

## Preservice Teachers' Pedagogical Beliefs and Knowledge: Sources and Influences on Planning and Teaching

Dr Carol A Richards

University of Newcastle

Australia

### Abstract

This paper reports on an integrated Methods subject/Field experience in which a group of second year Bachelor of Education (Music) students and a group of Diploma in Education (Music) students practised targeted teaching and management skills in a school under the supervision of their Methods lecturer. After planning each lesson, students were interviewed and asked to identify the sources of their planning decisions and the rationale for their planning decisions. Results indicated that the sources of decisions changed throughout the study, although prior pedagogical beliefs remained the same. New pedagogical beliefs and knowledge were generated if the information and strategies advocated in lectures were compatible with previous beliefs or if the information and strategies were successfully used in teaching. Implications for teacher education are discussed.

Paper presented at the AARE Conference  
Singapore  
November 1996

### Introduction

Few would argue [against claims] that the beliefs teachers hold

influence their perceptions and judgements, which in turn, affect their behavior in the classroom . . . (Pajares, 1992, p.307).

The perceptions and beliefs of teachers and preservice teachers and the effect these have on teacher behaviour (Calderhead, 1988; Lange & Burroughs-Lange, 1994) represent a focus in the literature on learning to teach. This literature suggests that the pedagogical beliefs and knowledge of entering preservice teachers act as a filter through which information presented in teacher education is either accepted or rejected. Further, prior beliefs and knowledge can act as a theoretical basis which preservice teachers use to test research-based information, principles and arguments (Holt-Reynolds, 1992). Since there is ample evidence that suggests that preservice teachers'

pedagogical knowledge and beliefs will influence what they think, what they learn in teacher education, and how they behave in the classroom, there is a need for studies which examine these issues.

### Background to the Study

In some respects the musical knowledge and skill background of entering preservice music teachers is different from that of preservice teachers in many other disciplines outside of the arts. For example, preservice music teachers are required to audition to gain entry into the Bachelor of Education (Music) course at this university. During the audition, they are expected to display a high level of performance proficiency on their principal instrument and display a competent knowledge of music theory. The majority of these students would have learnt their principal instrument through many years of private tuition based on the Australian Music Examination Board (AMEB) system. This system of private tuition focuses on a graded syllabus with highly structured proficiency examinations that emphasise the traditional rules of music notation and performance. It is reasonable to assume that this experience may have entrenched some rigid beliefs about how to go about teaching music performance, and about what knowledge is important in the learning of music. These beliefs may be reinforced during their studies at the university. The Faculty of Music was formerly a Conservatorium of Music, "the teaching principles of which, in Australia, are mostly grounded in a Conservatoire tradition going back to the nineteenth century" (Jeanneret, 1990, p.8). The Conservatoire tradition that Jeanneret speaks of refers to the emphasis on learning the instrument and the rules of musical notation in a conservative manner. These beliefs are again reinforced during their university studies when many of these students give private lessons to young pupils who are also working their way through the AMEB Syllabus.

The subjects of this study, however, were studying to be high school music teachers. The Syllabuses that guide the development of music programs in schools take a holistic approach to the teaching and

learning of music which may be contrary to the way these students have learned music. The emphasis in the Primary and the Years 7-10 Music Syllabuses is on the integration of activities such as performance (movement, singing, speaking, dancing, playing), composition and other creative activities, and listening. Although they would have participated in music classes during their high school years, it is not certain what influence high school classroom music experiences would have on their beliefs about teaching music or how their beliefs would influence their developing pedagogical knowledge and skills.

The present study was concerned with extending the body of literature on teacher planning and the literature on learning to teach by an examination of the processes, influences and the sources of the influences involved in the professional development of preservice music teachers.

### Research Design

Fourteen Bachelor of Education (Music) and three Diploma in Education (Music) students were the subjects of this study. The BEd students were in the second year of a four-year teacher education program. They had completed one semester of Pedagogy (with an emphasis on lesson planning), a four-week practicum in a primary school and one year of Syllabus Methods (with an emphasis on teaching music in the primary school) along with their music discipline studies. The Diploma in Education students had just completed a three-year Bachelor of Music degree. All of these students were enrolled in a Methods subject with

an emphasis on the development of teaching strategies for high school music classrooms.

For this study, all students planned six lessons. Lesson one gathered baseline information on student's pedagogical skills and knowledge but was not taught.

Lessons two, three and four were planned and taught in a participating high school.

Lesson five was planned but not taught. The requirements for lesson five were

the same as lesson one. The data from Lesson five provided information on student's acquisition and use of coursework knowledge. Lesson six was planned and taught while students were participating in their first four-week practicum experience.

