scale, one being the lowest and five the highest. One of the participants completed only 75% of the questionnaire, thus for the final section, there are only seventeen participants (N = 17). Table A.3 shows the analysis for the five-star rating of participants’ current PMTI.
In the rating, participants rated subject matter highest at 92%, while they rated pedagogical aspects at 89%, and didactical aspects at 82%. The two second stage teachers rated pedagogical matter with a 5-star rating. First stage teachers \((n = 3)\) rated didactical matter rather low, 53% compared to 80% in second stage teachers \((n = 2)\) and 87% in post-second stage teachers \((n = 12)\).

Also, in Section 4, I asked participants to rank their current PMTI using the three aspects. Table A.4 shows the analysis for the rank order of participants’ current PMTI. Most participants ranked subject matter first, while the pedagogical and didactical aspects followed. In contrast, second stage teachers ranked pedagogical matter first and subject matter tied with didactical aspects. Overall, participants ranked didactical aspects third in perceived importance of PMTI.
Finally, in section 4, I asked the participants if their current PMTI was the same at the beginning of their career, regardless of their prior teaching experience. 53% perceived their current PMTI to be the same as their beginning PMTI, while 47% perceived their PMTI changed over time. None of the first or second stage teachers perceived their current PMTI had changed over time. Only post-second stage teachers noted a change in their current PMTI.

The post-second stage teachers that noted a difference in their PMTI over time still ranked subject matter as the number one aspect in PMTI, while pedagogical and didactical aspects tied in second place.

Within the post-second stage teachers beginning teaching perceptions ($n = 6$), 100% ($M = 5$) rated the didactical aspect highest, while subject matter was 93% ($M = 4.14$), and pedagogical matter was 77% ($M = 3.86$). Post-second stage teachers perceived a 16% increase in importance for pedagogical aspects and an 18% decrease in didactical
aspects from the beginning stage of teaching to their current stage. The subject matter aspect did not significantly change and was rated as significant in both past and present teaching for PMTI.

After current and past rating of PMTI, I asked participants to justify their answers via opened-ended response. For subject matter justification participant responses included: (a) “vital to teacher success,” (b) “passion for subject matter drives a need for knowledge, executed through skills,” (c) “it is essential to know your subject matter in order to effectively teach your students,” (d) Your learning is never done….There’s always more subject matter to learn,” and (e) “If I am interested and passionate about the content, that shines through to the students and can hook them.”

For didactical justification participant responses included: (a) “I see many teachers who have tremendous subject matter knowledge, but who cannot assess students and give them productive feedback to improve,” (b) teachers who are ready to plan, execute, and evaluate are more efficient and burn out less often than those who do not,” (c) you need to be able to re-evaluate your teaching style/method,” (d) evaluations are not an end point, but a pivot,” and (e) a good teacher needs a TON of ideas ready to go at a moments notice….I have learned not to be afraid to try new things.” Some justifications for why participants stated that didactical matters were not as important as the other two aspects included: (a) “this is equally import but harder to do if you do not have knowledge of the instruments,” (b) “even planning will not help an ineffective teacher,” (c) “I do not plan a lot for my classroom….creative ways to teach on the spot,” (d) “not all lesson plans work….it is frustrating when you think you have a great lesson and it
works with one class but not another,” and (e) “some things that are not the same priority as in the non-music classrooms.”

For pedagogical justification participant responses included: (a) “I teach people. Music is the instrument that help me accomplish that goal,” (b) “my goal is to help them have a ‘beautiful heart,” (c) “NOTHING is more rewarding than when a student comes back and tells you that you were the most influential person in their life,” (d) “your caring and guidance has shaped them,” and (e) “it is not always about the music. There will be days when students just need to be heard and loved. The old adage- they won’t care unless they know how much you care.” Some justifications for why participants stated that pedagogical matters were not as important as the other two aspects included: (a) “avoid power struggles,” (b) crucial to a young string player that all aspects of string pedagogy are displayed and embedded in every lesson plan”, (c) “I try to focus on the content in my classroom,” (d) “We can help with the moral and emotional development of our students through carefully planned and executed lessons. This aspect comes across if the others are taken care of.”

