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ABSTRACT
The purpose of this follow-up study was to explore classroom management sources and content in music teacher preparation programs. K-12 music educators who self-identified as members of various professional music education organizations were the participants in this study. Similar to the initial iteration of the survey with elementary general music educators, recurrent sources of classroom management reported by participants included mentoring from a licensed teacher and supervised fieldwork. Teaching procedures and pacing instructions were common examples of classroom management content included in a music teacher education program, which differed slightly from those identified by elementary general music teachers. Mentoring from a licensed teacher and supervised fieldwork were the two sources of classroom management preparation with which participants were most satisfied; however, the majority of participants did not view their classroom management preparation as sufficient. These findings suggest that music teacher educators might continue to provide an array of experiences, within music education programs, for students to actively develop their approach to classroom management.
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INTRODUCTION
Teacher educators have traditionally struggled with consistently addressing classroom management in its coursework, if they include it at all (Hammerness, 2011; Greenberg et al., 2014); amidst this, teachers continue to report student behavior as a source of stress (Emmer & Sabornie, 2015). Freeman et al. (2014), reported that “a significant gap exists between the effective classroom management research base and teacher training” (p. 105). Thought classroom management is often considered one of the main components for effective teaching (Hattie, 2009) there is

wide variation in the amount and quality of that preparation (Sabornie & Espelage, 2023).

**Classroom Management**

Classroom management has recently been encapsulated as “establishing and maintaining order in a group-based educational system whose goals include student learning as well as social and emotional growth. The definition also includes actions and strategies that prevent, correct, and redirect inappropriate student behavior” (Emmer & Sabornie, 2015, p. 8). Notably, classroom management has often been considered a cornerstone of effective teaching and learning in the classroom, providing balance for engaged and attentive learners while students are supported and involved in the learning process (Freiberg et al., 2020; Hattie, 2009).

One facet of classroom management involves creating rules in which teachers present acceptable and unacceptable behaviors (Alter & Haydon, 2017), which provide structure (Maag, 2004) and help prevent challenging behaviors (Bicard, 2000), and are part of teachers’ foundation for effective classroom management (Freeman et al., 2014; Oliver & Reschly, 2010). Greenberg et al. (2014) identified classroom management strategies necessary for teacher preparation programs and included classroom rules to communicate the expectations for student behavior as one of the “Big Five” strategies for future teachers’ preparation in classroom management. The other four strategies consisted of building structure and establishing routines to help guide students in various classroom situations, reinforcing positive student behavior, consistently enforcing consequences for student misbehavior, and fostering and maintaining student engagement by teaching engaging lessons that involve active student participation (Greenberg et al., 2014). Additionally, teachers who demonstrated praise, clarity, care, monitor behavior (Conroy et al., 2009; Nie & Lau, 2009), warmth and closeness, eye contact, open body positioning, and teacher self-talk (Hall & Smotrova, 2013; Mazer et al., 2007) experienced more positive student behavior.

**School-Wide Initiatives**

With many factors (e.g., grade level, school setting, content area, social and emotional variables, student engagement, student motivation, school climate) to consider when examining how teachers might approach classroom management, schools often adopt a school-wide approach. For example, Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS), a systematic approach to social, emotional, and behavioral support, focuses on establishing support for all students to achieve social and academic success (Horner et al., 2015). Another approach, Conscious Discipline (Bailey, 2014), focuses on building resilient classrooms through safety, connection, and problem-solving where teachers integrate emotional learning, discipline, and self-regulation. Further, Responsive Classroom (2021) helps teachers create safe and joyful learning environments where students can develop strong social and academic skills, which include engaging in academics, building positive classroom communities, practicing effective classroom management, and striving for developmental awareness.
Though school-wide initiatives are often implemented at both the elementary and secondary levels, scholars have identified barriers, sources of opposition, and philosophical differences with such programs (Feuerborn & Tyre, 2015; Feuerborn et al., 2016; Kincaid et al., 2007). School staffs have opposed the implementation of school-wide behavior intervention systems due to skepticism of need and foundational differences in their beliefs on approaching students’ behavior (Lohrmann et al., 2008, 2013). Furthermore, those opposed to systematic approaches to student behavior note the potential negative effects on students and the entire school community (Hall & Hord, 2011). Tyre and Feuerborn (2017) examined educators’ support for schoolwide positive behavior interventions and found those in opposition were most concerned regarding consistency of implementation, underlying principles of the initiative, and the potential negative effects on students’ behavior and well-being.

