2018

Music Teacher Dispositions: Self-Appraisals and Values of University Music Students

Robert H. Woody

University of Nebraska-Lincoln, rwoody2@unl.edu

Danni Gilbert

Doane University, danni.gilbert@unl.edu

Lynda A. Laird

Bellevue Public Schools

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/musicfacpub>

Part of the [Music Pedagogy Commons](#)

Woody, Robert H.; Gilbert, Danni; and Laird, Lynda A., "Music Teacher Dispositions: Self-Appraisals and Values of University Music Students" (2018). *Faculty Publications: School of Music*. 68.
<http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/musicfacpub/68>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Music, School of at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Publications: School of Music by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

Published in *Journal of Research in Music Education* 66:1 (2018), pp. 111–125; doi: 10.1177/0022429418757220
Copyright © 2018 Robert H. Woody, Danni Gilbert, and Lynda A. Laird; published by the National Association for Music Education and SAGE. Used by permission.
Submitted February 2, 2016; accepted March 28, 2017.

Supplemental Figure S1 and Tables S1 through S14 follow the References.

Music Teacher Dispositions: Self-Appraisals and Values of University Music Students

Robert H. Woody,¹ Danni Gilbert,² and Lynda A. Laird³

1. University of Nebraska–Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska, USA
2. Doane University, Crete, Nebraska, USA
3. Bellevue Public Schools, Bellevue, Nebraska, USA

Corresponding author – Robert H. Woody, Glenn Korff School of Music, University of Nebraska–Lincoln, 354 Westbrook Music Building, Lincoln, NE 68588-0100, USA, email rwoody2@unl.edu

Abstract

For music teachers to be most effective, they must possess the dispositions that best facilitate their students' learning. In this article, we present and discuss the findings of a study in which we sought to explore music majors' self-appraisals in and the extent to which they value the disposition areas of reflectivity, empathic caring, musical comprehensiveness, and musical learnability orientation. Evidence from a survey of 110 music majors suggested that music education students possess and value the dispositions of reflectivity, musical comprehensiveness, and musical learnability orientation more highly after they have matured through their college careers. Additionally, based on their responses to music teaching scenarios, it appears that senior music education majors possess greater empathic caring than do their freshman counterparts.

Keywords: dispositions, teacher education, reflectivity, empathy, caring

Among the many factors that determine the quality of a student's music education, the personal characteristics and attitudes of a teacher figure prominently (Moore, Burland, & Davidson, 2003). It is then imperative that music teacher education programs recruit the

best candidates to the profession and equip them to be effective in the field. Most music education majors first identify themselves as musicians and only later as teachers (Ballantyne & Grootenboer, 2012). The transition from music student to music teacher likely happens as they develop dispositions that are integral to teaching effectiveness. Research has shown that two of the most highly regarded dispositions are reflectivity and caring (Parkes, Doerkson, & Ritcher, 2014; R. L. Smith, Skarbek, & Hurst, 2005). *Reflectivity* is characterized by the examination and refinement of one's own practice. Caring—specifically *empathic caring*—means understanding the feelings of students in need such that a teacher is moved to act on their behalf (M. Smith & Trede, 2013).

Reflectivity

Reflectivity is the ability of teachers to identify problems and solutions to enhance student learning outcomes (Copeland, Birmingham, La Cruz, & Lewin, 1993). This usually involves considering past strategies and modifying them to improve future outcomes for both self and students. Similar to findings in the fields of business, health care, and general education (e.g., Thompson & Pascal, 2012), research in music education has indicated that teachers who reflect on critical incidents in their past musical experiences and teaching activities gain important insights into their own beliefs and assumptions that underpin their classroom practices (Burnard, 2012). The end result of the reflective process is the creation of a more positive learning environment in which both teachers and students can take risks, engage in imaginative activity, and do things differently. Educators use a variety of approaches to engage in reflection, including journaling and writing first-person narratives (Brown, 2006; Kostos & Shin, 2010), video recording analysis (Tripp & Rich, 2012), peer classroom observation, and mentoring (Danielson, 2012).

Reflective teaching and learning seem to be regarded as best practices in a wide variety of educational settings. A teacher's own reflectivity is shown to vary depending on many factors, including time, situation, and context, as well as on that teacher's own proclivity to reflect (Chamoso & Cáceres, 2008). This suggests that reflection is at least in part a learned behavior and not necessarily an intuitive trait (Ryan & Ryan, 2013). Kaasilia and Lauriala (2010, 2012) investigated reflective practices of education majors and found that as students progressed through their teacher training programs, their ability to reflect both deepened and broadened. Among teachers-in-training, preferred reflection approaches are likely formed in the context of daily practice teaching experiences rather than traditional approaches presented to them in a formal higher education (M. Smith & Trede, 2013).

Empathic Caring

Empathic caring is a disposition that has been addressed in education and other professional (e.g., health care) research dialogues for some time. Empathy is generally accepted as having at least two components: cognitive and affective (Decety & Jackson, 2006; Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoe, 2007; Lawrence, Shaw, Baker, Baron-Cohen, & David, 2004). The cognitive element reflects an ability to recognize another person's feelings, while the affective refers to an emotional response that results in either personal distress or concern for

the other person. Programs promoting empathy have been implemented into school curricula in an effort to address and prevent school bullying and violence (Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2012). The importance of empathy exhibited toward students can positively impact both social interactions and academic performance. Students who perceive their teachers to be highly empathic have been shown to perform better in academic learning measures (Chang, Berger, & Chang, 1981). Besides creating safer environments for learning, empathic caring is also related to emotional management, positive relationships, and prosocial behavior. These concepts are important to the development of positive teacher-student relationships.

