Visions of Research in Music Education

Volume 36 Article 3

2020

Factors Influencing Pre-Instructional Decisions: An Initial Investigation of Expert Music Teacher Perceptions

Daniel C. Johnson
University of North Carolina Wilmington

Wendy K. Matthews
Kent State University

ISSN: 1968-2065

Factors Influencing Pre-Instructional Decisions: An Initial Investigation of Expert Music Teacher Perceptions

By

Daniel C. Johnson
University of North Carolina Wilmington

Wendy K. Matthews
Kent State University

Abstract

Pre-instructional decisions that teachers make fundamentally and directly influence their students' music learning. Particularly with expert educators, as defined by their professional qualifications and education, these decisions reveal teachers' motivations and pedagogical reasoning. Consequently, the purpose of this study was to examine pre-instructional decision-making from the perspective of expert music teachers, as framed by these two research questions: (1) which factors have more influence on pre-instructional decision-making among expert music teachers? and (2) what are the differences in pre-instructional decision-making by expert teachers in terms of teacher characteristics (gender and teaching experience) and educational setting (teaching level and musical context)? In a rank order analysis, teaching experience had the most prominent influence followed by materials and facilities, while the least influential factor was curriculum. In comparing differences among classroom-based and performance-based music teachers, results were largely the same. Performance-based teachers, however, ranked the influence of their own musical activities and assessment higher than did their classroom-based counterparts, who gave more emphasis to their own education and state curricula. Non-parametric tests revealed further insights, including directions for future research on pre-instructional decision-making among expert music educators, as well as recommendations for enhancing pre-service music teacher preparation and in-service professional development.

Keywords: pedagogy, instructional planning, expert music teachers

Johnson, D. C., & Matthews, W. K. (2020). Factors influencing pre-instructional decisions: An initial investigation of expert music teacher perceptions. *Visions of Research in Music Education, 36*. Retrieved from http://www.rider.edu/~vrme.

Throughout the teaching process, educators make a wide range of instructional decisions that reveal their perspectives on instruction and curriculum (Gill & Hoffman, 2009; Shavelson & Stern, 1981). These essential and critical decisions directly impact their students' music learning and demonstrate teachers' motivations and pedagogical reasoning. This is particularly true for expert teachers because their instructional decisions encompass both philosophical approaches and views on practical matters, indicating both their focus of attention and fundamental approach to education. Teachers rely on their professional knowledge, reflective thinking skills, information gleaned from classroom observations, and their ability to use assessment data to modify planned instruction (Bernstein-Colton & Spark-Langer, 1993; Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2014; Fogarty, Wang, & Creek, 1983). Furthermore, classroom environment and diverse pedagogical contexts, as well as teachers' experiences, intuition, values, and pedagogical content knowledge further shape pre-instructional decisions (Matthews & Johnson, 2019; Shavelson & Stern, 1981; Vanlommel, Vanhoof, & Van Petegem, 2016). Accounting for multifaceted environments, teachers plan by focusing on short-term and long-term goals for individual classes, specific days, units, or entire school years (Shavelson & Stern, 1981). In music education, classroom environment and musical context further shape these instructional decisions (Matthews & Johnson, 2019). The scarcity of literature on music teachers' pre-instructional decision-making combined with previous research corroborating its importance highlights the need for more research in this area (Shaw, 2020; Viciana & Mayorga-Vega, 2017). Consequently, the purpose of this study was to examine pre-instructional decision-making from the perspective of expert music teachers. More specifically, the authors aimed to determine (1) which factors have more influence on pre-instructional decision-making, and (2) the differences

in these decisions in terms of teacher characteristics (gender and teaching experience) and educational setting (teaching level and musical context).

Review of Literature

In the general education literature, Bernstein-Colton and Spark-Langer (1993) specified three phases of instructional decisions: pre-instructional planning, decisions made during instruction, and post-instructional reflection. Most relevant of these to the current study is the planning phase, synonymous with pre-instructional decision-making (Isman, 2011; Mohan, Greer, & McCalla, 2003). At this point, teachers devise a course of action for implementing instruction by selecting appropriate instructional activities and materials based on contextual factors and curriculum standards, e.g. student needs, preferences, prior knowledge, skill levels and high stakes testing (Amador & Lamberg, 2013; King-Sears & Emenova, 2007; Lutnpe & Chambers, 2001).

The literature on non-music teachers' pre-instructional decision-making focuses on the multiple and diverse pedagogical decisions made before, during, and after the process of teaching (Shavelson & Stern, 1981). Prior to teaching, decisions encompass curricular choices and planning activities to achieve a variety of outcomes with the goals of enhancing student understanding and engagement. Employing a cyclic practice of teaching and learning, teachers also modify planned instruction by using their professional knowledge, observation skills, and metacognition (Bernstein-Colton & Spark-Langer, 1993; Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2014; Fogarty et al., 1983). Teachers regularly use formal and informal assessment strategies both during teaching and following teaching episodes as reflection-in-action (Matthews & Johnson, 2019). In addition, blended assessments bridge the traditional divide between formal and informal learning

practices in an effort to combine the two approaches (Malcolm, Hodkinson, & Colley, 2003), further complicating assessment terminology and their classroom applications.

Teaching environments vary by discipline and have important influences on educators' pedagogical approaches (Prosser & Trigwell, 1997). For example, instructors of physical science, engineering, and medicine courses used a more teacher-focused approach as compared to those teaching the social sciences and humanities, who employed a more student-focused pedagogy (Lindblom-Ylänne, Trigwell, Nevgi, & Ashwin, 2006). Similarly, a disciplinary focus on math and science played a role in instructor views regarding how students learn and influenced their instructional decisions (Gill & Hoffman, 2009; Hora, 2014). Although these authors found similarities with respect to the importance of practice and perseverance, instructional differences emerged by discipline regarding the importance of using examples, repetition, memorization, and individualized instruction as pedagogical strategies. In other words, subject matter, activities, available materials, class size, and scheduling influenced teachers' instructional decision-making (Shavelson & Stern, 1981).

Research on experienced teachers provides further valuable insights into instructional decision-making. As Calderhead (1996) reported, experienced teachers make instructional decisions more effectively. They also demonstrate more detail and more instructional strategies than their less experienced counterparts, with noticeable improvements in classroom instruction. Experienced teachers generally make informed, thoughtful decisions about the learning environment, establishing goals for their students, and planning instruction to achieve those goals (Anderson, 2003). Experienced teachers also know more about developmental traits, have more pedagogical content knowledge, possess larger lexicon of techniques and strategies, and make better-informed decisions reflecting the context in which they teach (Borko & Livingston, 1989).