One complication with the pilot study included an uneven balance between career stages for first ($n = 3$) and second stage teachers ($n = 2$) to that of post-second stage teachers ($n = 12$). Data for the pilot study may be affected due to sample size. Positive participant comments, however, regarding the questionnaire included: “Such an interesting subject, I never sat down and analyzed what makes up my teacher identity before” and “It made me think about things I hadn't before or, at least, in a long time.”
APPENDIX C

PROFESSIONAL MUSIC TEACHER IDENTITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Original Format on SurveyMonkey

Section 2 and 3 convey the aspect or influential factor for each question.

Introduction

Objective:
To obtain insight into the way music teachers perceive important areas of their profession.

What you gain:
Inservice music teachers reflect on their professional identity.

Results will show how music teachers perceive themselves based on 3 aspects of teaching.

Layout:
The questionnaire consists of 4 sections. Most of the questionnaire consists of statements in which you can specify whether they apply to you or to what extent you agree with these statements.

Time:
It should take about 30 minutes to complete.

Thanks so much for your time; I know it is precious. I will make results available when all questions are analyzed; stay tuned!
Section 1: Demographics

1) What is your gender?
   Female
   Male
   Other (please specify) *(Fill in blank)*

2) What is your age?
   *(Fill in blank)*

3) Do you have any children under 18 living in your household?
   Yes
   No

4) What is your main instrument?
   *(Drop down menu)*
   Violin
   Viola
   Cello
   Bass

5) List the full name of your college/university (if more than one please list in chronological order):
   *(Fill in blank)*

6) Year degree/s received (in chronological order):
   *(Fill in blank)*

7) What is the highest degree you hold?
   Undergraduate
   Master’s
   Master’s +30
   Doctorate
   Other (please specify if you have more than one degree and what they are)

8) How many years have you been in the music teacher profession?
   *(Fill in blank)*

9) How long have you been in your current position?
   *(Fill in blank)*

10) I teach at a ____ school.
    *(Drop down menu)*
    Public
    Private
11) Approximately, what percent of your school population receives free or reduced lunch?
(Drop down menu)
- 0-20%
- 20-40%
- 40-60%
- 60-80%
- 80-100%

12) Your school is located in a ____ area.
(Drop down menu)
- Rural
- Suburban
- Urban
- Other (please specify) (Fill in blank)

13) Subject you currently teach. (Check all that apply).
- Orchestra
- Band
- Choir
- Guitar
- Piano
- Higher Education
- Theory/History
- Other (please specify) (Fill in blank)

14) What types of music classes do you teach? (Check all that apply.)
- Homogeneous (one type of instrument/voice)
- Heterogeneous (multiple types of instruments/voices)
- Private lessons
- Lecture

15) What other positions or roles do you have at your school?
(Fill in blank)

16) List any music performance groups in which you currently participate.
(Fill in blank)
Section 2: Statements regarding your job.
Indicate to what extent these statements apply to yourself as a teacher/music educator.
1- Never 2- Sometimes 3- Often 4- Always

1) (Pedagogical) I serve as a role model for how students should interact with each other.

2) (Didactical) I use a variety of teaching methods in my classes.

3) (Pedagogical) I encourage positive interactions between students.

4) (Subject Matter) From my past education, I have a good knowledge of music repertoire and techniques.

5) (Didactical) Which aspects of your university experience have been most influential in your teaching? (List 3)
   Aspect 1 (Fill in blank)
   Aspect 2 (Fill in blank)
   Aspect 3 (Fill in blank)

6) (Didactical) I provide opportunities for my students to be independent musicians inside and outside the classroom.

7) (Pedagogical) I make every effort to resolve behavior problems among my students.
8) **(Subject Matter)** I use many resources (ex. books, technology, supplies, etc.) in my classroom.

9) **(Subject Matter)** I am committed to discussing music repertoire and techniques with my colleagues.

10) **(Pedagogical)** My students feel safe and encouraged in my classroom; they know they can visit whenever they have the opportunity.

11) **(Subject Matter)** I have invested my time and resources ($) to regularly attend professional development conferences, workshops, or classes.

12) **(Didactica)** I formally/informally reflect on my teaching.