After planning each lesson, students were interviewed and asked to provide a rationale for each teaching decision. They were also asked to identify the source of their rationale. Students' rationale for teaching decisions and the sources of these rationale provided the data for the study. Data were grouped into three phases for analysis and reporting. Phase one

contains the data from interviews concerning lessons one and two (planned before students taught in the high school). Phase two contains the data from interviews concerning lessons three, four and five (when they were teaching the lessons in the high school). Phase three contains only the data from lesson six (lesson planned and taught during their four week practicum).

Results: Bachelor of Education Students: Sources of Planning Decisions: Phase One

The data for this section came from the original responses to the interview protocol questions used for Lessons one and two. Often the preservice teachers were unable to identify the sources of their decisions. Those which were identified for Lessons One and Two were categorised as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Bachelor of Education students: Sources of planning decisions: Phase One (n=14)

Sources of planning decisions	No. responses	%responses
High school experience	46	20%
Primary Practicum	36	16%
Syl Methods II and Pedagogy II	23	10%
Syl Methods I and Pedagogy I	22	10%
Personal beliefs and imagination	19	8%
Personal experience unspecified	19	8%
Personal music learn experiences	16	7%
Observation of peers' teaching	16	7%
Req of the coursework (subject)	14	5.5%
Private teach/tutoring experiences	12	5%
Own limitations (musical)	4	1%
Same age relatives as pupils instudy	5	1.5%
Resource and equipment access	3	1%
Peer's lesson plan	1	

The data in Table 1 summarise the perceived sources of the BEd

preservice teacher's decisions about teaching and assessment strategies, about anticipated problems and positive features, about what constituted lesson success and what other factors were considered in planning lessons.

All 13 of the BEd students who had come directly from high school mentioned their experiences as high school pupils as one of the sources

of their planning decisions (46 of 226 total responses). Some specific experiences, both positive and negative, had a strong impact on the way the students in the study thought about planning for teaching. There was a tendency for many of them to believe that what they felt was true for them as pupils would be true for the pupils they taught. One example of this tendency emerged in an interview with Janice, who wanted to help the pupils in her class to understand music and have positive attitudes toward it, because she believed that:

All children have attitudes from music, that music's a bludge. I know from when I was at school. I chose music because I wanted to do music and I enjoyed it. But there were about four kids in the class who were just there because music's a bludge. Those are the people who ruined the atmosphere in the class and brought down everybody's learning.

Another student, Russell, anticipated that pupils would be reluctant to participate in a solo improvisation for fear of making a mistake and looking stupid in front of their peers. The reason he felt that might occur is that, "I went through that too [in high school]".

A common source of planning decisions from this group in Phase One was their teaching experiences during the Primary Practicum (36 out of 226 responses). For example, Ellen's decision to explain the lesson procedure to the pupils at the beginning of the lesson was based on this experience: " I found in my practicum last year that it helped if the learners know what was going on and why, and then they weren't forever asking why they were doing it or how much longer it was going to take".

Preservice teachers' coursework at the university was acknowledged as a source of beliefs and decisions. Specifically, the Syllabus Methods II program containing the lectures, field experience and videos and the Pedagogy II program containing lectures and tutorials on classroom management (23 responses) were acknowledged as sources of planning decisions. In Lesson two, for example, Ellen demonstrated the melody for the pupils on a board and Rowan planned to sing the note names of the melody to assist the pupils. Both admitted that their ideas came from the previous week's lecture.

Two subjects from the first year of the course, Syllabus Methods I and Pedagogy I, (22 responses), were also acknowledged as a source of decisions. In Lesson one, for example, Brenna decided to begin her lesson with echo clapping the song rhythms one bar at a time. She did this "to gain attention . . . and to assist pupils to work with me". Syllabus Methods I was identified as the source of those ideas.

In 19 instances students were unsure of why they made a specific decision, but to them the decisions were based on what seemed "logical" or "common sense" or were based on "my own imagination" or "my belief". An example of this was found in Felicity's second lesson. She chose

to play the same song to the pupils as that introduced in a previous lesson, echo clap the rhythms, then look at the notation. Her reasons for these decisions were that:

the process would reinforce what they did last week . . . and make more sense. They can understand and start to visualise why the piece was

written like that. And the rhythms were a new thing introduced today.

When asked why she thought it was a good idea to reinforce previous learning, she stated that it seemed like "common sense to me". There are many reasons why previous learning should be reinforced and the idea of reinforcement is often addressed in Syllabus Methods I as well as Education I. Felicity had obviously learned of the importance of reinforcement but the source was not identified as her teacher education program.