The teacher-student relationship is an important factor in student achievement. In a longitudinal study, Hamre and Pianta (2001) concluded that the quality of the relationship between teacher and student in kindergarten predicted a number of academic and behavioral outcomes through the eighth grade. Additionally, it appears that low-achieving students stand to benefit the most from caring and supportive relationships with teachers. A caring teacher will be “tuned in to the child and manifest awareness of the child’s needs, moods, interests, and capabilities, and allow this awareness to guide his/her behavior with the child” (Hamre & Pianta, 2005, p. 957). The ability to develop strong student-teacher relationships may in fact be a defining characteristic of all truly effective teachers. These educators tend to allow students freedom and give them responsibility; they are skilled in analyzing students’ needs and meeting those needs (Wubbels, Levy, & Brekelmans, 1997).

Students perceive teacher behaviors as caring in various ways. Young people can come to believe their teachers are caring when they deal with students as individuals, listen to them, strive to get to know them, treat them fairly, offer encouragement and praise, help them with schoolwork, provide a safe and secure classroom environment, and plan and deliver engaging learning activities (Bosworth, 1995; Rogers, 1991). Jeffrey, Auger, and Pepperell (2013) found that teachers primarily demonstrate their caring by meeting students’ physical needs, fostering emotional well-being, and providing strategic assistance. Clearly, caring is perceived through teachers’ words and actions.

Music-Specific Dispositions

There are other valued personal qualities that are specific to teachers of music. Comprehensive musicianship is a well-accepted learning goal by our profession. *Musical comprehensiveness* has been suggested as a key correlate to the development of a student-centered teacher identity (Bouij, 2004). Teachers committed to musical comprehensiveness aspire for their students’ performance experiences to go beyond technical proficiency and their overall learning experiences to include a variety of musical genres and performance traditions and a range of activities, such as listening, composing, improvising, and analyzing music (Austin, 1998; Berg & Sindberg, 2014). Research has indicated that teaching with musical comprehensiveness can enhance student motivation and learning, with no loss of performance quality (Austin, 1998).

Also important is a teacher’s attitude about the *learnability of music*, that is, whether musicianship is primarily determined by experience and education or innate talent (Howe, Davidson, & Sloboda, 1998). A societal belief about musical talent as being innate has often

been linked to children coming to consider themselves “non-singers” or altogether “un-musical” by nature (Lamont, 2011). Teachers convinced of the learnability of music can equip young people with a “growth mindset” that leads to increases in musical motivation and achievement; in contrast, a teacher belief system built around musical giftedness and talent identification can yield a “fixed mindset” in students, with which they doubt their ability to achieve without the existence of inborn talent (Evans, 2006; see also Dweck, 2006).

In the present study, we surveyed university music majors about the disposition areas of (a) reflectivity, (b) empathic caring, (c) musical comprehensiveness, and (d) music learnability orientation. Participants appraised themselves in these dispositions and separately indicated the extent to which they value the dispositions in music teachers. As discussed previously, these dispositions are considered particularly important to teachers of music but not necessarily performers and other music professionals. By design, our participant sample included both preservice music educators and music majors studying performance/composition. We did this because we were interested in whether music majors’ self-appraisals and values might predict decisions to pursue a career in music education. Our sample also included only freshman and senior college students so we could explore whether dispositional development might be attributable to the experiences of a music teacher education program. The research questions that guided our investigation were (1) How do music majors appraise themselves in these dispositions? (2) To what extent do music majors value the dispositions in music teachers? (3) Are the self-appraisals and values different between first-year and fourth-year music majors and between those in a music education degree and those studying performance/composition? and (4) Do relationships exist between music majors’ self-appraisals, their values, and their decisions to pursue a career in music education?

Method

Participants in the study were 110 music majors at the first author’s institution. Employing a criterion-group design, 70 (64%) of the participants were freshmen, and the remaining 40 (36%) were seniors. Fifty-nine (53%) were students in the bachelor of music education (BME) degree, and the remaining 51 (47%) were music performance/composition majors in the bachelor of music or bachelor of arts in music (BM/BA) degrees. Identifying students appropriate for each criterion group was accomplished by their membership in freshman-level and senior-level required courses in the BME, BM, and BA degree programs. At the end of individual class sessions of these courses, students were invited to participate in the study. After the class dismissal, the volunteering participants first read and signed an informed consent form (approved by the institutional review board) and then completed the paper-and-pencil questionnaire, which took 15 to 20 minutes for most participants.

A two-page questionnaire collected participants’ responses regarding the four disposition areas. The content of the questionnaire was collaboratively developed by the researchers based on their reading of the related research literature. Pilot versions of the questionnaire were also evaluated by a panel of music teacher educators (i.e., four music education faculty members at the first author’s institution). Their feedback resulted in the final version of the questionnaire that was administered to the study’s participants. Additionally, we

planned to remove any questionnaire items that showed poor internal reliability upon examination *ex post facto* (addressed more in the following Results section).

One section of the questionnaire's first page collected demographic information, including age, major, and year in school. Another section of that page, titled "Beliefs About Personality and Musicianship," measured participants' self-appraisals using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*) to indicate their level of agreement with 16 statements (e.g., "I like to show kindness to people in need" and "I believe some people are just born to be great musicians"). Each of the dispositions of interest (i.e., reflectivity, empathic caring, musical comprehensiveness, and music learnability orientation) was addressed by four statements.

The final section of the first page, titled "Qualities of an Excellent Music Teacher," measured attributes that participants valued in music teachers. This section listed 16 characteristics of music educators, and participants indicated how important they thought each was using a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *not at all important*, 7 = *very important*). Again, four items addressed each of the four dispositions of interest. To guard against order effects in the list of self-appraisal belief statements and the list of valued teacher attributes, four different random orders of the items were used across the sample of participants.