Specifically, when compared to their novice counterparts, experienced teachers focus less on teaching from planned content, textbooks, and other written resources. Instead, by mentally planning, they have more confidence in the effectiveness of their prepared lessons, trust their students' abilities or interests, and are less concerned about exhausting their lesson plans before their teaching episodes ended (McCutcheon, 1980). Therefore, experienced teachers are less likely to over-plan and more likely to deliver student-centered instruction. As a result, their teaching is more tailored to the classroom climate and includes more instructor feedback to the students (Graham, Manross, Hopple, & Sitzman, 1993). Experienced teachers also write less in their actual lesson plans. However, they spend significant time mentally planning. Their understanding of both practical and theoretical insights into the teaching process is a critical component of their pedagogical reflections (Carr & Skinner, 2009; Winkler, 2001). Also, as Westerman (1991) determined, experienced teachers, base their decision-making process on understanding the student perspectives and the entirety of the educational process.

While the general education literature includes research on differences in students' developmental changes, this topic is largely absent from the music education literature. Regarding teaching levels, music education researchers routinely treat middle and high school education as one category (e.g., Blocher, Greenwood, & Shellahamer, 1997; Schmidt, 2005) or consider middle and high school learners separately (Adderly, Kennnedy, & Berz, 2003; Kinney, 2008; Lucas, 1994; Matthews & Kitsantas, 2007). This strategy overlooks the inherent developmental differences in the learners themselves and the importance of their transition through the K-12 levels. As adolescent learners' mature, they have more curricular choices (electives) yet have a more negative view of school while experiencing a more grade-oriented and anonymous setting (Eccles, Midgley, & Adler, 1984; Mizelle & Irvin, 2000). In contrast, the

general education literature provides many studies on the transition from middle to high school, with particular attention to academic, procedural, and social changes (Akos & Galassi, 2004). For example, Mac Iver (1990) found that successful transitions programs were those that facilitated students' social development and enhanced communication among middle and high school teachers. Therefore, the authors included teaching level as a variable in the current study.

Assessment

Assessment is a key pedagogical component that influences instructional decisions and is embedded throughout the planning process. This is especially relevant in the current climate of high stakes testing where assessment and educational policy can also influence teachers' instructional decisions (Ball, 2003; Datnow & Hubbard, 2015; Young & Kim, 2010). Teachers often rely on information gleaned from classroom observations and assessments to modify current and future instruction (Amador & Lamberg, 2013; Borko, Livingston, & Shavelson, 1990; Dana & Yendol-Hoppey, 2014; Fogarty et al., 1983), and to gather evidence for post-instructional reflection and decision-making (Kohler, Henning, & Usma-Wilches, 2008). In addition, assessment choices often reveal how and why approaches to measuring student learning can vary by musical context (Johnson & Matthews, 2017; Matthews & Johnson, 2019).

Pedagogically, teachers use a variety of assessment data to choose when and how to structure lessons, to address students' misconceptions, and to maintain student attention (Young & Kim, 2010). For example, Amador and Lamberg (2013) found that when planning elementary math instruction, teachers considered students' collective errors and created lesson plans to practice corresponding concepts while also modeling problem-solving through independent work. Most relevant to the current study are planning decisions that reflect learning goals, objectives, and pedagogical decisions. These directly link with instructional decisions as

reflection-in-action (Matthews & Johnson, 2019; Schön, 1986) and evaluation strategies used to gather evidence for post-instructional reflection and follow-up (Kohler et al., 2008).

Music Education Contexts

The planning-instruction-reflection model (Bernstein-Colton & Spark-Langer, 1993) is consistent with those used in music teaching, as evidenced by the three-legged objectives-strategies-evaluation curriculum design for classroom music instruction (Campbell & Scott-Kassner, 2014). Standerfer and Hunter (2010), however, have articulated challenges with using a traditional, objectives-first lesson planning model in musical contexts, particularly for performance-based music educators. Instead, a recent survey on music teacher planning strategies describes alternative models using non-linear approaches that are more music-focused, student-centered, interactive, and creative (Shaw, 2020).

While these models explore the nuances of planning music instruction, there is limited research on pre-instructional planning among music teachers (Shaw, 2020). Some literature on this topic indicates that music teachers rely on factors, including teaching experience, site-specific circumstances, and student abilities when planning instruction (Bauer & Berg, 2001). In addition, more experienced music teachers use fewer words and more specific instructional strategies than novice teachers (Brittin, 2005). In particular, Bazan (2010) found that music teachers de-emphasize written lesson plans and pre-determine instructional objectives. This finding is consistent with those Shaw (2017) reported among similar music teachers who favor a more dynamic and flexible approach to lesson planning, allowing them to focus on instructional aspects that their students need most.

Although the general education literature reinforces some aspects of pre-instructional decision-making (Shaw, 2020), the musical context and content influence the ways teachers plan

and reveal their pre-instructional foci (Johnson & Matthews, 2017; Standerfer & Hunter, 2010). This scholarship highlights the consistency of pre-instructional decisions among different musical contexts. For example, Johnson and Matthews (2017) found that classroom-based music teachers prioritized a life-long love of music and fostering responsible citizenship, with pedagogical attention to developing clear goals and objectives, using appropriate methodologies, and student assessment. In a second study, however, Matthews and Johnson (2019) reported that performance-based music teachers highlighted the importance of pedagogical knowledge, instructional strategies, and classroom management to inform their instructional planning decisions. These teachers also focused on the importance of developing group skills to create unity within their ensembles. Similarly, Rohwer and Henry (2004) found that performance-based music educators rated musical expression, error diagnosis, and sight-reading as the most important musical skills for making instructional decisions. Subtle differences, however, surfaced, which aligned with the specific pedagogies related to developing vocal or instrumental techniques and classroom management tools. For example, Millican (2012) reported that much of the instructional focus during beginning instrumental music lessons highlighted proper tone production, posture, and other specific psychomotor skills with the overarching goal to build individual and ensemble skills. Consistent with these findings, Parker (2016) found that choral music directors emphasized creating a caring community within the ensemble as an important part of successful music instruction. Her research revealed a focus on cooperation, acceptance, and teamwork instead of more specific musical outcomes.