In 19 other instances, students named "personal experience" as the source of their decisions. John identified "his own experience" as a jazz pianist as the source of his idea that improvisation was a good skill for pupils to have and the reason he decided to include improvisation in his second lesson. Preservice teachers' personal music learning experiences accounted for a further 16 decisions. Mick, for example, in Lesson Two, stated that lesson success for him meant that the pupils "got their fingers around it [the melody], or if they learnt something. If they have successfully gone a bit further than Rowan's lesson". Those ideas of lesson success he claimed came from "my own experience, knowing how long it takes to get to a certain level as a student, whether it be private tuition or in a class".

Another source of planning decisions from this group was their private teaching experience. As music education students, many had been involved in private and group tuition of younger children. John, for example, had conducted beginner bands at the local primary school. His justification to choose music that was "nice and light, and easy to listen to, as well as being reasonably easy to play" was based on his experiences in choosing music that was too difficult for his band to play. He explained, "I've done it a few times . . . and they'd sit there with blank faces. I don't do that [choose music that is too difficult] any more". Those students in the study who had engaged in private teaching and tutoring all indicated that it had affected their planning decisions (12 out of 226 responses).

High school experiences as a pupil, experiences in the Primary Practicum, and private tutoring experiences were not the only experiential sources of the planning decisions of the subjects in this study. In Phase One, half of the students observed their peers teach before they planned their second lesson. Pamela, in Lesson Two, explained that her observation of another lesson influenced her choice of music for her lesson because "I watched Janice's lesson last week.

Then I looked for something that I thought would work in the areas where her lesson didn't work". From this group, 16 responses indicated that the observation of the class they were to teach had affected planning decisions. The last two sources of their planning decisions in Phase One were the requirements of the NSW Syllabus and Callaghan music class program (12 responses), and the actual requirements of the coursework (14 responses). Most of these responses came from the question, "Why are you teaching this lesson?" Robert's response was typical of the group's response to this question in the first lesson. He said: "I am teaching this lesson because I was told to and the idea for it was given to me by my lecturer".

Other sources of decisions in Phase One were from the advice of relatives who were the same age as the pupils in the study or friends (5 responses). Brenna chose a song in Lesson Two on the advice of her friends and Pamela chose a song for Lesson Two that the pupils would know. She explained that she "tested my brothers and they knew it", therefore she reasoned the pupils she would teach would know it also. Preservice teachers perceived that musical or repertoire limitations (4

responses) also affected their planning decisions. Sarah decided to teach the pupils to play a song on guitar. She explained that, in the previous year, the BEd students had learned "classical guitar and now that we have to teach it [rhythm guitar], it's completely irrelevant, and it's just a big shock to teach guitar when you can't play it very well". Robert responded in Lesson Two that he was teaching that particular lesson because it was something he could play. Other sources included easy access to information (3 responses) and examination of a peer's lesson plan (1 response).

For Bachelor of Education (Music) students, the four major sources of their planning decisions in Phase One appeared to be: (a) all prior experiences as a student and a teacher, (b) Syllabus Methods I and II and Pedagogy I and II, (c) the requirements of the coursework and (d) their first observation of the class they were to teach (Table 1).

Although it will later be shown that the sources of decisions made by the Diploma in Education students were different, initial knowledge of Diploma in Education students shows some striking similarities to the beliefs and knowledge of the Bachelor of Education students in Phase One.

Diploma in Education students: Initial Pedagogical Knowledge and Sources: Phase One

The Diploma in Education students also came to their teacher education course with pedagogical skills, knowledge and beliefs based on their prior experiences as learners in a tertiary Bachelor of Music course, years of private instrumental tuition and experiences teaching

instrumental pupils privately.

Because these students were all mature age, their high school experiences did not appear to be an important source of their pedagogical knowledge or beliefs. The pedagogical knowledge they revealed did share some similarities with the Bachelor of Education students; for example, all three students expressed the idea that teaching must be tailored to the knowledge and ability level of the pupils before successful planning can occur and, therefore, the teacher must be aware of what the pupils already know and can do.

One big difference between the Diploma in Education and the Bachelor of Education students in Phase One was knowledge of lesson planning which guided pupils' learning in a systematic way. None of the Diploma students had received any instruction in lesson planning. In contrast, lesson planning is a large part of the BEd course. The DipEd student's knowledge of writing objectives and of selecting teaching, assessment and independent practice strategies for classroom music teaching was minimal.

The other major difference between the Diploma students and the Bachelor of Education students was that the Diploma students had not had the opportunity to teach whole classes of children in a practicum. The Primary Practicum was a major influence on the decisions of the Bachelor of Education students in the first phase of this study (16% of the total responses). During the Primary Practicum, they had an opportunity to trial teaching strategies and gain pedagogical knowledge of teaching and learning which the Diploma in Education students had not experienced. The Diploma in Education students, therefore, relied heavily on all their prior music teaching and learning experiences to inform the decisions they made in the first phase of the study (Table 2).