Social and Emotional Learning

Classroom management extends far beyond classroom rules and expectations and, importantly, encompasses students’ social and emotional learning. Social and emotional learning is the process of acquiring and effectively applying the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to recognize and cope with emotions; developing caring and concern for others; making responsible choices; establishing positive relationships; and handling challenging situations (CASEL - Collaborative for Academic, Social, & Emotional Learning, 2021). For educators, it is crucial to teach students how to interact with their peers; thus, social learning is a key piece of the functioning of any classroom (Freiberg et al., 2020) and can impact the effectiveness of music teachers’ classroom management (Edgar, 2017).

The impacts of focusing on social and emotional learning in the classroom have been explored within both elementary and secondary classrooms. Gest et al. (2014) studied the quality of teacher-student interactions, peer and community bonding and motivation, and students’ social behavior among 54 elementary teachers and students. They found that elementary teachers who implemented strategies to approach the social dynamics of the classroom had students with more positive social interactions, academic performance, and positive behavior. Additionally, Korpershoek et al. (2016) found that focusing on students’ social and emotional development seemed to have the largest contribution to the effectiveness of a behavioral intervention.

Restorative Justice and Trauma-Sensitive Schools

Another lens through which to view behavior in the classroom is that of restorative justice. According to the National Education Policy Center (Gregory & Evans, 2020), Restorative Justice in Education focuses on relationships, justice, equity, fostering resilience, and well-being. The practices are aimed to be proactive and responsive including values and principles such as dignity, respect, accountability, and fairness while focusing on relationships and repairing conflicts. Darling-Hammond et al. (2020) reviewed research regarding the effectiveness of restorative justice in K-12 schools in the United States and found that its implementation can foster improvements
in responding to misbehavior. Gregory et al. (2016) examined teachers implementing restorative practices, and those who implemented these practices at a greater level correlated with more positive teacher-student relationships and more equitable classroom management practices.

When considering the social, emotional, and humanistic aspects of our teaching, educators must also acknowledge the possibility that they have students in our classrooms who have suffered or are suffering with trauma. According to the Trauma and Learning Policy Initiative (2021), trauma-sensitive schools are those in which all students feel safe, welcomed, and supported, while creating a school culture where all students can learn and experience success. Central components of trauma-sensitive schools are a shared understanding of trauma among the staff; helping children to feel safe; student relationships, self-regulation, academic competence, and physical and emotional well-being; bolstering school community; student connections; and sharing responsibility for all students (Gherardi et al., 2020).

**Cultural Responsiveness**

Another important aspect of considering student behavior in our classrooms is that of cultural responsiveness. According to Gay (2018), “Culturally responsive teaching is about teaching, and the teaching of concern is that which centers classroom instruction in multiethnic cultural frames of reference (p. xxvii).” Culturally responsive teaching “is defined as using the cultural characteristics, experiences, and perspectives of ethnically diverse students as conduits for teaching them more effectively” (Gay, 2000, p. 106). When academic knowledge and skills are situated within the lived experiences and students’ frames of reference, they are more personally meaningful and are learned more thoroughly and with more ease (Gay, 2000). Ford and Kea (2009) explained that it is especially important that educators are not judgmental of students and make efforts to understand, embrace, respect, and meet the needs of students who are from differing cultural backgrounds than their own.

**Classroom Management in Music Classrooms**

Within the context of a music classroom, one must consider that music teachers’ responsibilities, schedules, and workloads are often strikingly different from teachers in other subject areas. Elementary music teachers might teach several hundred children in multiple classes per week, while secondary music teachers are often teaching ensemble-type classes with upwards of 100 students (Byo & Sims, 2015). Matthews and Johnson (2019) explored instructional decisions of 40 choral and instrumental directors and participants emphasized the importance of communicating clear and consistent expectations with students, utilizing strategic seating to prevent behavior problems. Pellegrino (2014) examined four public school string teachers’ music making and teaching strategies, and findings indicated that they utilized their own music making and instrumental modeling (e.g., beginning of class, during transitions) as approaches to proactive classroom management. Though their teaching settings are varied, it appears
that both elementary and secondary music educators placed value in similar approaches to classroom management for students’ success in their classrooms.