Also particular to music education contexts is the potential for teacher gender to influence their pre-instructional planning practices. As Roulston and Misawa (2011) proposed, music teachers have the potential to recognize gender as a relevant aspect of the educational

process. In the process, teachers could reconsider their own assumptions about music teaching and learning. Consistent with this direction, Zhukov (2012) found that male music teachers in music studios gave more directions and played more authoritarian roles than did female teachers. The latter were more cooperative and answered more student questions. This finding is consistent with Gierczyk and Harrison's (2019) study of general education teachers. They reported that male teachers were less likely to diverge from set teaching procedures than their female counterparts who were more willing to accommodate student requests. In contrast, Shahvand and Rezvani (2016) found no difference in teacher effectiveness among general education teachers by gender. These studies suggest the possibility of gender-based differences in instructional planning, but this question remains unanswered.

In music education, thoughtful decision-making and reflective thinking skills play an important role in effective teaching (Conway, 1999). The majority of studies on music teaching, however, do not address the pre-instructional decision-making process demonstrated by expert teachers. Instead, most studies have emphasized other topics (e.g., general and pedagogical content knowledge, comparative teaching strategies, evaluation protocols, conducting, and literature selection) among other subgroups of music educators (e.g., beginning teachers, pre-service teachers, and early childhood educators). To reflect the spectrum of influences on instructional decisions and to extend their earlier qualitative research (Johnson & Matthews, 2017; Matthews & Johnson, 2019), the authors designed this quantitative study to investigate a range of factors on expert music teachers' pre-instructional decision-making including pre-service education, musical context, curricula, prior teaching experiences, and assessment. Consequently, the purpose of this study was to examine decision-making within the context of pre-instructional planning from the perspective of expert music teachers. The two corresponding

research questions were: (1) which factors have more influence on pre-instructional decision-making among expert music teachers? and (2) what are the differences in pre-instructional decision-making by expert teachers in terms of teacher characteristics (gender and teaching experience) and educational setting (teaching level and musical context)?

Method

Participants

Sixty-eight (N = 68) music teachers in four online Master of Music Education degree programs based in the United States served as participants for this study. Because teaching experience alone does not provide a reliable indication of teaching expertise specifically in music education (Standley & Madsen, 1991) or more broadly in general education (Palmer, Stough, Burdenski, & Gonzales, 2005), the authors invited these teachers to participate as expert teachers based on their graduate studies, the intensity of their teacher preparation, and their subsequent education. The authors chose participants in master's degree programs because they were actively engaged in expanding their cognitive engagement in the context of current music education practices (Berliner, 2001). Their teaching expertise was, therefore, not a direct reflection of their years of experience (which varied) but instead a function of fully participating in the practices of teaching excellence (Lave & Wenger, 1991).

Participants' demographic data indicated: 32% males, 65% females, and 3% who did not answer. Their ethnicity was predominately Caucasian (80%), followed by Hispanic (6%), Multiracial (6%), Asian (5%), and African American (3%). They ranged from 23 to 52 years of age (M = 32.08, SD = 8.41) and their teaching experience extended from 2 to 27 years (M = 9.07, SD = 6.55). Their school geography was: 28% urban, 51% suburban, and 21% rural. Their primary teaching levels were 56% elementary and 43% secondary. Their teaching contexts were

50% classroom-based (i.e., non-performance / general music) and 46% performance-based (i.e., ensembles) with 19% choir, 18% band, and 9% orchestra, as well as 4% of respondents who did not answer this question.

Survey development. As an extension of their earlier qualitative research (Johnson & Matthews, 2017; Matthews & Johnson, 2019), the authors undertook this project to expand their work on teacher decision-making and to address the lack of quantitative research on this topic. The authors adapted a survey, "Cuestionario de Influencia en la Planificacíon de la Educacion Física" (CIPEF) *Planning Decision-Making in Physical Education Questionnaire,* published in Spanish, designed to address various factors that influenced how physical education teachers planned instruction (Viciana, Mayorga-Vega, & Blanco, 2015). The original survey included eight factors with a six-point Likert scale: 1=Totally Disagree to 6=Totally Agree. The factors were: (1) curriculum standards; (2) pre-service training; (3) physical environment; (4) physical activity experiences; (5) teaching experiences; (6) collaboration with other teachers; (7) material and equipment; and (8) level of preparation in the subject matter. To adapt the original survey, the authors first engaged an experienced music educator, fluent in Spanish, to translate the original survey into English. To refine the psychometric qualities of the survey, the authors then consulted three experts from physical education, music education, and educational survey research. The authors made changes based on the consultants' recommendations for clarity and focus.

The authors added assessment as a ninth factor because assessment is a key pedagogical component that influences instructional decisions and is embedded in each of the three stages of instruction: planning, presentation, and reflection (Bernstein-Colton & Spark-Langer, 1993). The authors designed assessment questions to correspond to the four artistic processes of the National

Core Arts Standards (State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education, 2016). Because these standards apply to PK – 12 music education settings, teachers'αα assessment responses revealed how and why their approaches to measuring student learning can vary by musical context. See the Appendix for the adaptations the authors made for musical contexts. The Appendix also lists the original survey items numbers followed by the adaptations for this study.

The alpha reliability coefficients for the original subscales ranged from .79 to .90. For the adapted scale, all items displayed had acceptable alpha reliability coefficients from .71 to .96, except *Level of Preparation* (α = .40). Although this subscale had a noticeably low coefficient for all participants, the coefficient rose to .83 when the authors isolated data from performance-based participants for this subscale. Therefore, the authors decided to retain this subscale, given that it measured the influence of musical activities participants engaged in personally and given the availability of performance-based opportunities such as community bands and choirs. For the classroom-based teachers, however, these activities are sparse and may only include music composition or professional development opportunities. The results of this subscale should be interpreted with caution when evaluating the responses of the full sample. See Table 1 for a comparison between estimates of reliability for original survey Factors and Adapted Surveys Factor Loadings.