A principal source for the planning decisions of the Diploma in Education students in Phase One was their private teaching and tutoring experiences (25% of total responses). Bruce decided that clapping the rhythm of the song was a good way for pupils to isolate and learn the rhythm of the song. This is a technique that Bachelor of Education students learned in the first year of their course. Bruce had come to this conclusion independently. He also believed that, by adding an accompaniment to the melody, the learning experience was more enjoyable and musically interesting. This strategy was a part of the teaching procedure required later in this study, but, again, he had arrived at that conclusion from his "previous personal learning experiences and teaching private lessons".

Table 2: Diploma in Education students: Sources of planning decisions:  
Phase One (n=3)

Sources of planning decisions	No. responses	% responses
High school experience	1	1.5%
Syl Methods II and Pedagogy II	8	12%
Other lectures at the university	2	3%
Personal belief, imagin, thinking	3	4.5%
Personal experience unspecified	2	3%
Personal music learn experiences	10	15%
Observation of peers' teaching	10	15%
Requirements of the study	2	3%
Private teach/tutoring experiences	17	25%
Own limitations (musical)	1	1.5%
Same age relatives as pupils in study	6	9%
Talking to teachers	2	3%
Prof experience as a performer	3	4.5%

The next largest categories of responses were the subjects' own personal music learning experiences (15% of responses) and their observation of their colleagues' teaching in the program (15% of responses). Bruce and Caroline had the opportunity to view their peers teach a lesson in the first session. Both indicated that their observation of their peer's teaching their class affected the planning of their first lesson to be taught in Phase One (5 responses each). For example, Caroline chose a song for her first teaching experience as a result of watching Robert teach the previous week. She explained that, "I thought last week, when they didn't get through everything, that it was a bit difficult".

Jennifer was in the first group to teach the high school pupils and therefore had not had the opportunity to observe anyone else teach the class. She indicated in Phase One that her experiences as a mother influenced many of her decisions (6 responses). For example, she was asked in her interview for Lesson Two where the idea for her lesson structure came from. She replied: "Some of it from experience as an adult mum with five children". When asked what she had done to prepare for that lesson, she stated that she "worked through some of this with my girls, saw how it worked with them".

Lectures at the university, including those involved with this study, were another influence on planning (15% of total responses). Jennifer admitted that some of her ideas for Lesson Two came from "your lectures [Problems in Teaching lectures] because one thing I've had to learn since starting the course is bringing things back to basics". Other

influences cited were experience as a professional performer (3 responses), personal beliefs, imagination and thinking (3 responses),

talking to teachers (2 responses), personal unspecified experiences (2 responses) and their own limitations (1 response). Bruce's remark that "improvisation is of great importance to me as a composer/performer" came from his experiences as a professional performer and influenced his decision to attempt improvisation in Lesson One. Jennifer's belief that "in order to keep their [the pupils'] interest, they should feel involved in learning" influenced her decisions on Lesson One's structure. High school experience was cited only once as a source of decisions in this group, possibly because they were mature age and their high school experience was distant. This is in contrast to the Bachelor of Education students who cited high school experience as a source of decisions in 46 instances.

### Instrumental Pedagogical Skills and Knowledge of Both Groups of Preservice Teachers

Both groups of preservice teachers brought to the study varying levels of pedagogical skills and knowledge related to the learning of their major instruments. It appeared that the level of pedagogical knowledge depended on two variables; their personal skill level and whether or not they had prior experience teaching beginners those instruments which were part of the study (keyboard, guitar and tuned percussion). Bruce, for example, was an accomplished guitarist and had taught guitar to small groups of pupils privately. He was well aware of the problems beginners have when learning to play the guitar. His first guitar lesson was based on his observation of a peer's lesson in which he identified a number of technical problems that pupils were having. He designed his lesson to overcome those technical problems. The preservice teacher whom he had observed teach was a flautist. Although she had learned guitar for a semester, she had never taught it to beginners. Her skills and knowledge related to the teaching of flute to beginners and she appeared not to be able to anticipate the specific problems that would occur in the teaching of guitar. Her experiences in dealing with the problems of beginning flautists were not transferred when she had to teach beginning guitarists. Her lack of knowledge of the problems of beginner guitarists led her to choose a song with chord changes which were beyond the capability of the pupils. Bruce's past experience, not his teacher education program, enabled him to recognise this problem and avoid it in his own lesson.

At the beginning of the study, students completed a survey to provide information concerning their major instrument, what other instruments they played, and whether or not they had experience teaching instruments privately. These data were collected to determine whether private teaching experience was a factor in pedagogical content knowledge used for lesson planning. A finding that emerged was that preservice teachers who were keyboard majors and had experience in teaching keyboard to beginners were more aware of the difficulties pupils may have when learning that instrument than were the keyboard

majors who did not have experience in teaching keyboard to beginners. Janice and Pamela, for example, although keyboard majors, did not have experience teaching keyboard privately to beginning pupils. From viewing the videos of their lessons, it was apparent that the songs they had chosen for the class to learn were beyond the pupils' technical capabilities. On the other hand, Melanie, Robert and Claire, all who had experience teaching keyboard to beginners, did not choose a song that was beyond the technical capability of the pupils, and always knew prior to the lesson what technical problems pupils were likely to have in learning to play that song.

