

An investigation of preservice elementary teachers' concerns on teaching music using Fuller and Bown's teacher concerns model*

Mi Young Choi**

The purpose of this study was to examine the concerns of preservice elementary teachers on teaching music using the Fuller and Bown's teacher concerns model. Participants were 15 senior undergraduates who specialized in music education at a national university of education in Korea. Data sources included teaching DVDs, accompanying lesson plans, self-evaluations of teaching, and unstructured interviews. For the interview, a video-assisted, stimulated recall method was used after peer teaching and field teaching episodes. Self-evaluations and the verbatim transcripts of the interviews were coded according to Fuller and Bown's concerns categories (self-survival, task, and student-impact). The results of the analysis indicated that task concerns were the most frequently reported, followed by self concerns and student-impact concerns. Task concerns and student-impact concerns increased from peer teaching to field teaching, whereas self concerns decreased from peer teaching to field teaching.

※ Key words: preservice elementary teachers, concern on teaching music, peer teaching, field teaching

Table of Contents

I . Introduction	
II . Research method	
1. Participants	2. Procedure
3. Data analysis	
III . Results	
1. Self concerns	2. Task concerns
3. Student-impact concerns	
IV . Discussion	
References	

* This work was supported by 2015 research fund granted by Daegu National University of Education

** Associate Professor of Music Education, Daegu National University of Education (choimiyoung@dnue.ac.kr)

I . Introduction

It is necessary for music educators to consider preservice teachers' expressed concerns on teaching music. Preservice teacher concerns can act as indicators of their thinking about teaching music. Identifying their concerns may reveal which elements of teaching music have been internalized and which are yet to be grasped. Preservice teacher concerns can signify obstacles to be overcome or needs to be met for growth in the effectiveness of teaching music. Consequently, investigations of preservice teacher concerns will provide insights into the complex challenges that preservice teachers experience in teaching music as they progress into the field (Berg & Miksza, 2010; Miksza & Berg, 2013). Therefore, the understanding of preservice teacher concerns on teaching music is important to design and implement preservice teacher education curricula.

Among several theoretical frameworks on preservice teacher concerns in general education and music education, Fuller and Bown's teacher concerns framework has been employed in many studies with relative significance (Berg & Miksza, 2010; Burden, 1990; Kagan, 1992; Rideout & Feldman, 2002; Yourn, 2000). According to Fuller (1969), teacher concerns are considered to be the perceived problems or topics which are frequently the focus of teacher thought and action. Based on Fuller's initial work (1969), Fuller and Bown (1975) developed a three-stage linear model of preservice teacher concerns. The three stages include self-survival, task, and student-impact. During the first stage, teachers are mainly concerned with their survival and a sense of personal adequacy as a teacher rather than a student. This stage is characterized by concerns about being liked by students, being evaluated by others, and being cut out for teaching. In the second stage, teachers are primarily concerned with mastery of teaching. The stage involves concerns about teaching situation such as planning lessons, mastering teaching materials, applying teaching method, and so on. In the final stage, teachers become oriented towards their impact on students. This is characterized by concerns for student's needs and students' academic achievement.

The stages represent the types of concerns that are considered to be a major focus of thought and action in the process of becoming a teacher. This three-stage model is centered on the changes of a teacher's dominant concern over time. In this model, it is hypothesized that preservice teachers are expected to express more self-survival concerns, whereas in-service teachers may be more likely to express task and student-impact concerns. The most effective teachers would have more student focused concerns predominantly (Fuller & Bown, 1975). Although Fuller and Bown used the term 'stage', they did not specify whether the stages were distinct or overlapping. Clusters of concerns seem to be associated with each stage, and these clusters can give insights on learning to teach.

Based on Fuller and Bown's model, research regarding preservice teacher concerns has showed mixed findings. Some researchers have reported findings that support the Fuller and Bown's model. Pigge and Marso (1989) found that student teachers' concerns shifted from self-survival to teacher task orientations. Calerhead and Robson (1991) identified that preservice teachers' concerns centered around self and task. Broyles (1997) and Berg and Miksa (2010) found similar results for music student teachers that their self-survival concerns decreased while student-impact concerns increased. Yourn (2000) also found that preservice music teachers progressed through teachers' concerns as suggested by Fuller and Bown. These studies supported the relatively linear change from self-survival to task to student-impact stages.

