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ABSTRACT

Using Fuller and Bown’s (1975) teacher concerns model as a framework, we examined precursor strategies to Fuller and Bown’s Stage 3 (concern with student impact). We examined preservice music teachers’ focus on teaching videos to determine (a) if participants focused on teacher or student, (b) if prompts to notice students resulted in more comments about students, (c) if focus on students maintained without instructions, and (d) if results differed based on prior teaching experience with school-aged students. Preservice music teachers (N = 114) viewed videos of music classes/rehearsals, specifying “what you notice” (control, n = 54) or “what did the students do” (focused observation, n = 60). As a posttest transfer, participants viewed the pretest video again without instructions. There were significant posttest differences, indicating the extent to which instructions influenced participant focus and the effects of small amounts of teaching experience. Specifically, results showed that the inexperienced teachers with guided instructions responded more like experienced ones. Implications for teacher preparation were discussed.

Field-based observation is considered a requisite activity by most music teacher preparation programs. Music educators might question, however, what students actually observe in field-based settings and what skills they subsequently retain from such observations as they move from the role of student to the role of teacher. Fuller and Bown (1975) postulated, in what has become widely known as the Fuller and Bown teacher concerns model, that preservice and novice in-service teachers experience three developmental stages: concern with self, task concerns, and concern regarding teacher impact on students. Both general educational researchers (Conway & Clark, 2003; George, Hall, & Stiegelbauer, 2013) and music education researchers (Campbell & Thompson, 2007; Killian, Dye, & Wayman, 2013; Madsen & Cassidy, 2005; Powell, 2014; Powell & Parker, 2017) have verified that preservice teachers and early career teachers tend to move through these or related stages.
Music researchers have recently used the Fuller and Bown model as a way of evaluating preservice teacher development (Juchniewicz, 2014; Killian et al., 2013; Miksza & Berg, 2013; Powell, 2014), documenting a distinct tendency for early career and preservice teachers to focus on self. When asked to write what they observed, preservice music teachers and music therapists attended more to the teacher than to the student (Duke, 1987; Duke & Prickett, 1987; Madsen & Cassidy, 2005; Standley & Greenfield, 1987; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999) regardless of whether they received observation training (Duke, 1987), knew the observed teacher’s goals (Henninger, 2002), or had a specific teacher/student observation task (Standley & Greenfield, 1987). The verified concern with self among novice teachers might explain why many music researchers have found that when observing teaching, preservice teachers tended to focus on what the teacher did and less often on how students responded (Berg, Woody, & Bauer, 2002).

Further, researchers have verified that individuals with teaching experience tended to focus more on student impact concerns than those with less experience (Conway & Clark, 2003; Killian et al., 2013). For example, Killian et al. (2013) examined self-reported concerns of 159 student teachers, finding that prior to student teaching, the majority of concerns were about self (56% of the total comments) with few student impact concerns (4%), while after student teaching, self concerns decreased (33%) while student impact concerns increased (20%). Task concerns, the second Fuller and Bown stage, showed less change with experience (20% before student teaching, 23% after student teaching). Berg and Sindberg (2014) examined novice in-service teachers’ implementation of comprehensive musicianship strategies and found that task concerns, such as implementing prescribed curricula, may have prevented focus on student impact in multidimensional ways.

Music researchers have found differing results when examining participant response to the Fuller and Bown stages, perhaps based on the specific dependent measures used. For example, Campbell and Thompson (2007) and Miksza and Berg (2013) found that preservice music teachers indicated significantly more concern with student impact than self when asked how strongly they agreed with prepared statements about teaching. Researchers using self-generated free response as a dependent measure, however, found differing results. Powell (2014), using a video-assisted recall method to solicit student reactions, found that instrumental music education majors had few self-generated student impact concerns but increased frequency of student mentions after multiple peer teaching episodes. Killian et al. (2013) concurred, finding that few self-generated student impact concerns were present prior to student teaching, but they did increase following student teaching.