For those non-keyboard majors who had to teach keyboard, the level of their skills and their confidence in playing influenced planning decisions. For example, Russell chose a song because "I am a really bad keyboard player. I can't get the two-handed co-ordination thing happening. I used this content because it was there, I could follow it and I thought they could follow it". The same principle applied to the guitar majors and the non-guitar majors. Those who learned guitar only as part of their university course as a second instrument, and had not taught guitar to beginning pupils, were not able to anticipate the learning problems pupils would have.

#### Phase Two: Pedagogical Knowledge and Sources of Planning Decisions for Both Groups of Preservice Teachers

As the study progressed, preservice teachers began to apply pedagogical knowledge that appeared to be the result of the study program. In Phase One, before the preservice teachers had taught a secondary class, they planned using the knowledge they brought to the program. Most, however, began to incorporate strategies into their second lesson plan in Phase One that were advocated in the lecture program. As the study progressed, it became clear that the planning decisions in Phase Two were influenced by knowledge gained in the lecture program and by knowledge gained through teaching.

#### Bachelor of Education students: Sources of planning decisions: Phase Two

Table 3 illustrates the sources of planning decisions in Phase Two of the Bachelor of Education (Music) students. At the beginning of Phase Two, all preservice teachers had taught one lesson and the planning decisions in Phase Two were influenced by this experience.

Table 3: Bachelor of Education students: Sources of planning decisions: Phase Two (n=14)

Sources of planning decisions	No.responses	%responses
Teaching the class in study	59	23%

Lectures in Syl Methods II, Pedag II50	19%
Obs of Peers teaching in program 44	17%
Previous experience in high school 24	9%
Syllabus Methods I and Pedagogy I 15	6%
Callaghan class program 12	5%
Discussion about lesson with peers 11	4.5%
Personal belief/thinking about lesson8	3%
Primary Practicum 7	3%
Imitate success aspects of peer's lesson6	2%
Requirements of the study program 6	2%
Personal experience (unspecified) 6	2%
Personal music learning experiences 5	2%
Private teaching/tutoring experiences 4	1%
Relatives same age as pupils being taught.3	1%
Time limitations 1	.5%

The Bachelor of Education (Music) students in Phase Two indicated that the major sources for their planning decisions (in Table 2) were all of the aspects of the program dealing with teaching at Callaghan High. These included: (a) teaching their class (23%), (b) the lecture programs associated with the teaching (19%), and (c) observing their peers teach their class and other classes (17%). These sources contrast sharply with the three major sources of their decisions in

Phase One. Table 4 illustrates how the principal sources for decision making in Phase Two (three lessons) differed from the principal sources in Phase One (two lessons).

Table 4: Bachelor of Education students: Sources of planning decisions: Phases One and Two (n=14)

Sources of planning decisions Phase One  
Percentage of total responses  
Sources of planning decisions Phase Two  
Percentage of total responses

Own high school experience  
20%  
Own high school experience  
9%

Primary Practicum  
16%  
Primary Practicum  
3%

Syllabus Methods I and Pedagogy I  
10%

Syllabus Methods I and Pedagogy I  
6%

Syllabus Methods II and Pedagogy II  
10%

Syllabus Methods II and Pedagogy II  
19%

Personal beliefs and ideas  
8%

Personal beliefs and ideas  
3%

Personal unspecified experience, personal music learning experiences  
15%

Personal unspecified experience, personal music learning experiences  
4%

Requirements of the study  
5.5%

Requirements of the study  
2%

Private teaching experience  
5%

Private teaching experience  
1%

Teaching the class  
23%

Observation of peers' teaching  
7%

Observation of peers' teaching  
17%

Discussions about lessons with peers  
4.5%

Imitating successful aspects of a peer's lesson  
2%

Callaghan High music program  
5%

Other  
3.5%

Other  
1.5 %

In Phase Two, the influence of their own high school experiences as a source of planning decisions drops sharply as does their Primary Practicum and their work in Syllabus Methods I and Pedagogy I. Other sources of their planning decisions in Phase Two appeared to come from the Callaghan High music program, and discussions about the lessons with peers. Neither of these sources was cited in Phase One. All of their previous experiences in teaching - the Primary Practicum, private teaching, and their previous experiences in learning - personal music learning - continued to influence the planning decisions of the preservice teachers from the Bachelor of Education (Music) group in Phase Two, but not to the extent that they had in Phase One.