13) **(Pedagogical)** I consider the social and emotional development of my students when planning instruction.

14) **(Subject Matter)** I seek new teaching strategies on how to instruct students on music.
15) *(Pedagogical)* My students’ self-confidence is important for how I teach.

16) *(Didactical)* Selecting appropriate and relevant music for students takes ___ time each year.

17) *(Subject Matter)* Everything I learned about music is important to impart to my students.

Section 3: Statements regarding your job
To what extent do you agree with these statements about your job?

1- Strongly disagree  2- Somewhat disagree  3- Somewhat Agree  4- Strongly agree

1) *(Contextual)* Cooperation among colleagues is important for my work as a teacher.

2) *(Experiential)* With experience, I developed a personal teaching style.

3) *(Biographical)* Former teachers have influenced my teaching.
4) (Contextual) Good interactions with administration at my school is important for my work.

5) (Experiential) I have learned how to respond to the unexpected in my classroom.

6) (Biographical) I see myself as a teacher, more than just a music teacher.

7) (Contextual) My school effectively incorporates educational innovations.

8) (Biographical) Continuing to perform helps my development as a music teacher.

9) (Experiential) I have had experiences that have changed my teaching style.

10) (Experiential) I like to try new teaching techniques in the classroom.
11) *(Biographical)* Being a part of a professional music organization helps my development as a teacher.

12) *(Biographical)* How I learned music as a child influences how I teach.

13) *(Experiential)* I know when students are learning skills or not learning skills.

14) *(Contextual)* With the skills my students acquire in class, they have opportunities to perform in the community.

15) *(Biographical)* Effective teachers have positively influenced my teaching.

16) *(Contextual)* It is important that the music department has a prestigious reputation within my school.

17) *(Experiential)* Based on experience, I rely less on prepared lesson plans.
18) (*Contextual*) It is important that professional development opportunities are provided at my school.

19) (*Biographical*) My demeanor with students reflects my former teachers’ demeanor with me.

20) (*Experiential*) I know my strengths and weaknesses as a teacher.

21) (*Contextual*) Collaboration with colleagues is important to me.

22) (*Experiential*) My experiences have shaped what I believe is important for my students.

23) (*Contextual*) My school has an effective teacher evaluation system.

24) (*Experiential*) With experience, I have developed my own teaching style.
25) **(Biographical)** My family background influences the way I work with students.

26) **(Contextual)** My school provides resources for students with disabilities to have music experiences.

27) **(Biographical)** A family member influenced me to become a teacher.

**Section 4: Regarding your teaching identity.**
To what extent do you care about these following aspects of teaching profession for your work as a teacher.

This section allows you to rate and rank your teacher identity in 3 areas (explained below).

The higher the number of stars you assign to an area, the more important the area is to your teacher identity.

Ranking each area requires you to state which aspect is most important to you.

In this questionnaire, the 3 areas are:

1) **Subject matter expert**: teacher bases his/her profession on subject matter knowledge and skills.
2) **Didactical expert**: teacher bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills regarding planning, execution, and evaluation of teaching and learning processes.
3) **Pedagogical expert**: teacher bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills to support students’ social, emotional, and moral development.

Please examine each of the above statements carefully before rating and ranking.

1) To what extent do you care about **SUBJECT MATTER** for your work as a teacher. (The more stars, the higher the rating).

Subject matter expert: teacher bases his/her profession on subject matter knowledge and skills.
2) Would you please give a brief justification for the rating?  
(Fill in the blank)

3) To what extent do you care about **DIDACTICAL** aspects for your work as a teacher. (The more stars, the higher the rating).
Didactical expert: teacher bases his/her professional on knowledge and skills regarding planning, execution, and evaluation of teaching and learning processes.

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

4) Would you please give a brief justification for the rating?  
(Fill in the blank)

5) To what extent do you care about **PEDAGOGICAL** aspects for your work as a teacher. (The more stars, the higher the rating).
Pedagogical expert: teacher bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills to support students’ social, emotional, and moral development.