To further examine the effect of varying dependent measures, Killian, Laity, Wilson, and Owens (2016) compared a group of preservice teachers’ free-response teaching concerns with their responses to specific statements (e.g., when I think about teaching, how strongly am I concerned with: appearing confident to parents) devised by Borich (2000) and used in previous studies (Campbell & Thompson, 2007; Miksza &
Berg, 2013). Results of the Killian et al. (2016) free-response “list your concerns” study indicated that, in confirmation of previous studies (Killian et al., 2013; Powell, 2014), student teachers mentioned significantly fewer student impact concerns prior to student teaching than after the teaching experience. In contrast, when reacting to a list of generated statements about teaching concerns, these same preservice teachers, whether before or after student teaching, indicated more concerns about student learning impact than task concerns or self-concerns. Thus, the two dependent measures (responses to lists of belief statements vs. actual written personal concerns) yielded strikingly different results. Like previous research (Berg & Sindberg, 2014), these preservice teachers appeared disposed to attend to student learning, but their immediate concerns primarily involved themselves as teachers.

Although researchers have verified movement through the three Fuller and Bown stages among novice teachers, it remains uncertain whether specific strategies might be effective to encourage preservice teachers to focus more on their impact on students (Fuller & Bown’s final stage) or whether such focus might be primarily developmental in nature gained primarily through teaching experience (Conway & Clark, 2003) or general maturity (Austin & Reinhardt, 1999; Perry, 1999) and thus less amenable to teaching.

Given the ultimate importance of teachers’ concerns with student impact, we elected to examine a strategy to stimulate preservice teacher’s focus on that stage. We speculated that because preservice teachers appear to attend to teachers rather than students when observing (Berg et al., 2002), a precursor learning strategy might effectively encourage preservice teachers to focus on student impact. We chose to increase the mention of students rather than the teacher while preservice teachers viewed teaching videos as a precursor learning strategy to Fuller and Bown’s Stage 3, concern with student impact.

Therefore, the purpose of this current study was to examine what preservice teachers say they observe when viewing videoed music lessons and whether they could be guided to focus more on students. Based on the teacher concerns model (Fuller, 1969; Fuller & Bown, 1975), we explored whether preservice teachers might learn to mention students more frequently based on written directions to do so. A secondary question involved whether preservice teachers with only small amounts of teaching experience might respond differently than their peers with no experience with school-age students. The following research questions guided our study:

1. To what extent would observers of videoed music lessons mention the teacher or the student?
2. To what extent would a written prompt to notice students result in more free-response comments about students?
3. Would focus on students remain when no instructions were given?
4. To what extent would results differ between preservice teachers who had had experience with school-age students and those who had no experience?
METHOD
The present study explored whether preservice music teachers (N = 114) could be guided to mention students rather than teachers when viewing music teaching videos under guided or nonguided conditions. We speculated that specific instructions to observe students might cause participants to mention students more frequently because, even though prior researchers found preservice teachers tended to focus primarily on the teacher (Duke, 1987; Duke & Prickett, 1987; Madsen & Cassidy, 2005; Standley & Greenfield, 1987; Yarbrough & Henley, 1999), those preservice teachers with even limited teaching experience tended to increase their student focus (Powell, 2014). Thus, we viewed the possibility of increasing student mentions as a precursor strategy to guiding preservice teachers to move toward Stage 3 of Fuller and Bown’s teacher concerns model (concern for student impact) through simple instructions to focus on students, using frequency of student mentions as the dependent measure.

Participants
Participants were music education majors (N = 114) from a large southwestern university, divided relatively evenly between the control group (n = 54) and treatment group (n = 60). After complying with our institution’s requirements for the protection of human subjects, we asked three intact groups to observe videos during their regular class times as part of their normal instruction. Classes in the study included: Introduction to Music Teaching (n = 70; first-year music education majors, primarily in their first year of college), Field-Based Practicum (n = 22; seniors who had completed 12 3-hour episodes teaching kindergarten through 12th grade [K–12] students in the schools), and Student Teaching (n = 22; students who had completed a semester-long, total immersion experience in K–12 schools).