Diploma in Education students: Sources of planning decisions: Phase Two

For the Diploma in Education students, two major sources of planning decisions were identified in Phase Two. Like the Bachelor of Education students, their practical experiences in the study program, including their teaching and watching the videos of their teaching were influential sources of planning decisions (Table 5). Bruce was asked in Lesson Four what factors he had considered when planning that lesson. He stated that he had "just thought . . . what they [the pupils] had been doing" and how he could "build on the [previous] lesson".

Observations of the class when it was taught by peers and observation of their peers' teaching played influential roles in their planning decisions. In Lesson Four, Caroline decided to teach the same melody as her peer attempted in the previous week. She explained that she "changed the melody a little bit, so it's more repetitive". She did that because "John [the student who had taught in the previous week] had difficulty patterning it in, so I decided to make the melody easier by making it more repetitive".

Table 5: Diploma in Education students: Sources of planning decisions: Phase Two (n=3)

Sources of planning decisions	No.responses	%responses
Lectures that are part of study program.	25	21%

Observations of their class in the study	21	18%
Other lectures at the university	20	17%
Teach their class and observ of their video	15	13%
Observation of peers' teaching	6	5.5%
Thinking	6	5.5%
Own children	5	5%
Callaghan music program requirements	4	3%
Personal music learning experiences	4	3%
I don't know	4	3%
Life's experiences	3	2.5%
Personal knowledge	2	2%
Own limitations (musical)	1	.5%
Fear	1	.5%
Requirements of the lectures and study	1	.5%
Total Responses	118	

A principal source of their planning decisions came from the lecture program associated with the study (21%). An example is found in Bruce's third lesson. Bruce decided to play the original of the song at the beginning of the lesson and have the pupils listen to it and sing along with it. By this process, "they will start to get a sense of the rhythm, patterning the melody, if I get them to sing".

Other music education lectures they were attending at the university were also cited as sources. Jennifer anticipated problems if pupils were not kept occupied in Lesson Three. She stated that, "the [other] lecturers have fairly well stressed that you must keep the lesson really moving, otherwise [the pupils will be problems]". Unlike the Bachelor of Education students, their prior personal music learning experiences, high school experiences and private teaching/tutoring experiences did not appear to have a substantial influence on their planning decisions in Phase Two.

The sources of the DipEd students' decisions in Phase Two differ markedly from the sources of decisions in Phase One (Table 6). The most dramatic difference was the influence private teaching experience and their personal music learning experiences had in Phase Two. These had played an important role in their decisions in Phase One (40% of total responses). In Phase Two, these sources accounted for only 3% of their total number of responses. The sources that were used more often in Phase Two are the Syllabus Methods II lectures associated with the teaching (from 12% in Phase One to 21% in Phase Two), observation of their class and their peers' teaching (from 15% in Phase One to 23.5% in Phase Two) and their other lectures at the university (from 3% in Phase One to 17% in Phase Two).

Table 6: Diploma in Education students: Sources of planning decisions: Phase One and Two (n=3)

Sources of planning decisions Phase One  
Percentage of total responses  
Sources of planning decisions Phase Two  
Percentage of total responses

Private teaching experience  
25%  
Private teaching experience  
0%

Personal music learning experiences  
15%  
Personal music learning experiences  
3%

Observation of peers' teaching  
15%  
Observations of their class and peers' teaching  
23.5%

Syllabus Methods II  
12%  
Syllabus Methods II  
21%

Same age relatives as pupils in study  
9%  
Same age relatives as pupils in study  
5%

Personal beliefs, imagination, thinking  
4.5%  
Personal beliefs, imagination, thinking, knowledge  
7.5%

Personal experience as a performer  
4.5%  
Personal experience as a performer  
0%

Talking to teachers  
3%  
Talking to teachers  
0%

Requirements of teaching program  
3%

Requirements of the teaching program  
.5%

Other lectures at the university  
3%  
Other lectures at the university  
17%

Personal unspecified experience  
3%  
Life's experiences  
2.5%

High school experience  
1.5%  
High school experience  
0%

Own limitations  
1.5%  
Own limitations  
.5%

Teaching class and observing their video  
13%

Callaghan class program  
3%  
I don't know  
3%

Fear  
.5%

Although Bachelor of Education students and Diploma in Education students entered the teacher education program and this study with different experiences which they called upon for planning decisions in Phase One, they were all part of the same lecture and teaching program for Phase Two. Table 7 shows some similarities and differences, however, in the sources they used for decisions and thinking about planning in Phase Two.