**Preservice Music Teacher Preparation**

Classroom management has also frequently been cited as a concern by beginning music teachers (Campbell & Thompson, 2007; Conway, 2002; Regier, 2021). Preservice music teachers do not appear to feel prepared for their future teaching positions regarding classroom management (Baker, 2012; Legette & McCord, 2014) and considered it to be one of the more challenging parts of music teaching (Legette & McCord, 2014). Miksza and Berg (2013) examined instrumental preservice music teachers’ \((N = 8)\) apprehension during field-based teaching experiences and found that classroom management was of high concern. However, Baumgartner (2014) reported that classroom management is often addressed in music student teaching seminars. In a study of elementary general music teachers’ preparation in classroom management, 341 participants reported the most frequent sources of classroom management preparation, within their music teacher preparation programs, emerged from mentoring from a licensed teacher and supervised fieldwork. Creating classroom rules/expectations and teaching procedures were the most frequent examples of classroom management content (Gee, 2022). Lastly, Hourigan and Scheib (2009) found that classroom management is necessary for a successful student teaching experience in a music classroom.

For those teaching a specialized subject such as music, educators’ approaches to and philosophy of classroom management are vitally important as music educators will likely interact and instruct a large portion of the school population. Specific to a music classroom, there are unique parameters for learning, including the addition of instruments and the expectations for listening to music, singing, playing, moving to, and creating music. With group music-making and large class sizes, classroom management within the context of a music classroom is necessary to avoid a potentially chaotic learning environment (Byo & Sims, 2015; Costello, 2005). Though classroom management seems to be a concern for teachers across all subjects, the way in which these topics are addressed in a music teacher preparation program might be different due to the specialty of music classrooms. The biggest takeaways from one’s music teacher preparation program, in terms of classroom management preparation, might also vary based upon the music classroom (e.g., general music, band, choir, orchestra) in which one is teaching. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to follow-up from a previous study and explore classroom management preparation and content in music teacher preparation programs. The following research questions guided the study:

1. What do K-12 music educators report as the classroom management preparation sources and content they experienced in their music teacher preparation programs?
2. For K-12 music educators, what is their rating of satisfaction for their music teacher preparation programs’ classroom management preparation?
3. For K-12 music educators, what is their rating of sufficiency of classroom management preparation within their music teacher preparation programs?

Definitions

For the purposes of this study, I defined classroom management sources as: a semester-long course devoted to classroom management, a semester-long course devoted to some other topic in which classroom management was addressed, a practicum-type course, a seminar or workshop devoted to classroom management, a lecture or presentation on classroom management, mentoring from a professor outside of what was required by coursework, mentoring from a licensed teacher, or supervised fieldwork. Within each of the aforementioned sources, classroom management content referred to instruction pertaining to: pacing instruction, creating classroom rules/expectations, teaching procedures, applying interventions for students with difficult behavior, teaching classroom rules and expectations, creating a community of learners, culturally responsive classroom management, school-wide behavior initiatives, social and emotional approaches to behavior, trauma-informed care, and approaches for behavior with special learners.

In addition, I classified novice teachers as those reporting one to three years of experience, and experienced teachers as those reporting four or more years of experience, which I based on Gold’s (1989, 1996) definitions for induction and postinduction teachers.

METHOD

The current descriptive investigation is a follow-up to an initial study (Gee, 2022) conducted in the fall of 2020 with practicing elementary general music teachers (N = 341). In reviewing the literature, I discovered studies examining classroom management preparation (e.g., Christofferson & Sullivan, 2015; Freeman et al., 2014; Oliver & Reschly, 2010); however, the majority focused on general classroom teachers. As a former practicing elementary general music teacher and current elementary general music teacher educator, I aimed my initial study on elementary general music teachers. The purpose of the initial study was to examine elementary general music teachers’ classroom management preparation within music teacher preparation programs. Findings indicated that participants most frequently received classroom management preparation through experiential sources, while the most common classroom management content included creating classroom rules and expectations and teaching procedures (Gee, 2022). For the current study, I collected responses from K-12 music educators from any type of music classroom to explore if those results might be comparable across grade levels and content areas taught (e.g., general music, band, choir, orchestra).
Participants