Video Excerpt Development
We perused our departmental video collection of experienced music teachers for which we have permission to use or which had been used in previous research (Duke, 2000). We narrowed our video pool to six excerpts by asking a panel of three experienced music educators to evaluate them for visibility of teacher and student(s), audio clarity, and apparent teacher/student interaction, avoiding lectures or rehearsal run-throughs. Based on panel ratings, we chose four examples to represent a variety of music teaching settings (class and private lessons) that preservice teachers might encounter, including (a) a kindergarten music class marching and chanting, (b) a middle school private bassoon lesson, (c) an elementary music classroom in which the students were singing, and (d) a high school band warm-up. All teachers in the videos were female to lessen potential gender influence. We created a composite video with these four examples that ultimately included five excerpts: pretest (Excerpt 1—kindergarten), treatment (Excerpts 2, 3, and 4—private lesson, elementary music...
class, and high school band rehearsal), and posttest (Excerpt 5—an identical repeat of Excerpt 1). We reasoned that using a different posttest example might control for possible memory effects, but it might also create uninterpretable differences caused by unique student/teacher interactions in a new setting. Therefore, we elected to use the identical excerpt for both pretest and posttest to allow us to compare responses to the identical teaching setting.

Excerpt lengths were approximately 2 minutes, ranging from 2:02 to 2:16, following protocols established by Standley and Greenfield (1987). We prepared a 17-minute composite video with on-screen instructions to turn the page of a printed instruction booklet prior to viewing each new excerpt. Instructions appeared in text in the instruction booklets, in writing on the screen in the video, and orally from an off-camera female voice in the video. Participants were told they could write during an excerpt, encouraging concurrent written reports (Ericsson & Simon, 1993), and the composite video showed a blank screen for 60 seconds between each excerpt (Standley & Greenfield, 1987) to allow retrospective written reports (Ericsson & Simon, 1993). Thus, both concurrent and retrospective responses were solicited as recommended by Ericsson and Simon (1993) for verbal reports, except responses were in writing and not verbal.

Procedures
We asked participants to view the five brief video excerpts, modeling our instructions after Standley and Greenfield (1987). Each preservice teacher received a booklet to be completed during video viewing, which contained either focused observation instructions (n = 60; treatment group) or no viewing instructions (n = 54; control group). Based on a pilot study with four preservice and eight experienced music educators, we modified booklet instructions to remove ambiguities. For example, some members of our pilot group interpreted the Standley and Greenfield instructions to “observe student behavior” as referring exclusively to classroom management, so we modified that language to the more generic “focus on what the student is doing.” Additionally, we piloted the clarity of instructions and the time between excerpts and found no modifications were necessary. Introductory instructions included:

Part of your music education degree requires observation. We are interested in what students notice when they observe a music classroom or rehearsal. You will now view five excerpts of music classes. One of these excerpts will be repeated to offer you a second chance to observe more closely. There are no right or wrong answers, only what you notice.

For Excerpt 1 (pretest) and 5 (posttest), all participants received the following written and on-screen instructions:

Example 1—Kindergarten Class
You will see a video of a music class.
Notice as much as you can. Write everything you notice.
Video will be paused to allow writing time.
Feel free to write while watching video.
Use sentences or bullets.

The rest of the page was blank, encouraging free-response comments. Control group participants (no focused instruction) received this identical instruction for each excerpt. The focused observation participants (treatment group) received the above instructions for pretest and posttest; however, for the treatment excerpts (Videos 2–4), their instructions were:

Example 2—Private Lessons
Focus on what the student is doing.
1. Write down what the student is doing.
2. Circle yes if the student learned.
3. Circle no if the student did not learn.
4. Circle ? if you are not sure whether the student learned.
The video will be paused to allow writing time.
Feel free to write while watching video.
Use sentences or bullets.