A second page of the questionnaire presented four music-teaching scenarios, one for each disposition area, designed to explore how participants would apply values in real-life decision making. Scenarios have been used in research on ethics and attitudes toward diversity (Foster, 2005) as well as preservice teachers' empathy dispositions (Tettegah & Anderson, 2007). Each of our scenarios told of a music teacher facing a decision and ended by essentially asking the reader, "What do you think the teacher should do?" A headshot photo and a teacher name accompanied each scenario to make the teacher seem more like a real person. Face pictures were obtained, with permission, from an online database (Minear & Park, 2004).

For each scenario, participants chose from three options of what the teacher in the scenario could do. In writing the scenario response options, we made an effort to control for social desirability bias (Weber, 1992). Using the approach of Sims (1999), a panel of music teacher educators (i.e., music education faculty members) had previously ranked the response options from lowest to highest in each disposition area (least to most reflective, least to most empathic/caring, least to most musically comprehensive, and least to most indicative of a music learnability orientation). When the experts were presented with each scenario and its three response alternatives, they also received a research-based definition and description of the disposition it was designed to address. For example, when evaluating the scenario about empathic caring, they were told,

Empathic caring is defined as understanding the feelings of people in need such that you are moved to act on their behalf. Teachers with low empathic caring may simply recognize a student's expression of emotion, whereas teachers with high empathic caring would appreciate the students' feelings to the point of adjusting their own behavior accordingly.

So although the response options were not identified as such to the study's participants, in answering the question, "What do you think the teacher should do?" they were choosing a response that was either the most, moderately, or least characteristic (as established by the expert panel) of the disposition addressed in that scenario. To guard against order effects, multiple versions of the scenarios page were created. A balanced Latin square design was used to counterbalance the order (each scenario preceded and followed each other scenario equally often). Across the four resulting orders, each scenario was paired with all four of the teacher photos and names. Response options were also listed in various random orders. One version of the questionnaire's second page with scenarios is shown in Supplemental Figure S1 (following References).

Results

Participant responses to the self-appraisal belief statements (four for each disposition area) were aggregated to form self-appraisal variables (addressing our Research Question 1) for reflectivity (SA-Refl), empathic caring (SA-Emp), musical comprehensiveness (SA-MuComp), and music learnability orientation (SA-MuLearn). Responses to the teacher qualities were similarly aggregated to create valued-in-teachers variables (addressing our Research Question 2) for reflectivity (ViT-Refl), empathic caring (ViTEmp), musical comprehensiveness (ViT-MuComp), and music learnability orientation (ViT-MuLearn). Participants' chosen responses to the scenarios were recorded as the lowest, moderate, or highest level for the disposition area it measured.

Before aggregating the variables mentioned previously, we computed correlation matrices to assess the internal consistency across the four items used in each of the four disposition areas for self-appraisal belief statements (Table 1) and valued-in-teachers qualities (Table 2). As seen in Tables 1 and 2, the data for some of the items did not correlate well with those of other items intended to measure the same thing. We used linear regression analysis to determine which item's response data should be included in the aggregate variable. Based on the correlation matrix, we identified which item correlated best with the others. Using that item's data as the criterion variable, we performed a regression analysis, entering the other three items' data in stepwise fashion. The results of each analysis indicated which items (if any) did not contribute to model fit. These items were then excluded from their aggregate variables. Supplemental Tables S1 and S2 (which follow the References) display the coefficients for each regression analysis.

For each of the four self-appraisal and four valued-in-teachers variables, a 2×2 between-subjects factorial analysis of variance was carried out. Specifically, in each analysis of variation (ANOVA), the dependent variable was the SA or ViT aggregate score; the independent variables were grade level (freshman vs. senior) and major (BME vs. BM/BA); these analyses addressed Research Question 3. Figure 1 illustrates these data. The factorial ANOVA indicated a significant interaction between grade level and major for the self-appraisal variables of reflectivity, $F(1, 101) = 6.096, p < .05$; musical comprehensiveness, $F(1, 101) = 4.706, p < .05$; and music learnability orientation, $F(1, 101) = 6.734, p < .05$. ANOVA source tables for these analyses are found in Supplemental Tables S3 through S6 (following the References). As shown in Figure 1a, in each case of an interaction, the senior BMEs,

compared to their freshman counterparts, rated themselves higher in the disposition addressed; this difference was not found between the freshman and senior BM/BA students.

Table 1. Correlation Matrices for Self-Appraisal Belief Statement Items

Reflectivity	First Item	Second Item	Third Item ^a	Fourth Item ^a
First item: "I often re-examine my own actions and motivations"	1			
Second item: "I like to change how I do things to find better ways"	.591**	1		
Third item: "I prefer to trust my instincts and not overthink things" ^{a,b}	.013	-.205	1	
Fourth item: "I learn a lot about myself from the feedback of others" ^a	.084	.179	-.012	1
Empathic Caring	First Item	Second Item	Third Item	Fourth Item
First item: "I am able to appreciate other people's felt experience"	1			
Second item: "I like to show kindness to people in need"	.513**	1		
Third item: "I am a good listener"	.545**	.579**	1	
Fourth item: "I find it hard to understand other people's points of view" ^b	.535**	.681**	.610**	1
Musical Comprehensiveness	First Item	Second Item ^a	Third Item	Fourth Item
First item: "I can learn music by ear quickly"	1			
Second item: "I am mainly a specialized performer on one instrument/voice" ^{a,b}	.048	1		
Third item: "I am good at composing and/or songwriting"	.463**	.232*	1	
Fourth item: "I am familiar with a variety of musical genres"	.535**	.217*	.523**	1
Music Learnability Orientation	First Item	Second Item	Third Item	Fourth Item ^a
First item: "I believe some people are just born to be great musicians" ^b	1			
Second item: "I think everyone can learn to sing or play an instrument"	.385**	1		
Third item: "I think the most talented kids should have the best teachers" ^b	.462**	.594**	1	
Fourth item: "I believe musical skill is developed with experience and education" ^a	-.053	-.160	-.142	1

a. Item excluded from aggregate variable.

b. Item was reverse scored.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed).