Other researchers have challenged the Fuller and Bown's model. Weinstein (1990) and Gore and Zeichner (1991) reported that preservice elementary teachers remained concerned about self-survival issues with no evidence of a shift throughout conducting the studies. Burn, Hagger, Mutton, and Everton (2003) yield the findings that self-survival concerns decreased and student-impact concerns increased as the teaching experience progressed. However, student-impact concerns were prevalent at the beginning of student teaching. Similarly, Campbell and Thompson (2007), when they surveyed preservice music teachers on concerns, found that the preservice music teachers rated student-impact concerns significantly higher than self-survival

or task concerns regardless of their undergraduate degree progress. Berg and Miksza (2010) and Teachout and McCoy (2010) also reported the similar findings. However, Berg and Miksza concluded that preservice music teachers did not necessarily progress through linear concern stages. Their concerns were displayed in clusters as suggested McLaughlin's study (1991).

In general, preservice teachers have peer teaching and field teaching experiences before being in-service teachers. Peer teaching has allowed preservice teachers to focus on the technical aspects of teaching, such as lesson planning, rehearsal techniques, and content delivery, without concerning on classroom management. Peer teaching setting is only simulation of real teaching situation, so it fails to provide an authentic context and develops little the participants' identity as teachers. However, field teaching provides preservice teachers the opportunity to teach in authentic context. Field teaching experiences helped them boost their confidence in working with K-12 students and have the advantages for evaluating the effectiveness of their own teaching (Butler, 2001; Powell, 2011, 2014).

It is helpful that instructors who seek to provide an optimal teaching environment for preservice music teachers are informed of preservice teacher concerns in both peer teaching and field teaching settings. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to investigate the status of preservice elementary teacher concerns on teaching music in both peer teaching and field teaching contexts using Fuller and Bown's model.

II. Research method

1. Participants

Participants in this study was selected by purposive sampling. This sampling is known to be useful for situations where researchers need to reach targeted sample quickly, and where sampling for proportionality is not the primary concern. They were 15 undergraduates who enrolled in both materials

and methods for teaching elementary music course and teaching management practicum course at a national university of education in Korea. They all understood the purpose of this study and agreed to it.

All participants were 4th-year seniors and their specialization was music education. They consisted of six males and nine females. Their previous curricular experiences consisted of a five week observation and a three week field teaching.

2. Procedure

Data were collected during spring 2015 and functioned as both the course assignments and data for this study. As preparation for field teaching experience, all participants led peer teaching episodes in class prior to field teaching episodes. Each teaching episode was recorded with a HD digital video camcorder. Data sources included teaching DVDs, accompanying lesson plans, self-evaluations of teaching in which participants identified self, task, and student-impact concerns for each teaching setting, and unstructured interviews.

For the unstructured interviews, each participant had individual meetings with the researcher within 48 hours after each teaching. To enhance the quality of the participants' recall, the time between each teaching episode and interview was minimized. Participants watched each video of their teaching episodes with the researcher during the meetings. No prepared specific questions were asked in order to mitigate researcher effects and seek their honest reflections of their teaching. Participants were asked to pause the video at any time when it stimulated them to reflect on their teaching. They were encouraged to speak freely and share their thought at that moment in the teaching episodes. All interviews were transcribed literally.

Self-evaluations and the verbatim transcripts of the interviews were coded and analyzed to compare the concerns of the participants in peer teaching experiences and field teaching experiences, and identify the most common concerns of the participants during two teaching settings.

3. Data analysis

Coding approach in the previous studies (Berg & Miksza, 2010; Powell, 2011), which was a deductive approach based on Fuller and Bown's (1975) three categories, was employed to code teaching DVDs and self-evaluations. Self concern category codes focused on participants' concerns for themselves as teachers and their personal characteristics. Task category codes included concerns with the content and delivery of instruction and the teaching environment issue. Student-impact category codes reflected concerns for students' knowledge, skill, and affective development and their characteristics. The following table is a complete list of codes.