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

6) Would you please give a brief justification for the rating?  
(Fill in the blank)

7) I would rank the three aspects as indicated (1 is the highest, 3 is the lowest):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (highest)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 (lowest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter Expert</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didactical Expert</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Expert</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) From question 7, was the rank order at the **beginning of your career** the **same as now**?  
(Drop down menu)
Same Rank
Different Rank
Beginning of your career
In this questionnaire, the 3 areas are:

1) **Subject matter expert**: teacher bases his/her profession on subject matter knowledge and skills.

2) **Didactical expert**: teacher bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills regarding planning, execution, and evaluation of teaching and learning processes.

3) **Pedagogical expert**: teacher bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills to support students’ social, emotional, and moral development.

Please examine each of the above statements carefully before rating and ranking.

1) To what extent did you care about **SUBJECT MATTER** for your work as a teacher at the **beginning of your career**. (The more stars, the higher the rating). Subject matter expert: teacher bases his/her profession on subject matter knowledge and skills.

   [☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆]

2) Would you please give a brief justification for the rating?
   *(Fill in the blank)*

3) To what extent did you care about **DIDACTICAL** aspects for your work as a teacher at the **beginning of your career**. (The more stars, the higher the rating). Didactical expert: teacher bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills regarding planning, execution, and evaluation of teaching and learning processes.

   [☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆]

4) Would you please give a brief justification for the rating?
   *(Fill in the blank)*

5) To what extent did you care about **PEDAGOGICAL** aspects for your work as a teacher at the **beginning of your career**. (The more stars, the higher the rating). Pedagogical expert: teacher bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills to support students’ social, emotional, and moral development.

   [☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆ ☆]

6) Would you please give a brief justification for the rating?
   *(Fill in the blank)*
7) At the beginning of my career I would rank the three aspects as indicated (1 is the highest, 3 is the lowest):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (highest)</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3 (lowest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject Matter Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didactical Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical Expert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Complete the following sentences.**
The following questions are important learning experiences you gained around these three areas of the teaching profession during your career as a teacher.

In this questionnaire, the 3 areas are:

1) **Subject matter expert:** teacher bases his/her profession on subject matter knowledge and skills.
2) **Didactical expert:** teacher bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills regarding planning, execution, and evaluation of teaching and learning processes.
3) **Pedagogical expert:** teacher bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills to support students’ social, emotional, and moral development.

1) As for my role as a **SUBJECT MATTER EXPERT**, the most important thing I have learned as a teacher, throughout my career is: 
*(Fill in the blank)*

2) As for my role as a **DIDACTICAL EXPERT**, the most important thing I have learned as a teacher, throughout my career is: 
*(Fill in the blank)*

3) As for my role as a **PEDAGOGICAL EXPERT**, the most important thing I have learned as a teacher, throughout my career is: 
*(Fill in the blank)*

4) Please provide any feedback or clarification regarding this questionnaire. 
*(Fill in the blank)*
APPENDIX D

INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR PRESENT AND PAST VIDEO

Give participants 3 aspects definitions.

Directions: Comments can be made below each aspect as you are watching the video or you can write comments after the first or second viewing.

Describe what are you seeing in the video?

- Regarding subject matter
- Regarding didactical matter
- Regarding pedagogical matter
- Any other comments or things you notice besides these aspects

From what you are seeing in the video, how would you interpret your strengths:

- Regarding subject matter
- Regarding didactical matter
- Regarding pedagogical matter
- Any other comments or things you notice besides these aspects

From what you are seeing in the video, how would you interpret your weaknesses:

- Regarding subject matter
- Regarding didactical matter
- Regarding pedagogical matter
- Any other comments or things you notice besides these aspects
Does your video represent how you perceive yourself as a teacher?

Based on the video, how would you rank your professional music teacher identity based on the 3 aspects?

From the first interview you ranked your Current/Past PMTI as ______________

Does the video accurately show your PMTI or do you believe it to be different now that you’ve watch the video?

If the video does not accurately show your PMTI describe what you saw versus what you envision happens.

We may not see all your PMTI in this video, so describe something you think is important regarding your PMTI that we did not see.

After watching BOTH Videos

What similarities in your teaching do you see from present to past video?

What differences in your teaching do you see from present to past video?

Do you think your professional music teacher identity has evolved over time?