Table 2. Correlation Matrices for Valued-in-Teachers Quality Items

Reflectivity	First Item	Second Item ^a	Third Item	Fourth Item
First item: "Tries out new teaching ideas with students"	1			
Second item: "Firmly trusts his or her own judgment over all others" ^{a,b}	.025	1		
Third item: "Accepts input from peers and supervisors"	.472**	.037	1	
Fourth item: "Learns from students and adapts accordingly"	.593**	.115	.598	1
Empathic Caring	First Item	Second Item	Third Item ^a	Fourth Item
First item: "Shows sensitivity to students' feelings"	1			
Second item: "Shows patience and understanding to students"	.666**	1		
Third item: "Ignores students' emotions and deals with them logically" ^{a,b}	.403**	.298*	1	
Fourth item: "Fosters a warm and accepting learning environment"	.473**	.530**	.200	1
Musical Comprehensiveness	First Item ^a	Second Item	Third Item	Fourth Item ^a
First item: "Rehearses only the best time-honored pieces of music" ^{a,b}	1			
Second item: "Has students make music by ear and improvise"	.139	1		
Third item: "Teaches with many styles (e.g., classical, rock, jazz, folk)"	.074	.634**	1	
Fourth item: "Focuses teaching on proper technique and note reading" ^{a,b}	.075	.005	-.015	1
Music Learnability Orientation	First Item	Second Item	Third Item ^a	Fourth Item ^a
First item: "Accommodates students who have little musical aptitude"	1			
Second item: "Teaches students that everyone can be musical"	.592**	1		
Third item: "Finds special opportunities for gifted performers" ^{a,b}	-.105	.027	1	
Fourth item: "Gives additional attention to talented students" ^{a,b}	-.182	-.183	.477**	1

a. Item excluded from aggregate variable.

b. b Item was reverse scored.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$ (two-tailed).

Figure 1. Mean scores for (a) self-appraisal variables, (b) valued-in-teachers variables, and (c) scenarios by grade level and major.

Similar results (i.e., significant interactions between grade level and major) were found with the ANOVAs with the valued-in-teachers variables of reflectivity, $F(1, 101) = 5.347, p < .05$; musical comprehensiveness, $F(1, 101) = 10.54, p < .01$; and music learnability orientation, $F(1, 101) = 10.625, p < .01$. ANOVA source tables for these analyses are found in Supplemental Tables S7 through S10 (following the References). As shown in Figure 1b, in each case of an interaction, the senior BMEs, compared to their freshman counterparts, rated more highly in the disposition addressed; this difference was not found between the freshman and senior BM/BA students.

We were interested to know whether participants' self-appraisals of a disposition might relate to their views on the importance of that disposition on teaching excellence (Research Question 4). Specifically, we theorized that collegiate musicians who choose the BME degree over the BM or BA might do so because they believe they possess qualities that will make them excellent teachers. To investigate this, Pearson product moment correlation coefficients were calculated between the self-appraisal and valued-in-teachers variables for each of the four dispositions. These data, broken down by the four combinations of the two independent variables of grade level and major, are shown in Table 3. Positive correlations were found for all groups for the disposition of empathic caring; that is, students who judged themselves as high in empathic caring tended to also highly value that quality in a music teacher. Additionally, and somewhat surprisingly, positive correlations were found for all dispositions among the BM/BA students and not the BME students as we theorized might be the case.

Table 3. Correlation Coefficients Between (1) Valued Qualities in a Music Teacher and (2) Self-Appraisals for the Four Disposition Areas

	Reflectivity	Empathic Caring	Musical Comprehensiveness	Music Learnability Orientation
Freshman BME	-.084	.403*	-.070	.043
Freshman BM/BA	.267	.511**	.354	.234
Senior BME	-.183	.359	-.278	.079
Senior BM/BA	.641**	.304	.534*	.469*

Note: BME = bachelor of music education; BM = bachelor of music; BA = bachelor of arts in music.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

In analyzing the scenario responses, when a participant chose the response that our expert panel established was the least characteristic of the disposition, that response was scored as 0. Choosing the response most characteristic of the disposition was scored as 2, and choosing the response moderately characteristic was scored as 1. Using these data as dependent variables, we then carried out a 2×2 between-subjects factorial ANOVA, again with grade level (freshman vs. senior) and major (BME vs. BM/BA) as the independent variables. Figure 1c illustrates these data. ANOVA source tables for these analyses are found in Supplemental Tables S11 through S14 (following the References). Only with the disposition area of empathic caring was a significant interaction between grade level and major revealed, $F(1, 101) = 5.442, p < .05$. The senior BMEs, compared to their freshman

counterparts, showed greater empathic caring in their scenario responses; this difference was not found between the freshman and senior BM/BA students.

Discussion

The most surprising result of the study was that our participants' self-appraisals and valued-in-teacher variables were not generally correlated among the BMEs but were among the BM/BA students. It is possible that collegiate musicians do not choose to study education (instead of, say, performance or composition) because of a perceived match between themselves and important music teacher dispositions. Perhaps as music education students come to understand the importance of certain dispositions, they simultaneously become more critical of themselves and believe they have much room for improvement. The BMEs in our study appraised themselves as being highly reflective. That reflectivity itself may make preservice music teachers less satisfied with the assets they already possess and more concerned about the growth they wish to accomplish.