Thus, the focused observation participants were told to notice what students were doing and, as a further means of focusing their attention on the students, we asked participants whether the students learned. Whether or not students learned was not designed as a dependent measure in our study—it was simply an effort to further remind the focused observation participants to attend to the students in the video. Thus, our only differentiated instructions to focused observation (treatment) participants were the prompts to attend to what students were doing. The posttest without guided instructions allowed us to evaluate whether any responses to the “observe students” prompts would be transferred immediately to a video in which no student prompts were given and to determine whether there were differences in numbers of comments about students made between those who were provided focused prompts and those who were not.

All participants were tested in intact classes and, following their usual class procedures, each participant took a booklet from a stack of booklets as he/she entered the class. The booklets in the stack were randomly premixed between focused observation booklets (containing instructions to focus on students) and control booklets (containing no prompts to focus on students), allowing each student an equal chance of picking a focused observation or a control packet. Each booklet contained an identical cover page requesting demographic information (year in program, gender, primary instrument, major), followed by a separate page for each of the five video excerpts. At each page turn, the following words appeared on the screen and were spoken off camera by a recorded speaker: “Please turn to the next page in your packet and read the instructions at the top of the page.”
RESULTS

Data consisted of frequency with which participants wrote comments related to student(s), teacher, or other topics. Participants were divided into those asked to focus on students (focused observation treatment group, \( n = 60 \)) and those asked simply to notice what happened in the video (free response control group, \( n = 54 \)). Based on our expectation that even limited exposure to teaching students might influence participants’ mention of videoed students (Berg et al., 2002; Conway & Clark, 2003; Killian et al., 2013; Powell, 2014), for analysis purposes we subsequently recategorized these preservice teachers into inexperienced preservice teachers \( (n = 70; \text{participants with no teaching experience}) \) and experienced preservice teachers \( (n = 44; \text{participants with documented but limited experience teaching students, including in-school practicum or student teaching}) \). All participants were students; none were in-service teachers.

Data Organization

Subsequently, three researchers independently coded each written comment. Consistent with our strategy of evaluating student mentions as a precursor activity to Fuller and Bown’s student impact stage, we were primarily interested in the extent to which instructions increased the mention of students as compared to teachers. Thus, we used the codes “Student,” “Teacher,” and “Other,” depending on what the comments referenced. The Other code included any illegible or ambiguous comments (e.g., “worked on dynamics” could refer to either teacher or student) or comments unrelated to student(s) or teacher (“room was very small”). Because some participants listed comments and some wrote paragraphs, we considered the sentence/phrase as the primary unit of analysis (Killian et al., 2013; Miksza & Austin, 2010) and separately coded each sentence or phrase within a sentence. After independent coding, three researchers met together and discussed any disagreements until a consensus was reached.

Overall, the 114 participants made a total of 2,179 comments (Teacher = 862, Student = 1,090, and Other = 227). For the purposes of the present study, we were interested only in the relationship between comments coded as Teacher and Student, so we excluded any comments coded as Other from any subsequent analysis. To allow comparison between comments coded as Teacher and Student across unequal group sizes, and to decrease the potential effect of one participant writing more comments than another, we converted all coded comments for Student and Teacher to percentages of Student mention (Student divided by Teacher plus Student comments for each participant). Thus, regardless of the number of comments made while watching the video, each respondent received a single Student percentage score for each video. After much discussion, we elected to view Excerpts 2–4 as an aggregate treatment rather than as repeated measures for each excerpt to avoid the potential effect of different teaching settings on gathered data and because ultimately we were interested solely in the effect of guided video viewing on posttest scores. Thus, treatment (focused observation) and
experience levels were considered as two between-subject factors, and preservice teachers’ responses on the posttest were set as the dependent variable.