The Institutional Review Board at the host university granted me permission to conduct this follow-up investigation. Participants (N = 99) consisted of practicing K-12 music teachers self-identified via state music education organizations. My goal was to gather data from K-12 music educators currently teaching in the United States, which was stated in the recruitment language shared with potential participants. I recruited participants through state music education organizations’ social media platforms throughout August 2021. The recruitment language included an invitation to participate in the study; the purpose of the study; estimated survey completion time; and an anonymous link to the online questionnaire. To avoid collecting any identifying participant data, I used the anonymous link generated by Qualtrics.

Data Collection Instrument

For this follow-up study, I modified a pre-existing questionnaire (Christofferson & Sullivan, 2015) by including the phrase “in your music teacher preparation program.” In their original, questionnaire Christofferson & Sullivan (2015) identified classroom management sources and content in teacher preparation programs. Their findings indicated that preservice teachers experienced classroom management preparation via experiential sources (e.g., mentoring from a licensed teacher, supervised fieldwork) and reported greater satisfaction for those types of experiences. They recommended that other scholars explore the relationship between instruction in classroom management strategies in teacher preparation programs and its implementation in classroom contexts (Christofferson & Sullivan, 2015). For my investigations, I applied this questionnaire to the field of music education to explore potential parallels between the fields of general education and music education.

In the initial study (Gee, 2022), the questionnaire included 28 questions, gathering information on participant demographics, classroom management preparation, sources, content, level of satisfaction, level of sufficiency: all within the context of their music teacher preparation program. For this follow-up study, the questionnaire contained 22 questions, of which the first eight referenced consent and demographic information (items 1-8; sections one, two, and three). The remaining questions focused on classroom management sources and content (items 9-18, section four), level of satisfaction with classroom management sources and content (items 19-20, section five), and the level of sufficiency of overall classroom management preparation (items 21-22, section six). Classroom management sources included a semester-long course devoted to classroom management, a semester-long course devoted to some other topic in which classroom management was addressed, a practicum-type course, a seminar or workshop devoted to classroom management, a lecture or presentation on classroom management, mentoring from a professor outside of what was required by coursework, mentoring from a licensed teacher, or supervised fieldwork.
All closed-ended items within the questionnaire related to participants’ music teacher preparation programs. In section four, which pertained to classroom management preparation sources and content, participants responded with a “select all that apply” option to questions such as: From which of the following sources, if any, did you receive classroom management preparation in your music teacher education program; and During your music teacher education program’s course devoted to classroom management, which of the following areas, if any, were discussed? In the fifth section of the questionnaire, related to satisfaction with classroom management preparation sources and content, participants responded to items using a 7-point Likert-type scale bounded by 1 (very dissatisfied) to 7 (very satisfied). In section six, regarding sufficiency of participants’ classroom management preparation in their teacher preparation programs, participants responded to items using a 7-point Likert-type scale bounded by 1 (very insufficient) to 7 (very sufficient). This section included prompts such as: Please indicate the extent to which you were satisfied with classroom management preparation you received from the following sources during your music teacher education program; and Please indicate the degree of sufficiency of your music teacher education program’s preparation in classroom management.

To address content validity, readability, and clarity, I sent the questionnaire for this follow-up study to four experienced and currently practicing music educators representing general music, band, choir, and orchestra. Based upon their feedback, I reorganized some of the questionnaire and clarified the wording of three questions. In addition, I found a high reliability estimate (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .95$) for this questionnaire.

**Data Analysis**

To analyze the data, I inserted participants’ ($N = 107$) data in SPSS 28.0. While cleaning the data, I removed eight incomplete responses. I analyzed respondents’ ($N = 99$) categorical data using descriptive statistics including frequencies of responses and percentages.

**Limitations**

The somewhat low response rate for this follow-up study could be explained by the participants receiving the invitation to participate during the COVID-19 pandemic in August 2021, which was also the start of the school year for many music educators. The number of music educators who belong to these state music education groups does not entirely represent the views of the complete population of K-12 music educators. Thus, I acknowledge that these responses may not be generalizable to all K-12 music teachers.