The authors analyzed the dimensionality of the 21 items from the assessment subscale using the maximum likelihood factor analysis. Initial analyses indicated that the items were not highly skewed (skewness between -.18 to -.89). The authors used three criteria to determine the number of factors to rotate: the a priori hypothesis that the measure was unidimensional, the Scree test, and the interpretably of the factor solution. Two factors with the assessment subscale emerged, accounting for 57.49% of the item variance. The two subscales included: *Creativity,*

encompassing the NAfME anchor standards 1-3, and *Performing/Responding/Connecting,* encompassing anchor standards 4-11. See Table 2 for factor loadings, ranging from .90 to .55. The authors also computed two internal consistency estimates of reliability for the assessment subscale: a split-half coefficient expressed as a Spearman-Brown corrected correlation and a coefficient of alpha. For the split-half coefficient, the scale was split into two halves to be as equivalent as possible. The Split-half coefficient was $r = .96$, and a Coefficient of Alpha was $r = .94$.

Results

To address the first research question regarding the relative influence of each factor on pre-instructional decision-making among expert music teachers, the authors calculated a rank order of the mean scores for all participants. The highest rank order revealed the influence of teaching experience as the most prominent factor followed by materials and facilities, while the least influential factor was the influence of curriculum. See Table 3 for means and standard deviations of all participants. The authors performed further analysis to compare the rank order of factors on instructional planning by musical context (classroom-based vs. performance-based). While the results were largely the same, with teaching experience being the most influential factor, the performance-based ranked participants ranked their own level of preparation and musical activities higher than their classroom-based counterparts who gave more emphasis to their own materials/facilities and state curricula. See Table 4 for those means and standard deviations.

To address the second research question regarding how participant characteristics (gender and teaching experience) and educational setting (teaching level and musical context) influenced their pre-instructional decision-making, the authors conducted nonparametric tests. First, they

conducted a Mann-Whitney *U* test to evaluate gender differences with the factors influencing instructional planning, and they found no significant differences. They then conducted a Kruskal-Wallis test to evaluate the differences among three levels of teaching experience (Low, 1-3 years; Moderate, 4-12 years; and High, 25 years or more) on the influences of pre-instructional decisions. These categories correspond to those used in the original survey (Viciana & Mayorga-Vega, 2017). The test revealed a significant difference 2 (2, N =68) = -2.008 p =.045. The authors conducted follow-up tests to evaluate for statistically significant pairwise differences and found those only between low and high experienced teachers who reported the influences of their education (*Mdn* = 4.60 and 3.80, respectively).

The authors conducted a Mann-Whitney *U* test to evaluate factors influencing pre-instructional decision-making by teaching level differences (secondary vs. elementary). They found significant differences in three factors: influence of state curriculum ($z = 2.46$, $p < .05$); influence of musical activity ($z = -1.96$, $p < .05$); and influence of materials and facilities ($z = -2.29$, $p < .05$). Music teachers at the elementary level (*Mdn* = 4.35) reported significantly more influence from the state curriculum when planning than did the secondary music teachers (*Mdn* = 3.80). Elementary music teachers (*Mdn* = 5.50) also reported significantly more influence from materials and facilities when planning than did their secondary counterparts (*Mdn* = 5.00). Finally, secondary music teachers (*Mdn* = 4.67) reported significantly more influence from their musical activities when planning than did their elementary counterparts (*Mdn* = 4.00).

The authors also conducted a Mann-Whitney *U* test to evaluate factors influencing pre-instructional decision-making by teaching context (classroom-based vs. performance-based). They found significant differences in two factors: teaching experience ($z = 2.46$, $p < .05$) and influence of materials and facilities ($z = -2.29$, $p < .05$). Classroom-based music teachers (*Mdn* =

5.33) reported significantly more influence from teaching experience than did the performance-based music teachers (*Mdn* = 5.00). Additionally, classroom-based music teachers (*Mdn* = 6.00) reported significantly more influence from materials and facilities than did their performance-based counterparts (*Mdn* = 5.75).

Discussion

With respect to the first research question, regarding which factors have more influence on the pre-instructional decision-making among expert music teachers, the authors found that participants drew most notability on their teaching experience and the materials available. Other teachers, assessment, and prior education factored in less prominently while curriculum had the least influence. In this rank order, however, all factors scored at the middle of the Likert scale, indicating that all factors were relatively important.

Comparing the rank order of factors by musical context (classroom-based vs. performance-based), the authors found differences in the level of preparation, teachers' own musical activities, materials/facilities, and state curriculum. The first two of these factors figured more prominently among the performance-based teachers, probably because the participants were focused on performance-based outcomes requiring longer-term preparation for high-quality rehearsals and performances. Likewise, performance-based participants had more opportunities for participation in community-based performing ensembles (e.g., community choirs and bands). In contrast, the classroom-based participants ranked materials/facilities as a greater influence on their pre-instructional decisions. This highlighted their perceived dependence on available resources such as musical instruments and space for movement activities. As a parallel outcome measure more relevant to classroom-based teachers, they ranked state curricula as a more important measure of learning success, reflecting their focus on these state learning guidelines.

These findings are consistent with the content vs. pupil-centric roles found among secondary and elementary-level music teachers, respectively (Bouij, 1998). These findings are consistent with those from the general educational literature that accounted for the influence of instructional materials and teaching context on teachers' decision-making (King-Sears & Emenova, 2007).

With regard to the second research question about differences in pre-instructional decisions by expert teachers' characteristics (gender and teaching experience) and educational setting (teaching level and musical context), the authors found no difference by gender. This finding is consistent with Shah and Rezvani's (2016) results but inconsistent those reported by Giercayk and Harrison (2019) and Zhukov (2012). The gender imbalance among music teachers in this initial investigation, and in the profession at large, may have influenced this finding. Regarding teaching experience, the authors found that more novice teachers reported a greater influence of their own education than did their highly experienced counterparts. Understandably, this finding may reflect the proximity of more novice teachers to their pre-service coursework while more experienced teachers are further removed from their formal education. These different foci emphasized the importance of master teachers working closely with inexperienced colleagues, especially during the first three years of their teaching careers as each can learn from the other to improve this aspect of teaching as well as student achievement (David, 2000). The authors also found differences by teaching level, indicating that elementary-level teachers had more influence from the state curriculum, and materials/facilities, while secondary-level teachers rated their own musical activities as more influential. This result is consistent with findings from the first research question because classroom-based teaching is the most common form of music education at the elementary level. The difference regarding materials/facilities also highlights the

range of teaching strategies incorporated in classroom-based teaching and the importance of varied instructional materials needed to teach students in this musical setting.