**Effect of Focused Observation**
A two-way ANCOVA was conducted to examine the main effect of treatment (focused observation) and teaching experience, with the participants’ pretest responses as a covariate to control for possible pretest differences among experienced and inexperienced teachers. According to the ANCOVA results, a main effect of treatment was found between the free-response control and focused observation groups after controlling for the effect of the pretest, $F(1, 109) = 4.51, p = .036$, partial $\eta^2 = .04$, indicating that the focused observation group had significantly higher mean percentages of student comments ($n = 60$, $M = .579$, $SD = .047$) than the control group ($n = 54$, $M = .43$, $SD = .052$). See Figure 1.

**Effect of Experience**
There was no significant main effect for experience level between the inexperienced group ($n = 70$, $M = .469$, $SD = .044$) and the experienced group ($n = 44$, $M = .54$, $SD = .056$), $F(1, 109) = .99, p = .32$, partial $\eta^2 = .009$, when controlling the effect of pretest. There was no significant interaction between treatment and experience level, $F(1, 109) = .020, p = .888$, $\eta^2 < .001$. See Figure 2.

Although we viewed the three middle video excerpts as an aggregate treatment, we found, as expected, that during treatment the respondents receiving the focused obser-
vation prompts had much higher percentages of student-related comments (84.2%, 82.9%, 88%) than the free-response control group (18%, 32%, 28%). It is worth noting that the focused observation group had even higher percentages of student-related comments during the treatment (84.2%, 82.9%, 88%) than at posttest (58%).

Table 1 contains the percentages of student mentions among focused observation and control conditions divided by experience level. Notably, both the inexperienced and experienced groups in the experimental condition (focused observation) outperformed the participants in the control condition at posttest after their differences in the pretest were statistically controlled.

The ANCOVA analysis showed no main effect for experience, although the experienced respondents had higher percentages of student-related comments than the inexperienced ones at posttest. When we examined respondents’ comments during the middle three treatment excerpts, without subdividing by the control and experimental conditions, we found that the experienced respondents maintained a slightly higher percentage of student-related comments (61%, 66%, 70%) than the inexperienced (52%, 58%, 60%).

Table 1
Percentage of Student-Related Comments by Condition and Experience Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Free response (control)</th>
<th>Focused (experimental)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
<td>Experienced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis of Written Comments

Although we were primarily interested in the extent to which respondents mentioned students or the teacher, their written comments did allow us to examine the content of those comments as a secondary part of the study. Thus, all comments coded Teacher and Student were examined for emerging categories using established procedures (Creswell, 2013), following the constant, comparative model (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015). The researchers collectively discussed possible categories after rereading all comments, discarded ambiguous statements, collapsed statements with few mentions, and ultimately developed the following categories. Comments coded Student were further divided into Student Behavior (e.g., “some children were not paying attention,” “some students are doing motions, others are not,” “children responded immediately to the teacher’s request”), Student Activity (e.g., “instruments warmed up,” “kids are mainly around in the circle”), and Student Learning (e.g., “everybody knew the words by the end of the lesson,” “going in circle seems difficult,” “identifying loud/soft was good but not sure about steady beat”). Comments coded as Teacher were ultimately divided into Teacher Instruction (e.g., “instructor gave feedback,” “teacher ignores when students are out of time,” “teacher is on their level,” “very interactive”), Teacher Objectives (e.g., “she wanted to focus on tuning”), and Teacher Evaluation (e.g., “looked like a good teacher,” “classroom management pretty good in terms of noise control”). Three researchers independently coded all comments and then discussed any disagreements until a consensus was reached (Killian et al., 2013; Miksza & Austin, 2010). Tables 2 and 3 allow examination of the relative frequency of each category. Note that these data are displayed as frequencies, not percentages.