<Table 1> Preservice teachers' concern codes classification

	Code	Definition
Self	Se	General teacher concern
	SeO	Organization
	SeH	Humor
	SeC	Communication
	SeR	Rapport
	SeID	Identity
	SeINDEC	Indecision
	SePERS	Personality
	SeEV	Evaluation of teaching
	SeA	Adapting
	SeP	Physical traits, quirks, appearance, voice, facial inflection
Task	T	General task concern
	TK	Knowledge
	TIS	Instrument-specific pedagogy
	TREP	Repertoire familiarity
	TGR	Student group size(class size)/configuration
	TREAL	Real-world relevance
	TT	Time
	TF	Feedback
	TREH	Rehearsal strategy use
	TC	Conducting
	TD	Discipline
	TPC	Pacing
	TE	Error detection
	TG	Goals

Code		Definition
	TPL	Planning
	TLRP	Long range planning
	TLEV	Student age/grade level
	TAB	Student ability level
	TQ	Questioning
	TMOD	Modeling
Student- impact	S	General student concern
	SGR	Student group size
	SM	Motivation
	SI	Individual student impact
	SL	General learning concern
	SLIK	Students liking the teacher
	SENJ	Students enjoying music
	SA	Adapting

An intercoder agreement process was used to generate codes from data. The intercoders who are two elementary school head teachers in music subject and the researcher completed coding. In order to attain high intercoder agreement, we contacted one another with coding questions that emerged during coding, and discussed disagreements in coding. For an example, Codes used by one participant were determined to be less robust and after discussion we were recoded. We compared all the codes and reach a consensus on the final label.

III. Results

Analyses of the coded concern statements from peer teaching and field teaching are presented in <Table 2>. Task concerns and student-impact concerns increased in frequency and percentage of overall responses from peer teaching to field teaching, whereas the frequency and percentage of self concerns decreased from peer teaching to field teaching.

<Table 2> Descriptive analyses of each concern

Concern	Peer Teaching			Field Teaching		
	sum	m	ratio(%)	sum	m	ratio(%)
Self	110	7.33	42.15	46	3.07	21.20
Task	104	6.93	39.85	122	8.13	56.22
Student-impact	47	3.13	18.01	49	3.27	22.58

The task category was the most frequently reported overall, and the percentage of overall responses in task concerns increased from peering teaching (39.85%) to field teaching (56.22%). The self category was the second most reported overall, although the percentage of concerns in this category considerably decreased from peer teaching (42.15%) to field teaching (21.20%). The student-impact category was reported the least overall, although the percentage of these concerns increased from peer teaching (18.01%) to field teaching (22.58%).

1. Self concerns

Ten self concern codes among eleven emerged from the data (Table 3). Any statement related to humor was not mentioned in two teaching episodes. Statements regarding the participants' physical traits and appearance were the most commonly cited issue in both teaching episodes.

<Table 3> Self concern code distribution by participants and overall frequency

Code	Definition	Peer Teaching		Field Teaching	
		n	#	n	#
Se	General teacher concern	4	5	3	3
SeO	Organization	1	2	5	6
SeH	Humor	0	0	0	0
SeC	Communication	11	14	6	8
SeR	Rapport	3	7	2	2
SeID	Identity	3	3	1	1
SeINDEC	Indecision	5	6	2	2
SePERS	Personality	9	10	2	2
SeEV	Evaluation of teaching	4	4	1	2
SeA	Adapting	9	12	3	4
SeP	Physical traits, quirks, appearance, voice, facial inflection	22	47	14	18

In peer teaching, the interpersonal concerns such as communication and personality, and adapting concern to peer teaching setting were also relatively frequent cited issues. Communication and self-organization were the relatively frequent concerns found in field teaching. A concern for self-organization increased in number of participants and frequency from peer teaching to field teaching, whereas participants' number and frequency of other concerns decreased from peer teaching to field teaching.

2. Task concerns

The task concern category had the most widely distributed set of concerns with nineteen codes (Table 4). No statement related to long range planning of lesson was mentioned in both peer teaching and field teaching episodes. Task concerns emphasized most included planning, age- and ability- appropriate strategies, rehearsal teaching strategies, pacing, and general task concern.

<Table 4> Task concern code distribution by participants and overall frequency

Code	Definition	Peer Teaching		Field Teaching	
		n	#	n	#
T	General task concern	8	10	11	15
TK	Knowledge	5	5	4	5
TIS	Instrument-specific pedagogy	7	8	5	5
TREP	Repertoire familiarity	8	8	3	6
TGR	Student group size(class size)/ configuration	5	6	0	0
TREAL	Real-world relevance	1	1	0	0
TT	Time	6	6	5	6
TF	Feedback	5	8	1	1
TREH	Rehearsal strategy use	8	12	7	8
Task TC	Conducting	1	1	0	0
TD	Discipline	2	2	5	6
TPC	Pacing	8	9	9	9
TE	Error detection	1	1	7	7
TG	Goals	1	3	6	8
TPL	Planning	6	13	7	9
TLRP	Long range planning	0	0	0	0
TLEV	Student age/grade level	3	3	9	12
TAB	Student ability level	2	2	11	12
TQ	Questioning	3	4	5	6
TMOD	Modeling	2	2	7	7