Are these thoughts based on the video or other factors? Explain:

How does watching present and past video effect your professional development?

What do you plan to develop or change in your music teaching from watching video of the past and present?

How do you think this study has affected your professional music teacher identity?
APPENDIX E

PMTI FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS & INFORMATION

Section 1: Demographics
The results of the PMTI questionnaire are from an analysis of 33 people, ranging between 22-45 in age. I categorized each person into a music career stage based on the number of years of teaching; this included the first stage (0–4 yrs.), the second stage (5–10 yrs.), and the post-second stage (11–20 yrs.) of teaching.
You are categorized in the post-second stage of teaching; your combined average of teaching years is 15.5.

1) Take a look at Figures 1 and 2 to compare or contrast yourself with the people in the PMTI questionnaire.

2) Is there anything interesting or out of the ordinary that you noticed about the other people in your career stage?

Figure E.1
Demographics of post 2nd stage (11–20 yrs.) PMTI Questionnaire alumni (n =13)
3) Take a look at Figures 3 and 4 to compare or contrast yourself with the people in the PMTI questionnaire.

4) Is there anything interesting or out of the ordinary that you noticed about the other people in your career stage?

---

### Figure E.2
**Demographics of post 2nd stage (11–20 yrs.) video alumni (n =3)**

- **Gender:** Female: 100%
- **Age:** $m = 40$  
  - Minimum: 39  
  - Maximum: 41
- **Children living in household:** 100%
- **Highest degree held:** Master's: 100%
- **Years in Music Teacher Profession:** $m = 15.5$  
  - Minimum: 12.5  
  - Maximum: 17

---

### Figure E.3
**School demographics of post 2nd stage (11–20 yrs.) PMTI questionnaire alumni (n =13)**

- **Years in current teaching position:** $m = 8.77$
- **Type of school**
  - Public: 100%
- **Area**
  - Rural: 0%
  - Suburban: 92%
  - Urban: 8%
- **Population on free or reduced lunch**
  - 0-20%: 38%
  - 20-40%: 23%
  - 40-60%: 8%
  - 60-80%: 31%
  - 80-100%: 0%
- **Other Subject/s Taught**
  - Band
  - Choir
  - General Music
  - Guitar
  - Higher Education
  - Music Technology
  - Piano
- **Types of music classes**
  - Homogeneous: 31%
  - Heterogeneous: 92%
  - Both: 23%
  - Private lessons: 8%
  - Lecture: 8%
Section 2&3: Current Analytical and Holistic Ratings of 3 PMTI aspects

Here are definitions of the three PMTI aspects:

- a **subject matter expert** is a teacher who bases his/her profession on subject matter knowledge and skills

- a **didactical expert** is a teacher who bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills regarding planning, execution, and evaluation of teaching and learning processes

- a **pedagogical expert** is a teacher who bases his/her profession on knowledge and skills to support students' social, emotional, and moral development

I categorized each person into a music career stage based on the number of years of teaching; this included the first stage (0–4 yrs.), the second stage (5–10 yrs.), and the post-second stage (11–20 yrs.) of teaching.
For the analytical rating, which included alumni answering 17 Likert-scale questions, all alumni, regardless of experience, perceived themselves as pedagogical experts (93%); this increased with experience. Alumni in the post-second stage (11–20 yrs.), however, indicated a slight decrease for perceived didactical expertise (1%) and a subject matter expertise (3%). Comparatively, first stage and post-second stage teachers regarded their subject matter expertise as almost the same.

5) Share your thoughts on this analysis.
   a. Why do you think pedagogical experts were more highly rated than didactical or subject matter experts?
   b. Why do you think didactical and subject matter experts slightly decreased in this rating as their experienced increased?

6) Two of you mentioned that you are teachers and one of you mentioned you are a music teacher.
   a. Defend your answer and discuss.

For the holistic rating, which included alumni rating their PMTI based on the aspects out of a 5-star rating scale (1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest), all alumni currently rated their PMTI as 88% a pedagogical expert, 87% a subject matter expert, and 81% a didactical matter expert. With experience, alumni’s pedagogical expertise decreased 8%, while their subject matter expertise increased 7% and their didactical expertise increased only 2%.