Limitations of this initial investigation stem from its sample. The authors acknowledge both the relatively small sample size ($N = 68$) and the narrow respondent pool (i.e., students in online Master of Music Education degree programs). The respondents were also not racially diverse and had a gender imbalance by teaching context. Specifically, Caucasians outnumbered other races, and more women taught classroom-based music while more men taught performance-based ensembles, however this lack of diversity reflects that of the music teaching profession nationally in the United States (Elpus, 2019, September; Kruse, Giebelhausen, & Ramsey, 2015; Matthews & Koner, 2017; Roulston & Mitsunori, 2011). For future studies in this line of research, the authors recommend expanding the sample size, broadening the participant pool, and obtaining responses from teachers with a more balanced demographic background.

Implications

As an example of survey adaptation, this study provides a model for other music education research. Effectively using a data-collection instrument designed for another specialized teaching area demonstrates the pedagogical commonalities of music and physical education. More specifically, the original survey results showed that novice teachers relied significantly more on their pre-service teacher education than did their more experienced colleagues (Viciana & Mayorga-Vega, 2017). The same study also revealed that teachers at the secondary level relied significantly more on their pre-service education, curriculum standards, and materials and equipment than did their colleagues at the elementary level. While the parallel findings between these two studies regarding novice teachers are not surprising, the differing

influence of curricular standards by teaching level on instructional planning deserves further investigation in future research.

Analyzing differences in participant responses revealed teacher motivation and pre-instructional decision-making that would have otherwise remained in the background without the opportunity to explore their importance. Outcomes of this study provide insights into the pre-instructional decision-making of expert music teachers. Those insights, in turn, may enhance music teacher preparation and promote relevant issues for professional development. These results, such as aligning lesson plans with curricula, could also illuminate common challenges music teachers encounter while they plan for effective instruction as shaped by their teaching context. Other challenges include recognizing and overcoming obstacles presented by lack of materials/facilities, and those presented by teachers' own limitations in their professional preparation. Targeted professional development can benefit both pre-service and in-service teachers by addressing their perceived dependence on pedagogical resources such as musical instruments and space for movement activities, thereby limiting their instructional planning decisions.

At the beginning of the twenty-first century, teachers and schools are experiencing an increased sense of accountability, with a resultant shift toward micro-management and deconstructing rich educational experiences into discrete tasks (Ball, 2003; Shaw, 2020). As a result, understanding which factors most directly influence music teachers' instructional planning may prove to be increasingly important to aid both in-service and pre-service teachers in meeting emerging expectations. On a broader scale, re-evaluating professional development to address specific factors for both developing and expert music educators could enhance all teachers' understanding and reflection on instructional preparation. As a result, both classroom-

based and performance-based music teaching would be likely to improve student motivation, self-regulation, and learning.

References

Adderly, C., Kennnedy, M., & Berz, W. (2003). "A home away from home": The world of the high school music classroom. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 51,* 190-205.

Akos, P., & Galassi, J. P. (2004). Middle and high school transitions as viewed by students, parents, and teachers. *Professional School Counseling,* 212-221.

Amador, J., & Lamberg, T. (2013). Learning trajectories, lesson planning, affordances, and constraints in the design and enactment of mathematics teaching. *Mathematical Thinking and Learning*, *15*(2), 146–170. doi: 10.1080/10986065.2013.770719

Anderson, L. W. (2003). *Classroom assessment: Enhancing the quality of teacher decision making.* New York, NY: Routledge.

Ball, S. J. (2003). The teacher's soul and the terrors of performativity. *Journal of Education Policy, 18*(2), 215–228. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/0268093022000043065

Bauer, W. I., & Berg, M. H. (2001). Influences on instrumental music teaching. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education, 150,* 53–66.

Bazan, D. E. (2010). Planning and assessment practices of high school band directors. In L. K. Thompson & M. R. Campbell (Eds.), *Issues of identity in music education: Narratives and practices* (pp. 109–125). Charlotte, NC: IAP Information Age Publishing.

Berliner, D. C. (2001). Learning about and learning from expert teachers. *International Journal of Educational Research, 5,* 463 – 482.

Bernstein-Colton, A., & Sparks-Langer, G. M. (1993) A conceptual framework to guide the development of teacher reflection and decision making. *Journal of Teacher Education, 44*(1), 44 - 45. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487193044001007

Blocher, L., Greenwood, R., & Shellahamer, B. (1997). Teaching behaviors of middle school and high school band directors in the rehearsal setting. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *45*(3), 456-469.

Borko, H., Livingston, C., & Shavelson, R. J. (1990). Teachers' thinking about instruction. *RASE: Remedial & Special Education*, *11*(6), 40–49. https://doi/10.1177/074193259001100609

Borko, H., & Livingston, C. (1989). Cognition and improvisation: Differences in mathematics instruction by expert and novice teachers. *American Educational Research Journal*, *26*(4), 473–498. https://doi 10.2307/1162861

Bouij, C. (1998). Swedish music teachers in training and professional life. *International Journal of Music Education, (1),* 24-32.

Brittin, R. V. (2005). Pre-service and experienced teachers' lesson plans for beginning instrumentalists. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 53,* 26–39. doi:10.1177/002242940505300103

Calderhead, J. (1996). Teachers: Beliefs and knowledge. In D. Berliner & R. Calfee (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 709 – 725). New York, NY: Macmillan.

Campbell, P. S., & Scott-Kassner, C. (2014). *Music in childhood.* Stamford, CT: Schirmer.

Carr, D., & Skinner, D. (2009). The cultural roots of professional wisdom: Towards a broader view of teacher expertise. *Educational philosophy and theory*, *41*(2), 141 – 154.

Conway, C. M. (1999). The development of teaching cases for instrumental music methods courses. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 47*(4), 343-356. doi:10.2307/3345489

Dana, N. F., & Yendol-Hoppey, D. (2014). *The reflective educator's guide to classroom research: Learning to teach and teaching to learn through practitioner inquiry.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Datnow, A., & Hubbard, L. (2015). Teachers' use of assessment data to inform instruction: Lessons from the past and prospects for the future. *Teachers College Record*, *117*(4).

David, T. (2000). Programs in Practice. Teacher Mentoring--Benefits All Around. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, *36*(3), 134–36.

Eccles, J. S., Midgley, C., & Adler, T. (1984). Grade-related changes in the school environment. *The Development of Achievement Motivation, 3,* 238-331.

Elpus, K. (2019). *Who teaches music? Demographics and diversity among in-service music educators in the United States.* Presentation at the Symposium on Music Teacher Education, The Society for Music Teacher Education, Greensboro, NC.