Among our music education students, we found evidence that seniors possessed different dispositions than freshmen. The BMEs' self-appraisals and valued-in-teachers ratings were greater among the older students for the dispositions of reflectivity, musical comprehensiveness, and music learnability orientation. Furthermore, the senior BMEs responded with greater empathic caring on the scenario item measuring that disposition.

Based on the research literature and our own experience, many within the field of music education subscribe to a value system in which the dispositions of reflectivity, empathic caring, musical comprehensiveness, and music learnability orientation are prominent factors. Students at the end of the program seemed to be better aligned with our hoped-for professional value system than students at the beginning of the program. As such, these findings are quite affirming for those of us in the music education professorate who have devoted our professional lives to the preparation of music teachers. Admittedly, ours was not a longitudinal study—we did not compare the values of senior BMEs to their own earlier values as freshmen—but at the very least, we have preliminary support for the efficacy of a music teacher education program.

The fact that ours was not a longitudinal study is but one of several limitations that are important to note. Also, as a team of researchers, we found it difficult to construct the scenario items to measure dispositional values. The specific challenge came in creating response options that avoided social desirability bias; that is, our participants seemed disinclined to choose the response options that were least reflective, least musically comprehensive, and least indicative of a music learnability orientation. The scenario that we thought was the most well written, that for empathic caring, was the one that yielded a significant interaction between grade level and major. It is our position that the scenario approach holds great promise for allowing a survey instrument to explore how people apply values in real-life decision making. We acknowledge, however, that to do it well, the development of reliable scenario items will likely involve a more exhaustive process than the one we carried out in this initial exploratory research effort.

Regarding the theoretical implications of our results, it seems that the development of certain dispositions may be important in the construction of teacher identity (Abrahams,

2011; Ballantyne, Kirchner, & Aróstegui, 2012). As suggested by Ballantyne and Grootenboer (2012), most music education majors first identify themselves as musicians and only later as teachers. Collegiate music education students can struggle with the challenges of developing dual identities as performers and educators simultaneously (Dolloff, 1999; Freer & Bennett, 2012; Scheib, 2006). In the present study, our senior music education majors exhibited more developed dispositions than the freshman BMEs, suggesting that a formal teacher education program can be successful in transforming collegiate musicians into music educators (see also Fletcher, 2012). Our research, however, did not seek to identify what specific components of a program are most consequential in the transformative process of disposition-related teacher identity development. It seems reasonable to suspect that the development of positive professional relationships (i.e., with music educators and other students) is key. Lopes and Pereira (2012) found that the quality of the school climate is an important factor in determining the quality of teacher identity. Isbell (2008) suggested that music education majors' teacher identity is influenced by the extent to which they are viewed as teachers by the important others in their lives, including collegiate music education faculty and school music teachers serving as mentors/cooperating teachers. Bernard's (2009) narrative analysis revealed assumptions and thoughts about music teaching of students participating in a music teacher education program; she asserted that her findings could be used to develop strategies to more effectively support students during their collegiate experience as they develop their professional identities as music educators. Hopefully the outcomes of this and future research will result in a better understanding of how students develop teacher identities and allow us in the teacher education profession to connect that understanding to a learning environment that nurtures positive identity development.

Acknowledgments – The authors thank Rose A. Munderloh for her contributions to this research project.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests – The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding – The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Author Biographies

Robert H. Woody is Steinhart Foundation Distinguished Professor of Music (Music Education) at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln. His research interests include cognitive aspects of music learning and the skills of vernacular musicianship.

Danni Gilbert is an assistant professor of music at Doane University in Crete, Nebraska. Her research interests include student-centered learning and the use of technology in music education.

Lynda A. Laird is a K–6 general music specialist for Bellevue Public Schools in Bellevue, Nebraska. Her research interests include empathy, inclusive music-making, and socio-emotional learning.

References

- Abrahams, F. (2011). Nurturing preservice music teacher dispositions: Collaborating to connect practice, theory, and policy. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 112, 108–114. doi:10.1080/10632913.2011.566076
- Austin, J. R. (1998). Comprehensive musicianship research: Implications for addressing the national standards in music ensemble classes. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 17(1), 25–32.
- Ballantyne, J., & Grootenboer, P. (2012). Exploring relationships between teacher identities and disciplinarity. *International Journal of Music Education*, 30, 368–381. doi:10.1177/0255761412459165
- Ballantyne, J., Kirchner, J. L., & Aróstegui, J. L. (2012). Developing music teacher identities: An international multi-site study. *International Journal of Music Education*, 30, 211–226. doi:10.1177/0255761411433720
- Berg, M. H., & Sindberg, L. K. (2014). Supports for and constraints on comprehensive musicianship through performance-based student teaching. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 201, 61–77. doi:10.5406/bulcouresmusedu.201.0061
- Bernard, R. (2009). Uncovering pre-service music teachers' assumptions of teaching, learning, and music. *Music Education Research*, 11, 111–124. doi:10.1080/14613800802700974
- Bosworth, K. (1995). Caring for others and being cared for: Students talk caring in school. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76, 686–693. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.unl.edu/stable/20405434>
- Bouij, C. (2004). Two theoretical perspectives on the socialization of music teachers. *Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education*, 3(3). Retrieved from http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bouij3_3.pdf
- Brown, N. (2006). Classroom connections I: Nyssa Brown. *Kodaly Envoy*, 33(2), 25–27.
- Burnard, P. (2012). Rethinking creative teaching and teaching as research: Mapping the critical phases that mark times of change and choosing as learners and teachers of music. *Theory Into Practice*, 51, 167–178. doi:10.1080/00405841.2012.690312
- Chamoso, J. M., & Cáceres, M. J. (2008). Analysis of the reflections of student-teachers of mathematics when working with learning portfolios in Spanish university classrooms. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 25, 198–206. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2008.09.007
- Chang, A. F., Berger, S. E., & Chang, B. (1981) The relationship of student self-esteem and teacher empathy to classroom learning. *Psychology: A Journal of Human Behavior*, 18(4), 21–25.
- Copeland, W. D., Birmingham, C., La Cruz, E. D., & Lewin B. (1993). The reflective practitioner in teaching: Toward a research agenda. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9, 347–359.
- Danielson, C. (2012). It's your evaluation—Collaborating to improve teacher practice. *Educational Digest*, 77(8), 22–27.
- Decety, J., & Jackson, P. L. (2006). A social-neuroscience perspective on empathy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 15, 54–58. doi:10.1111/j.0963-7214.2006.00406.x
- Dolloff, L. A. (1999). Imagining ourselves as teachers: The developing of teacher identity in music teacher education. *Music Education Research*, 1, 191. doi:10.1080/1461380990010206
- Dweck, C. S. (2006). *Mindset: The new psychology of success*. New York: Random House.
- Evans, P. (2006). Motivation. In G. E. McPherson (Ed.), *The child as musician* (2nd ed., pp. 325–339). Oxford, England: Oxford University Press.
- Fletcher, T. (2012). Experiences and identities: Pre-service elementary classroom teachers being and becoming teachers of physical education. *European Physical Education Review*, 18, 380–395.