DISCUSSION

Results of the present study indicated that preservice teachers whose attention was focused on students by a simple prompt (“write what the students did”) indeed mentioned students significantly more frequently than preservice teachers who were given

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Behavior Pre</th>
<th>Student Activity Pre</th>
<th>Student Learning Pre</th>
<th>Total Pre</th>
<th>Student Behavior Post</th>
<th>Student Activity Post</th>
<th>Student Learning Post</th>
<th>Total Post</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focused group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 26

n = 34

n = 18

n = 36
an open prompt (“write what you notice”). Notably, the effect of this focused instruction declined when a video was viewed without instruction (posttest); however, the differences were still significant as seen in Figure 1. In other words, these preservice teachers lost much of their focus on students when they were not instructed to pay attention to them, although their student mentions were still significantly more than those among the unguided control group. When preservice teachers were divided into inexperienced (no contact with school-aged children) and experienced (field-based or student teaching experiences with school-aged children) groups, the effect of focused instruction was much more evident among inexperienced teachers. Keep in mind that none of these participants had experience as the teacher of record in a school setting.

Specific research questions were addressed as follows:

1. To what extent would observers of videoed music lessons mention the teacher or the student? As in previous studies (see the review of literature), overall results with no instructions indicated that preservice teachers made more mention of teachers than students during free responses when viewing a brief video lesson. These preservice teachers responded much like the music educators and therapists in the review of literature, notably Standley and Greenfield (1987) and Berg et al. (2002).

2. To what extent would a written prompt to notice students result in more free-response comments about students? Instructions to focus on the student did indeed make a significant difference. As anticipated, these preservice teachers followed directions, and a simple written prompt resulted in significantly higher percentages of comments about students concurring with Standley and Greenfield (1987). The important part of our study, however, was the third research question involving transfer without instructions.

3. Would focus on students remain when no instructions were given? Our results indicated that the focused observation group remained significantly different from the

---

**Table 3**

Frequency of Teacher-Related Comments by Category of Response

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Teacher Instruction</th>
<th>Teacher Objectives</th>
<th>Teacher Evaluation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexperienced</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
control group at posttest. Examination of Figure 1, however, indicates that percentage of Student mentions dropped precipitously when the focused group had no instructions, although there was still a significantly higher percentage of Student mentions than in the control group. Note that this drop within the focused observation group occurred immediately after three excerpts prompting student notice. We might speculate whether this increased student attention would remain at all after a half hour, or a semester, or when in a teaching situation. Are these students simply responding as they are told, or has their attention truly shifted to a more student focus? Fuller and Bown (1975) postulated that teachers move through three stages, but relatively little research has addressed whether students can be taught to move more quickly toward the third stage (student impact) using a precursor strategy. We reasoned that student impact would be difficult to achieve before preservice teachers focused on students. Indeed, we remain uncertain whether concern for student impact might be something that is learned or is more developmental in nature and part of the development of young collegiate thinking (Brookfield, 1995; Perry, 1999). Is it best for novice music educators to focus more on the teachers they observe so they develop teaching techniques and strategies? Or is student impact the ultimate teacher challenge, and would those novice teachers benefit from a more student focus? Clearly further research is indicated. We continue to ponder these questions as we consider the complexities of guiding preservice teachers from identifying as a student to identifying as a teacher.

4. Would results differ between preservice teachers who had experience with school-age students and those who did not? The parallel lines of Figure 2 indicate that the preservice teachers in the present study who had even limited experiences with teaching school-aged children mentioned students more frequently during every video excerpt than did those with no such experiences, as did the educators and therapists in the Standley and Greenfield (1987) study. Differences between the experienced and the inexperienced groups decreased by posttest. We speculated that focused observation instruction may have created a situation in which inexperienced teachers responded more like experienced ones, and this may be the most important finding of the present study. The implications of this finding for effective teacher preparation are very strong. Can a very brief instruction time create a situation that mimics what experienced preservice teachers spent days or months acquiring? If so, continued focused video viewing (even with the simple prompt of “what is the student doing”) would appear to be a potentially promising and easily implemented strategy for those involved in music educator preparation. Or is this change so short-lived that it has little future benefit? Again, further research is indicated.