Lesson planning, rehearsal teaching strategies, and general task concern were relatively common issues cited in peer teaching, whereas general task concern and age- and ability- appropriate strategies were relatively common in field teaching. Concern for student group size or configuration was apparent in peer teaching, whereas this concern was no longer emerged in field teaching. Unlike the overall frequency of task concerns increased from peer teaching to field teaching, frequencies of codes in the task concern category showed no consistent pattern of increasing or decreasing from peer teaching episode to field teaching.

3. Student-impact concerns

Six discrete codes, which is the smallest number of concern code, were detected within the student-impact concern category (Table 5). There was no statement related to student group size and student's liking for teacher. Being able to motivate students was the most common concern of the participants in the student-impact concern category during peer and field teaching episodes.

<Table 5> Student-impact concern code distribution by participants and overall frequency

Code	Definition	Peer Teaching		Field Teaching	
		n	#	n	#
Student-impact	S General student concern	6	6	13	14
	SGR Student group size	0	0	0	0
	SM Motivation	11	13	12	15
	SI Individual student impact	2	3	2	2
	SL General learning concern	11	12	5	8
	SLIK Students liking the teacher	0	0	0	0
	SENJ Students enjoying music	3	4	4	4
	SA Adapting	6	9	6	6

Statements concerning general student concern increased from peer teaching to field teaching. Student learning statements decreased from peer teaching to field teaching episode. Although the overall frequency of student-impact

concerns increased from peer teaching to field teaching, frequencies of codes in the student-impact concern category showed no consistent pattern of increasing or decreasing from peer teaching to field teaching.

IV. Discussion

Data from the participants' self-reflection and interview indicated that task concerns were prevalent during peer teaching and field teaching experiences. The overall quantity of task concerns cited by participants was greater than that of self and student-impact concerns. This result is consistent with findings by Pigge and Marso (1989), Calderhead and Robin (1991), and Berg and Miksza (2010) in both general education and music education. They found that preservice teachers rated task concerns higher than self or student-impact concerns. However, this result is inconsistent with the finding in music education that identified student-impact concerns as the most prevalent preservice music teachers (Campbell & Thompson, 2007). The inconsistency between this result and Campbell and Thompson's result might be attributable to methodological difference (Powell, 2014). Participants in this study described their concerns in the actual music teaching experiences, but Campbell and Thompson's participants have reported idealized concerns.

The overall low level of student-impact concerns that participants addressed in both peer teaching and field teaching episodes is congruent with Weinstein's (1990) but incongruent with Burn et al.'s (2003) finding in which preservice teachers had a high level of student-impact concerns from the beginning of the student teaching experience. We may infer that participants were concerned about the influence of student learning by their performance on teaching task. But the number of statements that participants expressed student-impact concerns from the students' point of view remained low. Even though participants kept students' needs and interests in their mind, they still seemed to center on themselves and teaching task.

Student-impact concerns were reported the least in peer teaching episodes

because perhaps participants' peers simulated elementary school students. Even when participants had real elementary school students in field teaching, the frequency of student-impact concerns was still the relatively small magnitude although statements related to student-impact concerns slightly increased from peer teaching to field teaching. Probably preservice teachers viewed student teaching as nothing more than practice with the goal of self improvement rather than student learning enhancement. They analyzed and reflected on teaching from their perspectives. So it is encouraged that preservice teachers should try to see the lesson from students' perspectives (Powell, 2014).

Self concern cited the most commonly in both peer teaching and field teaching episodes was related to physical traits and appearance. Almost all participants reported this concern. They concerned on unnecessary gesture, stiff look, blush, soft and shaking voice, fast speaking, mumbling, stammering, blurting out, being talkative, bad handwriting on chalkboard, sweating, and so on. Among these, mumbling, blurting out, and unnecessary gesture were mostly reported. In contrast, two participants stated, "I kept on smiling and spoke slowly when I became apprehensive." Some participants also stated that they moved restlessly even while explaining something to students or they touched their hair too much.