- Foster, C. (2005). Scenarios as a method of exploring people's attitudes to diversity management. In A. Brown & D. Remenyi (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 4th European Conference on Research Methodology for Business and Management Studies* (pp. 141–147). Reading, England: Academic Conferences Limited.
- Freer, P. K., & Bennett, D. (2012). Developing musical and educational identities in university music students. *Music Education Research*, 14, 265–284. doi:10.1080/14613808.2012.712507
- Gini, G., Albiero, P., Benelli, B., & Altoe, G. (2007). Does empathy predict adolescents' bullying and defending behavior? *Aggressive Behavior*, 33, 467–476. doi:10.1002/ab.20204
- Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2001). Early teacher-child relationships and the trajectory of children's school outcomes through eighth grade. *Child Development*, 72, 625–638. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.unl.edu/stable/1132418>
- Hamre, B. K., & Pianta, R. C. (2005). Can instructional and emotional support in the first-grade classroom make a difference for children at risk of school failure? *Child Development*, 76, 949–967. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.unl.edu/stable/3696607>
- Howe, M. J. A., Davidson, J. W., & Sloboda, J. A. (1998). Innate talents: Reality or myth? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 21, 399–442. doi:10.1017/S0140525X9800123X
- Isbell, D. S. (2008). Musicians and teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 56, 162–178. doi:10.1177/0022429408322853
- Jeffrey, A. J., Auger, R. W., & Pepperell, J. L. (2013). "If we're ever in trouble, they're always there": A qualitative study of teacher-student caring. *Elementary School Journal*, 114, 100–117. doi:10.1086/671062
- Kaasilia, R., & Lauriala, A. (2010). Towards a collaborative, interactionist model of teacher change. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26, 854–862. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2009.10.023
- Kaasilia, R., & Lauriala, A. (2012). How do pre-service teachers' reflective processes differ in relation to different contexts? *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 35, 77–89. doi:10.1080/02619768.2011.633992
- Kostos, K., & Shin, E. (2010). Using math journals to enhance second graders' communication of mathematical thinking. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 38, 223–231. doi:10.1007/s10643-010-0390-4
- Lamont, A. (2011). The beat goes on: Music education, identity and lifelong learning. *Music Education Research*, 13, 369–388. doi:10.1080/14613808.2011.638505
- Lawrence, E. J., Shaw, P., Baker, D., Baron-Cohen, S., & David, A. S. (2004). Measuring empathy: Reliability and validity of the Empathy Quotient. *Psychological Medicine*, 34, 911–919. doi:10.1017/S0033291703001624
- Lopes, A., & Pereira, F. (2012). Everyday life and everyday learning: The ways in which preservice teacher education curriculum can encourage personal dimensions of teacher identity. *European Journal of Teacher Education*, 35, 17–38. doi:10.1080/02619768.2011.633995
- Miner, M., & Park, D. C. (2004). A lifespan database of adult facial stimuli. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, 36, 630–633. doi:10.3758/BF03206543
- Moore, D. G., Burland, K., & Davidson, J. W. (2003). The social context of musical success: A developmental account. *British Journal of Psychology*, 94, 529–549. doi:10.1348/000712603322503088
- Parkes, K. A., Doerksen, P. F., & Ritcher, G. (2014). Measuring professional dispositions in pre-service music teachers in the United States. In T. Brophy (Ed.), *Selected papers from the Fourth International Symposium on Assessment in Music Education, Music Assessment, and Global Diversity—Practice, measurement, and policy* (pp. 351–386). Chicago, IL: GIA.
- Polanin, J. R., Espelage, D. L., & Pigott, T. D. (2012). A meta-analysis of school-based bullying prevention programs' effects on bystander intervention behavior. *School Psychology Review*, 41, 47–65.