When alumni compared their beginning teaching to current teaching, all alumni indicated an increase in becoming a pedagogical expert (20%) and a didactical expert (6%). Regarding subject matter expertise, however, even though all alumni initially rated subject matter expertise as the most important (92%), with experience there was a slight decrease in growth (5%).
7) Share your thoughts on this analysis.
   a. To what extent do you think the similarity in rating (%) for PMTI expertise in current teaching is relevant?
   b. Why do you think pedagogical expertise is so important at the beginning stage of teaching as well as with years of experience?
   c. Why is subject matter valued more highly at the beginning of a career?
   d. Why does its perceived value decrease with experience?

When I asked you to rate holistically, using the 5-star rating scale, your current PMTI based on the 3 aspects, you were almost equal in importance. You rated pedagogical expertise at 92%, didactical expertise at 90%, and subject matter expertise at 87%.

8) Compare and discuss your ratings to the PMTI Questionnaire alumni.
   a. Why do you think with experience these percentages have increased or decreased for all or some of the aspects?

9) With all your many experiences, how do you feel you could or do mentor future teachers?
   a. What are the top 3 things they need to know?

Section 4: Analytical Rating of 3 influential factors

The three influential factors to PMTI are contextual, experiential, or biographical. All alumni perceived their experiential factors as most influential (90%). With a difference of 10–13%, all alumni also perceived biographical factors (83%) and contextual factors (80%) as influential. With experience, the alumni’s variation importance of influential factors is between 1% below or 1-3% above the average.

10) Tell me your thoughts on this analysis.
    a. Why do you think experiential influences were the highest overall?

11) Discuss how your personality directly affects your PMTI and how you teach.

Section 5: Ranking of PMTI
The alumni in the PMTI Questionnaire ranked their beginning and current PMTI based on the three aspects. At the beginning of their careers, all alumni regardless of experience, indicated their rank order as a subject matter expert, a didactical expert, and a pedagogical expert. Currently, all alumni ranked their subject matter expertise first, but ranked their pedagogical expertise second. There was only a 1% difference in that ranking which shows the significance of both. Within the career stages, first and second stage teachers currently ranked their pedagogical expertise first, followed by subject matter. The post-second stage alumni, however, currently ranked subject matter first, followed by pedagogical expertise. Regardless of current experience, alumni ranked their didactical expertise as third.

You were asked to rank your beginning and current PMTI during the first and second interview. With one exception, all respondents’ current rankings changed after watching the current video compared to that of the first interview. For both interviews, didactical expertise was ranked first by two alumni. In the second interview, pedagogical expertise ranked third for two alumni.

For the beginning of your career, all three of you picked different aspects for first place after watching your video. Only one person ranked their pedagogical expertise first in their beginning of career teaching. Consistently, pedagogical expertise ranked third in both the first and second interview. Seemingly, you wavered on beginning teaching ranking of first place for the didactical and subject matter expertise.
12) With the idea that we incorporate all 3 aspects within our PMTI, compare your rankings to that of the alumni in the questionnaire.
   a. Why do you think the rankings are valid or important?
   b. Why do you think rankings change depending on influential factors?

Section 6- Have we evolved?

I asked alumni in the PMTI Questionnaire to indicate whether their rank of PMTI was the same at the beginning of their career compared to their current teaching. In the first stage 5 alumni indicated that their rank from beginning to current teaching was the same and 4 indicated that it had changed. In the second stage, 5 alumni indicated that their rank from beginning to current teaching was the same and 6 different. In the post-second stage 6 alumni indicated that their rank from beginning to current teaching was the same and 7 different. Overall, 16 alumni indicated it was the same and 17 alumni indicated it was different. Regardless of experience, alumni’s perceived change in their evolution of PMTI as static.

13) Discuss why you think some alumni perceived they have not changed from the beginning of their careers to their current teaching?
   a. Does this mean they have not evolved?