Fogarty, J. I., Wang. M. C. & Creek, R. (1983). A descriptive study of experienced and novice teachers' interactive instructional thoughts and actions. *Journal of Educational Research,* doi.org/10.1080/00220671.1983.10885491

Gierczyk, M., & Harrison, T. (2019). The effects of gender on the ethical decision-making of teachers, doctors and lawyers. *New Educational Review, 1,* 147.

Gill, M. G., & Hoffman, B. (2009). Shared planning time: A novel context for studying teachers' discourse and beliefs about learning and instruction. *Teachers College Record*, *111*(5), 1242–1273.

Graham, G., Hopple, C., Manross, M., & Sitzman, T. (1993). Novice and experienced children's physical education teachers: Insights into their situational decision making. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, *12*(2), 197–214.

Hora, M. T. (2014). Exploring faculty beliefs about student learning and their role in instructional decision-making. *Review of Higher Education: Journal of the Association for the Study of Higher Education*, *38*(1), 37 – 70.

Isman, A. (2011). Instructional design in education: New model. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, *10*(1), 136-142.

Johnson, D. C., & Matthews, W. (2017). Experienced General Music Teachers' Instructional Decision Making. *International Journal of Music Education, 35*(2), 189-201. doi: 0255761415620531

King-Sears, M. E., & Evmenova, A. S. (2007). Premises, principles, and processes for integrating TECHnology into instruction. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 40*(1), 6 – 14. https://doi.org/10.1177/004005990704000101

Kinney, D. W. (2008). Selected demographic variables, school music participation, and achievement test scores of urban middle school students. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 56*(2), 145–161

Kohler, F., Henning, J. E., & Usma-Wilches, J. (2008). Preparing preservice teachers to make instructional decisions: An examination of data from the teacher work sample. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, *24*(8), 2108-2117. doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2008.04.002

Kruse, A. J., Giebelhausen, R., Shouldice, H. N., & Ramsey, A. L. (2015). Male and Female Photographic Representation in 50 Years of "Music Educators Journal." *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *62*(4), 485–500.

Lave, J., & Wenger, E. (1991). *Situated learning—Legitimate peripheral participation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lindblom-Ylänne, S., Trigwell, K., Nevgi, A., & Ashwin, P. (2006). How approaches to teaching are affected by discipline and teaching context. *Studies in Higher Education, 31*(3), 285 – 298

Lucas, K. V. (1994). Contextual condition and sightsinging achievement of middle school choral students. Journal of Research in Music Education, 42(3), 203–216.

Lutnpe, A. T., & Chambers, E. (2001). Assessing teachers' context beliefs about technology use. *Journal of Research on Technology in Education, 34* (1), 93 – 308. doi.org/10.1080/15391523.2001.10782337

Mac Iver, D. J. (1990). Meeting the needs of young adolescents: Advisory groups, interdisciplinary teaching teams, and school transition programs. *Phi Delta Kappan, 71*(6), 458-464.

Malcolm, J., Hodkinson, P., & Colley, H. (2003). The interrelationships between informal and formal learning. *Journal of Workplace Learning, 15*(7/8), 313-318.

Matthews, W. K., & Johnson, D.C. (2019). Instructional decision-making among expert choral and instrumental directors: How musical setting influences pedagogy. *Research and Issues in Music Education 15*(1). Retrieved from https://commons.lib.jmu.edu/rime/

Matthews, W. K., & Kitsantas, A. (2007). Group cohesion, collective efficacy, and motivational climate as predictors of conductor support in musical ensembles. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 55,* 6-17. Retrieved from http://journals.sagepub.com.proxy.lib.wayne.edu/doi/pdf/10.1177/0022429407055001

Matthews, W. K., & Koner. K. (2017). A survey of elementary and secondary music educators' professional background: Teaching responsibilities and job satisfaction in the United States.*Research and Issues in Music Education Journal.* Retrieved from http: //ir.stthomas.edu/rime/

McCutcheon, G. (1980). How do elementary school teachers plan? The nature of planning and influences on it. *The Elementary School Journal, 81,* 4–23.

Millican, S. (2012). *Starting out right: Beginning band pedagogy.* Lanham, MD: Scarecrow Press.

Mizelle, N. B., & Irvin, J. L. (2000). Transition from middle school into high school. *Middle School Journal, 31*(5), 57-61.

Mohan, P., Greer, J., & McCalla, G. (2003). Instructional planning with learning objects. *Knowledge representation and automated reasoning for e-learning systems*, 52-58.

Palmer, D. J., Stough, L. M., Burdenski, Jr, T. K., & Gonzales, M. (2005). Identifying teacher expertise: An examination of researchers' decision making. *Educational Psychologist*, *40*(1), 13-25.

Parker, E. C. (2016). The experience of creating community: An intrinsic case study of four midwestern public school choral teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *64*(2), 220-237. doi.org/10.1177/0022429416648292

Prosser, M., & Trigwell, K. (1997). Relations between perceptions of the teaching environment and approaches to teaching. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 67*(1), 25 – 35.

Rohwer, D., & Henry, W. (2004). University teachers' perceptions of requisite skills and characteristics of effective music teachers. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, *13*(2), 18-27. doi.org/10.1177/10570837040130020104

Roulston, K., & Mitsunori, M. (2011). Music teachers' constructions of gender in elementary education. *Music Education Research*, *13*(1), 3–28

Schmidt, C. P. (2005). Relations among motivation, performance achievement, and music experience variables in secondary instrumental music students. *Journal of Research in Music Education, 53,* 134-147.

Schön, D. (1986). *Educating the reflective practitioner.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Shahvand, M., & Rezvani, E. (2016). Iranian EFL teachers' beliefs and practices on effective teaching: The case of gender and level of experience. *Research in English Language Pedagogy, 2,* 30.

Shavelson, R. J., & Stern, P. (1981). Research on teachers' pedagogical thoughts, judgments, decisions, and behavior. *Review of Educational Research*, *51*(4), 455-498. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543051004455

Shaw, R. D. (2017). I can hardly wait to see what I'm going to do today: Lesson planning perspectives of experienced band teachers. *Contributions to Music Education, 42*, 127–149.

Shaw, R. (2020). Planning and preparation for instruction, In C.M. Conway, K. Pellegrino, A.M. Stanley, & C. West (Eds.) *The oxford handbook of preservice music teacher education in the United States* (pp. 395-418). New York: Oxford University Press.