- Rogers, D. (1991, April). *Conceptions of caring in the fourth grade classroom*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.
- Ryan, M., & Ryan, M. (2013). Theorising a model for teaching and assessing reflective learning in higher education. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 32, 244–257. doi:10.1080/07294360.2012.661704
- Scheib, J. W. (2006). Policy implications for teacher retention: Meeting the needs of the dual identities of arts educators. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 107, 5–10. doi:10.3200/AEPR.107.6.5-10
- Sims, R. L. (1999). The development of six ethical business dilemmas. *Leadership & Organizational Development Journal*, 20, 189–197. doi:10.1108/01437739910276993
- Smith, M., & Trede, F. (2013). Reflective practice in the transition phase from university student to novice graduate: Implications for teaching reflective practice. *Higher Education Research & Development*, 32, 632–645. doi:10.1080/07294360.2012.709226
- Smith, R. L., Skarbek, D., & Hurst, J. (Eds.). (2005). *The passion of teaching: Dispositions in the schools*. Latham, MD: ScarecrowEducation.
- Tettegah, S., & Anderson, C. J. (2007). Pre-service teachers' empathy and cognitions: Statistical analysis of text data by graphical models. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 32, 48–82. doi:10.1016/j.cedpsych.2006.10.010
- Thompson, N., & Pascal, J. (2012). Developing critically reflective practice. *Reflective Practice*, 13, 311–325. doi:10.1080/14623943.2012.657795
- Tripp, T., & Rich, P. (2012). Using video to analyze one's own teaching. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 43, 678–704. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8535.2011.01234.x
- Weber, J. (1992). Scenarios in business ethics research: Review, critical assessment, and recommendations. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 2, 137–160. doi:10.2307/3857568
- Wubbels, T., Levy, J., & Brekelmans, M. (1997). Paying attention to relationships. *Educational Leadership*, 54(7), 82–86.

MUSIC TEACHING SCENARIOS

After reading each scenario, select one of the three choices to indicate how you think the teacher should respond.

April teaches elementary classroom music. Her school principal recently visited one of her classes and observed her teaching a song for the upcoming 3rd grade music program. Toward the end of the half-hour class, the students began to talk more and leave their seats without permission. A few of them complained that they were bored. The principal noted these behavior problems in his comments to April. She realizes that some of the students didn't get much out of class when they stopped paying attention. She also thinks her principal would benefit from seeing her teach some other classes.

What do you think April should learn from this experience? (check one box below)

☐ Teachers can sometimes be blamed for classroom problems that are truly beyond their control.

☐ Learning is most effective when teachers offer their students a variety of activities in each class.

☐ Young kids have a relatively short attention span and they tend to misbehave when it runs out.

Devin teaches elementary and middle school strings. In addition to playing quality orchestra pieces, his school's curriculum calls for students to explore improvising and composing music of their own. To accomplish this he has used some rehearsal time for students to start composing projects, but he now has an orchestra concert coming up in two months. Devin believes his strength is teaching string performance, and that administrators and parents will judge him by what's heard at the concert. He also believes his students have learned a lot through the composing experience.

How do you think Devin should use class time over the next two months? (check one box below)

☐ Continue both rehearsing the orchestra pieces and doing the composing projects; share some of each at the concert.

☐ Rehearse the orchestra music so they can enjoy giving a good performance; return to composing after the concert if possible.

☐ Spend most time rehearsing the orchestral works; save a little at the end of class to share composing done at home.

Jared teaches high school band. He is approached by a junior, Michael, who has an open period in his schedule and wants to join the school band for the first time. Michael is an honors student with a 4.0 GPA and is highly motivated to learn an instrument. However, his middle school general music teacher told him that he "has no musical talent" and Michael admits it's true. As a teacher Jared likes having honors students in his band but they usually come up from the middle school as good players already. The school guidance counselor wonders if Michael might be better served in a class other than band.

What do you think Jared should do? (check one box below)

☐ Have the guidance counselor put Michael in a non-music class in which he's more likely to enjoy the success he's used to.

☐ Have Michael join the band and give him the opportunity to accomplish whatever music learning he's capable of.

☐ Let Michael enroll as a student in band and grade him on attitude and effort, in addition to musical achievement.

Joan teaches middle school choral music, as well as a music class for students with disabilities. A student in the special needs class, Josie, loves to sing and enjoys the music activities they do together. Josie's parents tell Joan that she would really like to be a part of the 8th grade concert choir class. She is very excited about the possibility of joining the choir and her parents believe it would give her more social learning opportunities with other kids. Josie's singing is not as strong as others in the choir, and allowing her to join would be a change in Joan's normal practices.

What do you think Joan should do? (check one box below)

☐ Allow Josie to visit the choir class on days when the rehearsal schedule is lighter.

☐ Invite Josie to join the concert choir because of how meaningful it is to her and her parents.

☐ Keep Josie in the special education music class with students who are more like her.

Figure S1. One version of the questionnaire's second page presenting scenarios.

Woody, R. H., Gilbert, D., & Laird, L. A. (2018). Music teacher dispositions: Self-appraisals and values of university music students. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 66.

Supplemental Material

Table S1

Regression analysis coefficients for Self-Appraisal belief statement items

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Partial r</i>
Reflectivity				
2nd item "I like to change how I do things to find better ways"	.591	7.44	< .001	.591
3rd item "I prefer to trust my instincts and not overthink things" ^{ab}	.171	2.12	.036	.206
4th item "I learn a lot about myself from the feedback of others" ^b	-.015	-.182	.856	-.018
Criterion variable: 1st item "I often re-examine my own actions and motivations"				
Empathic Caring				
1st item "I am able to appreciate other people's felt experience"	.143	1.67	.098	.163
3rd item "I am a good listener"	.210	2.29	.024	.221
4th item "I find it hard to understand other people's points of view" ^a	.476	5.23	< .001	.460
Criterion variable: 2nd item "I like to show kindness to people in need"				
Musical Comprehensiveness				
4th item "I am familiar with a variety of musical genres"	.523	6.26	< .001	.523
1st item "I can learn music by ear quickly"	.257	2.68	.009	.255
2nd item "I am mainly a specialized performer on one instrument/voice" ^{ab}	.143	1.71	.086	.169
Criterion variable: 3rd item "I am good at composing and/or songwriting"				
Music Learnability Orientation				
2nd item "I think everyone can learn to sing or play an instrument"	.594	7.53	< .001	.594
1st item "I believe some people are just born to be great musicians" ^a	.273	3.35	.001	.314
4th item "I believe musical skill is developed with experience and education" ^b	-.048	-.601	.549	-.059
Criterion variable: 3rd item "I think the most talented kids should have the best teachers" ^a				