Examination of the types of Student-related or Teacher-related comments made by experienced or inexperienced teachers (Tables 2 and 3) yielded some interesting thoughts about the inherent differences that the experience of teaching K–12 students might make. For example, note that experienced preservice teachers (n = 26) frequently mentioned Student Learning (total of 23 mentions in the focused group) while inex-
experienced preservice teachers ($n = 34$) did not (total of three mentions in the focused group). It should be noted that further interesting data might be gleaned by separating experienced into those who have completed student teaching from those who have completed a much briefer field-based practicum in the schools. We did not make this separation, believing that dividing these further into focused and control would yield samples too small to analyze meaningfully. However, our initial perusal indicated that field-based practicum students were much more influenced by the focused instructions, while the student teachers made relatively few changes in their focus with or without instructions; they already mentioned students more often than any other groups even at pretest. Clearly the effect of the amount of student contact should be explored more fully.

A further interesting finding, beyond the scope of the present study, was the fact that these focused instructions appeared to be much more impactful upon males than females. Our sample included approximately an equal number of males ($n = 54$) and females ($n = 60$), but our randomization techniques within intact classes did not allow us to place the same number of males in the control or treatment groups. Thus, further analysis was not possible due to small numbers in some groups. We speculated subsequently that since each of our videos purposefully showed a female teacher, the gender of the teacher might have been differentially influential on male respondents. Further research might be designed to examine the effect of gender when viewing video teaching excerpts. Additionally, future researchers might want to examine the possibly differentiated effects of viewing a private lesson versus an ensemble rehearsal versus classroom music teaching. For the present study, we examined only comments made about students and teachers, excluding any other comments. Researchers might productively divide written comments into different categories and/or examine the content of the Other category in detail as further insight into the thoughts of preservice teachers (Ericsson & Simon, 1993).

Pedagogically, the protocols of the present study might be offered to undergraduate students as training on noticing students but then followed up with further strategies that lead toward the Fuller and Bown Stage 3 (concern with student impact) by asking preservice teachers to speculate on what observed students’ important needs might be in a specific situation. Further research examining the effectiveness of such a series of strategies is recommended.

Generally, the results of the present study should be viewed with caution. These preservice teachers were all from a single institution consisting of those registered for specific music education classes. Further, although 114 is a fairly substantial sample, it could be questioned if reliable generalizations should be made, especially when that sample was divided into smaller groups for comparison. Additionally, it should be noted that we did not analyze the entire three-stage Fuller and Bown model; we only analyzed the preservice teachers’ responses to mentioning students versus teachers as a precursor strategy to Fuller and Bown’s student impact concern. Future researchers may want to
ask respondents to write more (Ericsson & Simon, 1993) since our written responses were very brief (sometimes only a couple of words). Given more time and expectations to write more fully might allow a comparison between participants’ mentions of student versus teacher and evidence of preservice teachers moving from mere mention of students to Fuller and Bown’s student impact.

Overall, we have found the Fuller and Bown (1975) teacher concerns model to be a useful way to examine young music educator development, and thus we pursued this precursor strategy to encourage preservice teachers to notice students. But it should be noted that the underlying assumption of Fuller and Bown, of the present study, and of many others in the review of literature is that student focus is a desirable and a more mature teaching characteristic than focus on the teacher. Several areas remain vital and intriguing areas of future research, including what combination of student and teacher focus is most ideal, whether one precludes focus on the other, the teacher/student focus of master teachers, and further development of strategies to move preservice educators toward mature thinking about teaching.

AUTHORS’ NOTE
This research was presented at the research poster session of the National Association for Music Education’s Music Research and Teacher Education National Conference in St. Louis, Missouri, April 2014.
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