Standerfer, S. L., & Hunter, L. R. (2010). Square peg for a square hole: A standards- and repertoire-based curriculum model. *Music Educators Journal, 96*(3), 25–30. doi:10.1177/0027432109354976

Standley, J. M., & Madsen, C. K. (1991). An observation procedure to differentiate teaching experience and expertise in music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *39*(1), 5 – 11.

State Education Agency Directors of Arts Education (SEADAE). (2016). National Core Arts Standards. Retrieved from http://nationalartsstandards.org/

Vanlommel, K., Vanhoof, J., & Van Petegem, P. (2016). Data use by teachers: The impact of motivation, decision-making style, supportive relationships and reflective capacity. *Educational Studies*, *42*(1), 36-53.

Viciana, J., Mayorga-Vega, D., & Blanco, H. (2015). Psychometric properties of the influences on planning decision-making in physical education questionnaire (CIPEF),

Cuadernos de Psicologia del Deporte, 15(1), 285-294. doi:10.4321/S1578-84232015000100027

Viciana, J., & Mayorga-Vega, D. (2017). Influencing factors on planning decision-making among Spanish in-service physical education teachers: A population-based study. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology, 15*(3), 491-509. ISSN: 1696-2095. 2017. no. 43. http://dx.doi.org/10.14204/ejrep.43.16112

Westerman, D. A. (1991). Expert and novice teacher decision making. *Journal of Teacher Education, 42,* 292–305.

Winkler, G. (2001). Reflection and theory: Conceptualising the gap between teaching experience and teacher expertise. *Educational Action Research 9*(3), 437 – 449, doi: 10.1080/09650790100200168

Young, V. M., & Kim, D. H. (2010). Using assessments for instructional improvement: A literature review. Education Policy Analysis Archives, 18(19). Retrieved from http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/article/view/809

Zhukov, K. (2012). Teaching strategies and gender in higher education instrumental studios. *International Journal of Music Education, 30*(1), 32–45.

Table 1

Estimates of Reliability for Original Factors and Adapted Surveys

Factor	Original	Adapted
1 Curricula	.90	.94
2 Influence of Preservice education	.88	.71
3 Physical Environment	.87	.96
4 Teaching Experience	.86	.82
5 Musical Experience	.85	.83
6 Other Teachers	.82	.81
7 Materials	.79	.72
8 Level of Preparation in a Musical Context	.85	.40 (.83*)
9 Assessment	n/a	.94

Note: * is reliability for performance-based teachers only

Table 2

Example Questions with Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Loadings

		M	SD	FL1	FL2
30	Though assessments, I have students generate musical ideas that inform my instructional plans.	4.44	1.35	.88	
31	Though assessments, I have students conceptualize musical ideas that inform my instructional plans.	4.25	1.36	.90	
32	Through assessment, I have students organize musical ideas and work.	4.13	1.10	.74	
33	Through assessment, I have students develop musical ideas and work.	4.33	1.32	.83	
34	Through assessment, I have students refine musical work.	4.37	1.22	.82	
35	Through assessment, I have students complete musical work.	4.50	1.23	.72	
36.	Through assessment, I have students select musical work for presentation.	3.51	1.43		.55
37.	Through assessment, I have students analyze musical work for presentation.	3.69	1.33		.72
38.	Through assessment, I have students interpret musical work for presentation.	3.92	1.35		.75
39.	Through assessment, I have students develop and refine musical techniques for presentation	4.49	1.31		.71
40.	Through assessment, I have students convey meaning through the presentation of musical work.	4.22	1.37		.74
41.	Through assessment, I have students perceive musical works.	4.15	1.24		.63
42.	Through assessment, I have students analyze musical works.	4.03	1.22		.77
43.	Through assessment, I have students interpret meaning in musical works.	4.05	1.28		.71
44.	Through assessment, I have students interpret intent in musical works.	3.75	1.17		.74
45.	Through assessment, I have students apply criteria to evaluate musical works.	3.98	1.38		.60
46.	Through assessment, I have students synthesize knowledge to make music.	4.37	1.13		.61
47.	Through assessment, I have students relate knowledge to make music.	4.42	1.25		.66
48.	Through assessment, I have students relate musical ideas and works with societal context to deepen understanding.	4.00	1.38		.80

49.	Through assessment, I have students relate musical ideas and works cultural context to deepen understanding.	4.17	1.29	.80
50.	Through assessment, I have students relate musical ideas and works with historical context to deepen understanding.	4.08	1.35	.70

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations for Rank Order of Dependent Variables Among All Participants.

	M	SD
Influence of Teaching Experience	5.68	.47
Influence of Materials Facilities	5.16	.79
Influence of Level of Preparation	5.09	.76
Influence of Physical Surrounding	4.51	1.30
Influence of Other Teachers	4.41	1.13
Influence of Assessment - Creativity	4.32	1.02
Influence of Education	4.11	.97
Influence of Musical Activities	4.11	1.29
Influence of Assessment - Performing/Responding Connecting	4.06	.94
Influence of Curriculum State Subscale	3.72	1.45
Influence of Curriculum District Subscale	3.61	1.47
Influence of Curriculum National Subscale	3.39	1.31

$N = 68$

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Rank Order of Dependent Variables

Classroom-Based Participants *			Performance-Based Participants**		
Factor	M	SD	Factor	M	SD
Teaching Experience	5.80	.39	Teaching Experience	5.53	.54
Materials/Facilities	5.32	.74	Level of Preparation	5.19	.72
Level of Preparation	4.99	.80	Materials/Facilities	4.95	.87
Physical Surrounding	4.55	1.25	Physical Surrounding	4.45	1.42
Assessment - Creativity	4.36	1.06	Other Teachers	4.44	1.12
Other Teachers	4.26	1.28	Assessment - Creativity	4.35	.94
Education	4.05	.99	Musical Activities	4.30	1.20
Curriculum State	4.04	1.41	Assessment-P/R/C	4.18	.93
Assessment-P/R/C	3.94	.98	Education	4.12	.98)
Musical Activities	3.86	.98	Curriculum District	3.88	1.50
Curriculum National	3.52	1.30	Curriculum State	3.46	1.36
Curriculum District	3.48	1.40	Curriculum National	3.34	1.32

*$N = 34$; **$N = 31$

Appendix

Factors Influencing Pre-Instructional Decisions

All of the following items represent influences that might affect you when you plan instruction. To mark low values in the scale does not imply denial of such influence but indicates that, in your planning of music education, those factors have little or no influence at all.