For both groups, important sources of decisions in Phase Two were their teaching experiences, observation of others teaching their class, the

Syllabus Methods II lecture program, their personal beliefs, ideas and music learning experiences, and the Callaghan music program. One important difference that emerged was that the BEd students appeared to view their teaching experience as a more important source than the DipEd students. The DipEd students appeared to use their observations of their own teaching of the class, as well as their observations of others, more than did the BEd students. One can only speculate about the causes of this difference. Perhaps this occurred because the Diploma students had only one year for teacher education and therefore took advantage of the observations to enhance their understanding. Another possibility is that because the Diploma students were mature age, they understood how observations would enhance their understanding better than the younger group.

Table 7: Bachelor of Education and Diploma in Education students:  
Planning decisions: Phase Two

BEd planning decisions

Percentage of total responses

DipEd planning decisions

Percentage of total responses

Teaching the class

23%

Teaching the class and observing the video of their teaching

13%

Syllabus Methods II and Pedagogy II

19%

Syllabus Methods II

21%

Observation of their class and peer's teaching

17%

Observation of their class and peer's teaching

23.5%

Callaghan High music program

5%

Callaghan High music program

3%

Personal beliefs and ideas

3%

Personal beliefs, imagination, thinking and knowledge

7.5%

Personal music learning and unspecified experiences

4%

Personal music learning and unspecified experiences  
3%

Own high school experience  
9%

Primary Practicum  
3%

Syllabus Methods I and Pedagogy I  
6%

Discussions about lessons with peers  
4.5%

Imitating successful aspects of a peer's lesson  
2%

Other lectures at the university  
17%

Same age relatives as pupils in study  
5%

The differences in sources used in Phase Two between the groups reflect the differences in their professional training. BEd students continued to use their Primary Practicum, Syllabus I and Pedagogy I experiences as sources for their planning decisions in Phase Two, but these were not available as sources by the DipEd students.

Two other differences occurred between the groups. BEd students used discussions with peers and the desire to imitate successful aspects of peers' lessons as sources for their decisions. DipEd students did not mention these. DipEd students, on the other hand, used other lectures at the university as a source for their thinking and planning in Phase Two. This source was not mentioned by the BEd students. Again, one can only speculate on the reasons for this occurrence. Perhaps the BEd group did not mention other lectures because they were theoretical (educational learning theories, for example) and they were not able to see the connection between the theory espoused in those lectures and the teaching in which they were engaging.

The BEd group appeared to use more sources that were direct personal experiences for their planning decisions than did the DipEd group. For example, teaching the class, their own high school experience, their Primary Practicum, their own music learning experiences and their discussions with peers accounted for their sources 43.5% of the time. DipEd students used their experiences as sources only 16% of the time (teaching the class, personal music learning experiences). Observation

of their class was a source only 17% of the time for the BEd students, but 23.5% of the time for DipEd students. This was not a large difference and the small size of the DipEd group makes speculation about causes difficult.

One bigger difference between the groups was the number of times university coursework is mentioned as a source in Phase Two. For the BEd students, university coursework was mentioned as a source 25% of the time (Syllabus Methods I and II, and Pedagogy I and II). DipEd students mentioned coursework as a source 38% of the time (Syllabus Methods II and other lectures at the university). Again, it is not known why these differences exist. Perhaps the Diploma in Education students were under more pressure to make connections between their coursework and their teaching experience and had greater maturity to do that by comparison with the BEd students. Perhaps it was because the DipEd students were spending five days a week in the Education Faculty while the BEds were only spending two. DipEd students were involved in four music education subjects, whereas the BEd students were involved in only one.

#### Sources of Preservice Teachers' Planning Decisions: Phase Three

During the preservice teachers' four-week block practicum, they were asked to plan a performance-focused lesson to provide data on the planning decisions they made and the sources of those planning decisions. No requirements were given regarding lesson content or procedures due to the unique contextual limitations of each practicum site (they were no longer teaching at Callaghan High). The responses for both groups are found in Table 8.

Table 8: Bachelor of Education and Diploma in Education students:  
Sources of planning decisions: Phase Three

#### BEd planning decisions

Percentage of total responses

#### DipEd planning decisions

Percentage of total responses

Teaching the class previously and other classes

43%

Teaching the class previously and other classes

46%

Syllabus Methods II lectures

18%

Syllabus Methods II lectures

11%

Callaghan High teaching experiences

9%

Callaghan High teaching experiences

6%

Cooperating teacher suggestion/requirement

6.5%

Cooperating teacher suggestion/requirement

11%

Requirement of Syllabus or class program

6.5%

Requirement of Syllabus or class program

11%

Personal music learning and unspecified experiences

4%

Own high school experience

5%

Private teaching/tutoring

1.5

Primary Practicum

1.5

Own musical limitations

1.5

Discussions with peers

1.5

Talking to teachers

1

Personal beliefs

.5%

Study requirements

.5%

Study requirements

3%

Thinking

6%

Other lectures at the university

6%

The major sources for both groups' planning decisions in this phase were their prior teaching experiences with that class and with similar classes (43% of responses for BEd and 46% of responses for DipEd). Robert, for instance, chose a melody to improve the pupils' reading skills because in the previous lesson he noticed that "Their reading skills are not great. They freeze when they are given music and you can really see some of them make mistakes when learning [too many] notes.