14) Tell me in what year (1, 5, 3, 11) or in which circumstances you felt that your teaching changed or evolved the most?
   a. Discuss if the years or circumstances line up or have a pattern.
   b. Or discuss this thought: “my overall experience shaped how and why I teach; I think it’s not one particular situation”

15) In your ideal world what does professional development look like for you?
APPENDIX F

PMTI QUESTIONNAIRE COVER LETTER

Dear USC String Project Alumni,

My name is Elizabeth (Beth) Reed. I am currently a Ph.D. candidate in the School of Music at the University of South Carolina. I am conducting a research study as part of the requirements for my degree in Music Education, and I would like to invite you to participate.

I am studying professional music teacher identity for stringed instrument teachers who have a common authentic context learning experience - the USC String Project. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete the Professional Music Teacher Identity Questionnaire which asks questions about ways music teachers perceive important areas of their profession in the present and past. You will be asked questions which specify whether they apply to you or to what extent you agree with these statements regarding your music teaching profession. If you are currently not teaching music in any capacity then you should not participate in this study.

Participation is anonymous, which means that no one (not even the researcher) will know what your answers are. So, please do not write your name or other identifying information on any of the questionnaire.

Taking part in the study is your decision. You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to. You may also quit being in the study at any time or decide not to answer any question you are not comfortable answering.

We will be happy to answer any questions you have about the study. You may contact me at earecello@outlook.com or my faculty advisor, Dr. Gail Barnes, gbarnes@mozart.sc.edu, if you have study related questions or problems. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Office of Research Compliance at the University of South Carolina at 803-777-7095.

Thank you for your consideration.

If you complete the PMTI Questionnaire you will be entered in a raffle to win a $25 gift certificate to Amazon!

If you would like to participate, please click on the link: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/uscspalumni and begin the PMTI Questionnaire in Survey Monkey. This questionnaire should take approximately 30 minutes. You have 3 weeks, until June 8th, to submit your answers.

Cheers,
Elizabeth A. Reed
University of South Carolina
Ph.D. Candidate
earecello@outlook.com
APPENDIX G

USCSP ALUMNAE PARTICIPANT COVER LETTER

Dear Participant,

My name is Elizabeth (Beth) Reed. I am currently a Ph.D. candidate in the School of Music at the University of South Carolina. I am conducting a research study as part of the requirements of my degree in Music Education, and I would like to invite you to participate.

I am studying professional music teacher identity for stringed instrument teachers who have a common authentic context learning experience- the USC String Project. If you decide to participate, you will be asked to participate in the following: 1) an interview via Skype regarding a Professional Music Teacher Identity Questionnaire, 2) an interview in person watching video of your present teaching (you would need to capture a 15 minute video of your current teaching in your orchestra classroom from the current school year, 3) an interview in person watching video of your preservice teaching at the USC String Project from 20 years ago, and 4) a focus group with 2 other participants and the research via group chat reflecting on the overall outcomes of the PMTI Questionnaire and underlying themes that came out of the interviews. For both video interviews, you would reflect on the 3 aspects of professional music teacher identity- subject matter knowledge, didactical knowledge, and pedagogical knowledge.

The interviews and focus group will take place at mutually agreed upon times and places, and should each last about 90 minutes. The interviews and focus group will be audio taped or screen captured so that I can accurately reflect on what is discussed. The tapes will only be reviewed by the researcher who will transcribe and analyze them.

Participation is confidential. The results of the study may be published or presented at professional meetings, but your identity will not be revealed. For the focus group, the two other participants and the researcher will hear what you say, and it is possible that they could tell someone else. Because we will be talking in a group, we cannot promise that what you say will remain completely private, but we will ask that you and all other group members respect the privacy of everyone in the group.

Taking part in the study is your decision. You do not have to be in this study if you do not want to. You may also quit being in the study at any time or decide not to answer any question you are not comfortable answering.

We will be happy to answer any questions you have about the study. You may contact me at earecello@outlook.com or my faculty advisor, Dr. Gail Barnes, gbarnes@mozart.sc.edu, if you have study related questions or problems. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may contact the Office of Research Compliance at the University of South Carolina at 803-777-7095.

Thank you for your consideration. If you would like to participate, please email a reply and we will set-up dates and times to begin the interviews in the early fall of this year.

Cheers,

Elizabeth A. Reed
University of South Carolina
Ph.D. Candidate
earecello@outlook.com