Task concerns frequently reported by participants in peer teaching and field teaching episodes were planning, rehearsal teaching strategies, pacing, and general task concern. Planning was the common concern during both teaching episodes. Participants compared their teaching performances to their lesson plans. They expressed how teaching context such as student ability level required them to change their original lesson plans during the lessons. One participant stated, "In playing xylophone, my lesson plan was not carried out. Even though I had planned to play an easy melody I thought, children felt difficulty in playing it on xylophone, so I changed my plan in the moment." Regarding rehearsal teaching strategies, participants indicated successful teaching strategies that they had used in the class or those that they would use in the later class. For examples, one participant stated in peer teaching episode, "If I taught this lesson in the actual teaching, I would approach small

group activity rather than individual activity.”

Student age- and ability- appropriate strategies emerged as important task related issues in field teaching episode. It seems that participants realized that the use of age- and ability- strategies was more important in field teaching episode, whereas they taught their peer with relatively low concern about student age and ability since their peer have a higher level of music achievement than elementary school students. In field teaching, participants concerned students' previous musical knowledge, and since they did not have enough information about students' musical experiences, they had difficulty in making decision on the width and depth of learning contents.

Motivation was the most commonly reported in the student-impact concern category. Similar results were reported by Campbell and Thompson (2007), Berg and Miksza (2010), and Powell (2014) who found that motivating students was the highest rated issue among student-impact concerns. While reflecting on field teaching experience, participants concerned about students' active class participation because of two main reasons. One was students' boredom and lack of interest, and the other was the difficulty of learning contents. Two participants stated, “They seemed they were bored with keeping on playing xylophone. I was worried about how they could get motivated to play it excitingly.” This statement shows that participants saw events from the students' point of view, however, they did not make appropriate adjustments to get their students to have more enthusiasm to play it. Preservice teachers should recognize whether and how teaching strategies motivated students during the lessons.

Overall, the concerns for self-survival decreased and the concerns for making an impact on students increased from their peer teaching to their field teaching. This result, to some extent, similarly shows the linear progression of three-stage model of teacher concerns developed by Fuller and Bown (1975). This supports findings of some studies in general education and music education, which reported similar trends of shifts from self-survival to student-impact concerns (Berg & Miksza, 2010; Brolyes, 1997; Hall & Hord, 1987; McLaughlin, 1991; Miksza & Berg, 2013; Powell, 2014).

Compared between peer teaching experience and field teaching experience, some participants reported that peer teaching was more stressful than field teaching. They were nervous about being judged by their peers who have more music expertise than elementary school students. This finding is consistent with findings by Paul (1998) and Butler (2001). On the other hand, some participants reported that teaching their peers was easier and made them less nervous than teaching elementary school students because they focused on and honed their teaching without concerns of student impact. This is congruent with Powell's finding (2011). He saw it as a positive aspect of the peer teaching process and an inherent value of peer teaching. However, at the same time, one participant stated, "It is difficult to anticipate the effectiveness of my teaching in the field placements based on my peer teaching experience, because peer teaching episodes are merely simulations of real teaching situation."

Based on these results, music educators can benefit from a better understanding of preservice elementary teacher concerns on teaching music. It will be beneficial for music educator to be aware of and reactive to prototypical types of needs that preservice elementary music teachers may evince various stages of their professional development and how teaching context interacts with those needs (Miksza & Berg, 2013). This information will be helpful in designing and implementing preservice music teacher education curricula. Therefore, music educators should consider preservice elementary teacher concerns on teaching music and be sensitive to their concerns' manifestations.

However, it is important for music educators to recognize that only perceived concerns cannot explain the whole of music teacher development. With regard to research methods, observation rather than self-reported methods might be helpful to understand better the development of preservice elementary teacher concerns on teaching music. In addition, it will be informative for music educators to examine longitudinally the change in preservice elementary teacher concerns on teaching music. The longitudinal studies (Pigge & Marso, 1989; Miksza & Berg, 2013) support that preservice

music teachers' focus of thought will change subtly in sophistication over an extended period rather than simply leap from one category to another.

Furthermore, more research is needed to investigate outliers whose concerns do not develop in step with overall trends. Future studies on preservice elementary teacher concerns might be expanded to examine the development of concerns through the first few years of music instruction.