Other sources cited by the two groups of preservice teachers were: the requirements of the practicum site, including the requirements of the cooperating teacher (6.5% of BEd, and 11% of DipEd responses); and the class programs and NSW Syllabus (6.5% of BEd, and 11% of DipEd responses).

Cooperating teachers have different interpretations of the NSW Syllabus in different schools, and obviously that was a factor in planning lessons. For example, Caroline stated that she had to teach a particular kind of lesson because, "They [the pupils] have to do a performance. [At this school] one period a week has to be performance". Lessons are also intended to meet the requirements of the class music program which meets the requirements of the State Syllabus. Bruce explained that his decision to use a particular song and resource for his lesson was based on "their [the school's] class program, and the Year 7 classes that I am teaching had to line up with the other Year 7 classes that the other teachers are teaching".

The Callaghan High teaching program was also cited as a source for decisions during the practicum by both groups of preservice teachers (Table 8). Pamela, for example, consulted the required teaching procedure used at Callaghan High when she planned her practicum lesson.

She did that "because it was something I knew that I could use. I know that it's worked, I've done it there, and so I brought it here thinking it would do the same thing".

Both groups also indicated that the lecture program attached to the Callaghan teaching experience was a source for some decisions during the practicum (9% of BEd responses and 11% of DipEd responses). Jennifer stated, for instance, that she thought "singing helps to pattern in the melody they are going to play. . . I got that idea from lectures, from information received in lectures".

BEd students mentioned several sources not cited by DipEd students. These included their own high school experience, private teaching experience, the Primary Practicum, their own musical limitations, discussions with peers and teachers and their personal beliefs. Two sources mentioned by DipEd students and not mentioned by BEd students

were thinking and other lectures at the university (6% of responses in both cases).

### Summary of Sources of Preservice Teachers' Planning Decisions in Phases One, Two and Three

In Phase One, both the Bachelor of Education and the Diploma in Education students indicated that the major source of their beliefs and planning decisions was all of their previous teaching and learning experiences prior to the study. The only major difference between the two groups appeared in one category of previous experiences. Bachelor of Education students who had come directly from high school to the teacher education course indicated that their high school experience played a major role in influencing the way they thought about teaching and what they believed about teaching music. For the Diploma in Education students and the one mature-age Bachelor of Education student, their high school experiences were not identified as a source of decisions about teaching.

For both groups in Phase One, the lecture program at the university was also cited as a major influence. In the Bachelor of Education group, the lectures in Syllabus Methods I and Syllabus Methods II (concurrent with this study) as well as Pedagogy I and Pedagogy II were mentioned as sources of decisions. In the Diploma in Education group, all university music education lectures were cited as sources. Another source of planning decisions for half of the preservice teachers in both groups was the observation of a peer teaching their class in a previous lesson.

In Phase Two, both groups cited the major sources for their decisions as being  
(a) teaching, observation and discussion of the high school experiences, (b) the university lectures and discussions of their teaching experience and (c) all previous teaching/tutoring and personal music learning experiences. Additionally, the Bachelor of Education group cited the requirements of the study, including the Syllabus and the class program, as influencing their decisions.

In Phase Three, both groups specified that the major sources of their decisions were their previous teaching experiences with the class or similar classes, and the requirements of the cooperating teacher and the music program at the school.

Personal factors such as confidence, personal preference, time constraints, subject matter knowledge and commitment impinged on planning decisions of preservice teachers during all phases. But the

most influential sources of their planning decisions were the practical experiences they had in learning and teaching. In this study, students

tended to name the university coursework as a source only when its principles and strategies had survived the test of successful practical implementation.

## References

- Calderhead, J. (1988). The development of knowledge structures in learning to teach. In J. Calderhead (Ed.), *Teachers' Professional Learning* (pp. 51-64). London: Falmer Press.
- Holt-Reynolds, D. (1992). Personal history - based beliefs as relevant prior knowledge in course work. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29(2), 325-349.
- Jeanneret, N. (1990). The beat of a different drum? Secondary Teacher Education in Music in New South Wales, Long essay, Master of Education, University of Sydney.
- Lange, J., & Burroughs-Lange, S. (1994). Professional uncertainty and professional growth: A case study of experienced teachers. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 10(6), 617-631.
- Pajares, M.F. (1992). Teachers' beliefs and educational research: Cleaning up a messy construct, *Review of Educational Research*, 62(3), 307-332.