Please rate each of the following statements on the six-point rating scale from:

Absolutely Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Absolutely Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6

Original Survey Corresponding Items	Adapted Music Questions
The Influence of pre-service education	
1.	1. The training that I have received while studying for my degree / certification influences me when planning my music classes.
2.	2. The educational trends or philosophy that my professors promoted in my degree program currently influence my music planning.
3.	3. I use the materials and notes from my pre-service teacher education program to plan music instruction.
4.	4. The methodology in my degree program influences me when planning music instruction.
5.	5. The learning experiences that I had as a student influence me when planning music instruction
Influence of the level of preparation in the different contents	
6.	6. If I have more information about some musical contexts (e.g. general /classroom music, band, choir, orchestra, and other settings), I tend to plan more effectively for my music classes.
7.	7a. The more knowledge I have about a specific musical content, the more I tend to use it in my lesson plans.
	7b. The more closely matched my student-teaching internship was to my professional teaching position, the more effective I am as a teacher.
Influence of curricula	
9.	8a. The national curriculum (NAfME) is very influential in planning music instruction.
	8b. The state-level curriculum is very influential in planning music instruction.

8c. The district or local-level curriculum is very influential in planning music instruction.

10. 9a. The guidelines of the national curriculum (NAfME) are a priority for me when planning for music.
9b. The guidelines of the state-level curriculum are a priority for me when planning for music.

9c. The guidelines of the district or local-level curriculum (NAfME) are a priority for me when planning for music.

11. 10a. Primarily, I plan for music instruction based on the national (NAfME) curriculum of the level (grade) I am teaching.
10b. Primarily, I plan for music instruction based on the state-level curriculum of the level (grade) I am teaching.
10c. Primarily, I plan for music instruction based on the district or local-level curriculum of the level (grade) I am teaching.

12. 11a. The official guidelines of the national curriculum (NAfME) are evident in my planning, and therefore in my music classes.
11b. The official guidelines of the state-level curriculum (NAfME) are evident in my planning, and therefore in my music classes.

11c. The official guidelines of the district or local-level national curriculum (NAfME) are evident in my planning, and therefore in my music classes.

13. 12a. In my music planning, there is an obvious influence of the national (NAfME) curriculum.
12b. In my music planning, there is an obvious influence of the state-level curriculum.

12c. In my music planning, there is an obvious influence of the district or local-level curriculum.

The Influence of geographical area

29. 13. When I plan music instruction, I tend to look for connections to the school's geographical area (e.g. urban, suburban, rural) where I am teaching.

30. 14. The characteristics of the geographical area (e.g. urban, suburban, rural) where I am working influences planning music instruction.

31. 15. When planning music instruction, I always consider the geographical area (e.g. urban, suburban, rural) in planning the content and how to incorporate it.

33. 16. In my planning of music instruction, I seriously consider the geographical area (e.g. urban, suburban, rural) and its possibilities.

The influences of your experiences as a musician

34. 17. The musical activities that I do outside of my music classroom or ensembles make me plan music instruction in a different way.

35. 18. The ensemble(s) that I participate in influence my planning of music instruction.

36.	19. My practice or music-making habits influence me when planning music instruction.

The influences of teaching experience

39.	20. My teaching experience informs my planning of future instructional units.
40.	21. The effectiveness of my teaching is of key importance to plan music instruction for the next year.
41.	22. The successes and failures I have during my teaching of music guides me when planning the upcoming years.
42.	23. The experiences that I accumulate with my classes influence my current planning.

The influence of materials and facilities

43.	24. Usually, I plan music instruction according to the educational materials and equipment I have available.
44.	25. The characteristics of the music classroom or performance facilities I have available at the school are fundamental to planning music instruction.
45.	26. I adapt planning for music instruction based on the presence or absence of specific materials or equipment.

The influence of other music teachers

46.	27. The experiences of my colleagues helps me plan music instruction.
47.	28. I consider the opinions of other music teachers to plan music instruction.
48.	29. I tend to share my ideas about how to deliver music instruction in my classes with my colleagues.

Assessment

n/a	30. Through assessment, I have students select musical work for presentation.
n/a	31. Through assessment, I have students analyze musical work for presentation.
n/a	32. Through assessment, I have students interpret musical work for presentation.
n/a	33. Through assessment, I have students develop and refine musical techniques for presentation.
n/a	34. Through assessment, I have students convey meaning through the presentation of musical work.
n/a	35. Through assessment, I have students perceive musical works.
n/a	36. Through assessment, I have students analyze musical works.
n/a	37. Through assessment, I have students interpret meaning in musical works.
n/a	38. Through assessment, I have students interpret intent in musical works.
n/a	389. Through assessment, I have students apply criteria to evaluate musical works.

n/a	40. Through assessment, I have students synthesize knowledge to make music.
n/a	41. Through assessment, I have students relate knowledge to make music.
n/a	42. Through assessment, I have students relate musical ideas and works with societal context to deepen understanding.
n/a	43. Through assessment, I have students relate musical ideas and works cultural context to deepen understanding.
n/a	44. Through assessment, I have students relate musical ideas and works with historical context to deepen understanding.

Daniel C. Johnson (johnsond@uncw.edu) is Professor of Music and Music Education at the University of North Carolina Wilmington. A Fulbright Scholar with over twenty-five years of teaching experience spanning the PK - university gamut, Dr. Johnson is an international authority on music education pedagogy. A graduate of the New England Conservatory and the University of Arizona, he has published in numerous eminent journals including *The Journal of Research in Music Education, The Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education,* and *Arts Education Policy Review.* His most recent book chapters appear in *The Oxford Handbook of Assessment Policy and Practice in Music Education, Applying Model Cornerstone Assessments in K–12 Music,* and *The Handbook of Listening.*

Wendy K. Matthews (wmatthe4@kent.edu) is Associate Professor of Music Education at Kent State University. She holds degrees from the Peabody Conservatory of Music, University of Maryland-College Park, and George Mason University. Her research interests include music teacher pedagogies, oral histories of pioneering women brass players, and self-regulation and group dynamics in large ensembles. Her research has been published in several journals including the *Journal of Research in Music Education, Psychology of Music, International, Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice,* and the *Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education* and *the Journal of Band Research*. Dr. Matthews is also the co-author of the *Basic Conducting Techniques (Seventh Edition).*