References

- Berg, M. H. & Miksza, P. (2010). An investigation of preservice music teacher development and concerns. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 20(1), 39-55.
- Broyles, J. W. (1997). *Effects of videotape analysis on role development of student teachers in music*. Dissertation Abstracts International, 58(03A), 0823.
- Burden, P. R. (1990). Teacher development. In W. R. Houston (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teacher education* (pp. 311-328). New York: McMillan.
- Burn, K., Hagger, H., Mutton, T. & Everton, T. (2003). The complex development of student teachers' thinking. *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 9, 309-331.
- Butler, A. (2001). Preservice music teachers' conceptions of teaching effectiveness, microteaching experiences, and teaching performance. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 49, 258-272.
- Calderhead, J. & Robson, M. (1991). Images of teaching: Student teachers' early conceptions of classroom practice. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7, 1-8.
- Campbell, M. R. & Thompson, L. K. (2007). Perceived concerns of preservice music education teachers: A cross-sectional study. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 55(2), 162-176.
- Fuller, F. (1969). Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. *American Educational Research Journal*, 6, 207-226.
- Fuller, F. & Bown, O. (1975). Becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), *Teacher education, Part II: The 74th yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education* (pp. 25-52). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gore, J. M. & Zeichner, K. M. (1991). Action research and reflective teaching in pre-service teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 7, 119-136.
- Hall, G. & Hord, S. (1987). *Change in schools: Facilitating the process*. Albany: State University of New York Press.

- Kagan, D. M. (1992). Growth among preservice and beginning teachers. *Review of Educational Research*, 62, 129-169.
- McLaughlin, M. W. (1991). The reflection on the blackboard: Student teacher self-evaluation. *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, 37, 141-159.
- Miksza, P. & Berg, M. H. (2013). A longitudinal study of preservice music teacher development: Application and advancement of the Fuller and Bown teacher-concern model. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 61(1), 44-62.
- Paul, S. J. (1998). The effects of peer teaching experiences on the professional role development of undergraduate instrumental music education majors. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education*, 137, 73-92.
- Pigge, F. L. & Marso, R. N. (1989). *A longitudinal assessment of the affective impact of preservice training on prospective teachers*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Powell, S. R. (2011). Examining preservice music teachers' perceptions of initial peer- and field-teaching experiences. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 21(1), 11-26.
- Powell, S. R. (2014). Examining preservice music teacher concerns in peer- and field-teaching settings. *Journal of Research in Music education*, 61(4), 361-378.
- Rideout, R. & Feldman, A. (2002). Research in music student teaching. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 874-886). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Teachout, D. J. & McKoy, C. L. (2010). The effect of teacher role development training on undergraduate music education majors: A preliminary study. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 20(1), 88-104.
- Weinstein, C. S. (1990). Prospective elementary teachers' beliefs about teaching: Implications for teacher education. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 9, 279-290.
- Yourn, B. R. (2000). Learning to teach: Perspectives from beginning music teachers. *Music Education Research*, 2, 181-192.

국문초록

Fuller와 Bown의 교사염려모델에 기초한 예비 초등교사의 음악교수에 대한 염려 조사

최 미 영

본 연구의 목적은 Fuller와 Bown의 교사염려모델을 사용하여 예비 초등교사의 음악교수에 대한 염려를 알아보는데 있다. 연구대상은 교육대학교 음악교육 심화 전공 4학년 예비교사 15명이다. 연구 자료로는 동료학생 대상의 모의 음악수업과 교육실습 음악수업에서 각각 사용된 교수학습 지도안, 동료교수 음악수업과 교육실습 음악수업에서 촬영한 수업 DVD, 그리고 각각의 수업에서 수업을 마친 후 예비교사가 기록한 자기 평가지 및 연구자와의 비구조화된 인터뷰가 사용되었다. 예비 초등교사의 자기 평가지와 전사한 인터뷰의 내용은 Fuller와 Bown의 교사염려의 3가지 카테고리(자신, 수업 업무, 학생 영향)로 코딩 처리하여 분석하였다.

데이터 분석에 따른 연구결과는 다음과 같다. 첫째, 예비 초등교사의 음악교수에 대한 염려는 전반적으로 수업 업무에 대한 염려가 가장 빈번하게 나타났고, 다음으로 자신, 학생 영향의 순으로 나타났다. 둘째, 음악수업 상황에 따른 음악교수에 대한 염려를 비교하면, 수업 업무와 학생 영향에 대한 염려는 동료교수 음악수업보다 교육실습 음악수업에서 더 나타났다. 반면, 자신에 대한 염려는 교육실습 음악수업보다 동료교수 음악수업에서 더 나타났다.

주제어: 예비 초등교사, 음악교수 염려, 모의수업, 수업실습

투고일: 2016년 2월 29일, 심사(수정): 4월 19일(4월 25일), 게재확정일: 5월 13일