^a Item was reverse scored

^b Item was excluded from model

Table S2

Regression analysis coefficients for Valued-in-Teachers quality items

	<i>Beta</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Partial r</i>
Reflectivity				
1st item "Tries out new teaching ideas with students"	.400	4.98	< .001	.353
3rd item "Accepts input from peers and supervisors"	.409	5.09	< .001	.361
2nd item "Firmly trusts his or her own judgment over all others" ^{ab}	.090	1.278	.204	.126
Criterion variable: 4th item "Learns from students and adapts accordingly"				
Empathic Caring				
1st item "Shows sensitivity to students' feelings"	.216	1.96	.053	.190
2nd item "Shows patience and understanding to students"	.269	3.52	< .001	.328
3rd item "Ignores students' emotions and deals with them logically" ^{ab}	.046	0.52	.602	.052
Criterion variable: 4th item "Fosters a warm and accepting learning environment"				
Musical Comprehensiveness				
3rd item "Teaches with many styles (e.g., classical, rock, jazz, folk)"	.630	8.23	< .001	.630
1st item "Rehearses only the best time-honored pieces of music" ^{ab}	.093	1.22	.225	.120
4th item "Focuses teaching on proper technique and note reading" ^{ab}	.016	0.20	.841	.020
Criterion variable: 2nd item "Has students make music by ear and improvise"				
Music Learnability Orientation				
1st item "Accommodates students who have little musical aptitude"	.582	7.24	< .001	.582
3rd item "Finds special opportunities for gifted performers" ^{ab}	.089	1.10	.276	.108
4th item "Gives additional attention to talented students" ^{ab}	-.074	-.901	.370	-.089
Criterion variable: 2nd item "Teaches students that everyone can be musical"				

^a Item was reverse scored^b Item was excluded from model

Table S3

ANOVA Source Table for Self-Appraisal Variable Reflectivity (N = 105)

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Major	7.448	1	7.448	2.043	.156
Grade-Level	1.383	1	1.383	.379	.539
Major $\times$ Grade Level	22.223	1	22.223	6.096	.015
Error	368.203	101			

Table S4

ANOVA Source Table for Self-Appraisal Variable Empathic Caring (N = 105)

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Major	9.113	1	9.113	1.101	.297
Grade-Level	12.339	1	12.339	1.491	.225
Major $\times$ Grade Level	12.185	1	12.185	1.472	.228
Error	836.080	101			

Table S5

ANOVA Source Table for Self-Appraisal Variable Musical Comprehensiveness (N = 105)

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Major	28.186	1	28.186	2.575	.112
Grade-Level	1.121	1	1.121	.100	.752
Major $\times$ Grade Level	52.666	101	52.666	4.706	.032
Error					

Table S6

ANOVA Source Table for Self-Appraisal Variable Music Learnability Orientation (N = 105)

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Major	181.752	1	181.752	17.166	< .001
Grade-Level	53.586	1	53.586	5.061	.027
Major $\times$ Grade Level	71.301	1	71.301	6.734	.011
Error	1069.388	101			

Table S7

ANOVA Source Table for *Valued-in-Teachers Variable Reflectivity* ($N = 105$)

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Major	17.490	1	17.490	5.146	.025
Grade-Level	.241	1	.241	.071	.791
Major $\times$ Grade Level	18.174	1	18.174	5.347	.023
Error	346.660	101			

Table S8

ANOVA Source Table for *Valued-in-Teachers Variable Empathic Caring* ($N = 105$)

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Major	3.650	1	3.650	1.158	.284
Grade-Level	.075	1	.075	.024	.878
Major $\times$ Grade Level	.140	1	.140	.044	.834
Error	321.602	101			

Table S9

ANOVA Source Table for *Valued-in-Teachers Variable Musical Comprehensiveness* ($N = 105$)

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Major	21.362	1	21.362	5.891	.017
Grade-Level	1.041	1	1.041	.287	.593
Major $\times$ Grade Level	38.225	101	38.225	10.540	.002
Error	366.275				

Table S10

ANOVA Source Table for *Valued-in-Teachers Variable Music Learnability Orientation* ($N = 105$)

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Major	16.667	1	16.667	3.884	.051
Grade-Level	3.135	1	3.135	.731	.395
Major $\times$ Grade Level	45.590	1	45.590	10.625	.002
Error	437.666	101			

Table S11

ANOVA Source Table for Reflectivity Scenario Responses (N =105)

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Major	.350	1	.350	1.062	.305
Grade-Level	.077	1	.077	.233	.630
Major $\times$ Grade Level	1.159	1	1.159	3.520	.063
Error	33.590	101			

Table S12

ANOVA Source Table for Empathic Caring Scenario Responses (N =105)

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Major	.016	1	.016	.073	.788
Grade-Level	2.239	1	2.239	10.301	.002
Major $\times$ Grade Level	1.183	1	1.183	5.442	.022
Error	22.170	101			

Table S13

ANOVA Source Table for Musical Comprehensiveness Scenario Responses (N=105)

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Major	1.636	1	1.636	4.144	.044
Grade-Level	.028	1	.028	.071	.790
Major $\times$ Grade Level	.151	101	.151	.384	.537
Error	40.257				

Table S14

ANOVA Source Table for Music Learnability Orientation Scenario Responses (N=105)

Source	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Major	9.113	1	9.113	1.101	.297
Grade-Level	12.339	1	12.339	1.491	.225
Major $\times$ Grade Level	12.185	1	12.185	1.472	.228
Error	836.080	101			