In addition, I cannot determine from which music teacher preparation programs the participants were enrolled, took courses, or what specific aspects of classroom management were covered within those programs. Participants might have participated in this study due to an interest, either positive or negative, in the topic of classroom management. Therefore, the reader should use caution with generalizing the study’s results given its limitations.
RESULTS

Participants (N = 99) identified as male (n = 35; 35.4%), female (n = 62; 62.6%), and non-binary (n = 2; 2.0%). Participants’ teaching experience included novice (n = 42; 42.4%), experienced (n = 57; 57.6%), and currently instructed music in elementary (n = 39; 39.4%), middle school (n = 38; 38.4%), and high school (n = 22; 22.2%) settings. They reported teaching the following: band (n = 35; 35.4%), orchestra (n = 13; 13.1%), choir (n = 12; 12.1%), and general music (n = 39; 39.4%). Degrees obtained consisted of Bachelor’s (n = 48; 48.5%), Master’s (n = 46; 45.5%), and Doctoral (n = 5; 5.1%). Participants reported the current region in which they taught: Northeast (n = 17; 17.2%), Southeast (n = 15; 15.2%), Midwest (n = 45; 45.5%), West (n = 12; 12.1%), Southwest (n = 9; 9.1%); and the region in which they attended a music teacher preparation program: Northeast (n = 17; 17.2%), Southeast (n = 22; 22.2%), Midwest (n = 37; 37.4%), West (n = 12; 12.1%), and Southwest (n = 11; 11.1%). Participants (n = 94; 94.9%) reported their status as currently licensed/certified as a music educator. They closely mirrored the profession in terms of gender, teaching experience, teaching setting, teaching content area, and education level (Matthews & Koner, 2017).

Research Question 1: For K-12 music educators, what are the classroom management preparation sources and content they experienced in their music teacher preparation programs?

Nearly all of the participants (n = 90; 90.9%) reported that their music teacher preparation program did not offer a semester-long course in classroom management, which represented novice (n = 25; 25.3%) and experienced (n = 74; 74.7%) K-12 music educators. The most common sources of classroom management preparation included a semester-long course devoted to some other topic in which classroom management was addressed (n = 28; 28.3%), mentoring from a licensed teacher (n = 23; 23.2%), and supervised fieldwork (n = 21; 21.2%). The least common sources included a seminar devoted to classroom management (n = 8; 8.1%) and mentoring from a professor outside of required coursework (n = 11; 11.1%).

In a course devoted to some other topic in which classroom management was addressed, a lecture or presentation, mentoring from a professor, and a seminar, the most common topics covered included creating classroom rules and expectations (10.1% - 22.2%) and teaching procedures (10.1% - 22.2%). In terms of mentoring from a licensed teacher and a practicum-type course, in addition to teaching procedures (19.2%; 21.2%), pacing instruction (16.2%; 18.2%) was a commonly cited source.

During supervised fieldwork, participants reported the most common classroom management contents were teaching procedures (25.3%) and applying interventions (20.2%). For a semester-long course in classroom management, the most commonly reported content consisted of creating classroom rules and expectations (8.1%) and using reinforcement strategies (7.1%). Participants also had a text field option of “other” to write in classroom management-related content in each of the aforementioned areas. One participant wrote in a response, “law and music education,”
under the source area of supervised fieldwork. See Table 1 for content covered within classroom management sources.

**Research Question 2: For K-12 music educators, what is their rating of satisfaction for their music teacher preparation programs’ classroom management preparation?**

Participants appeared to be the most satisfied with mentoring from a licensed teacher (40.6%) and supervised fieldwork (37.5%), while they were less likely to report satisfaction with a seminar (9.4%) or lecture (9.4%). See Table 2 for all source rankings. Participants were somewhat satisfied with content related to creating classroom rules and expectations (40.6%) and pacing instruction (25.0%); satisfied with using reinforcement strategies (34.4%), creating a community of learners (34.4%), and teaching procedures (31.3%); somewhat dissatisfied with applying intervention for students with difficult behavior (37.5%), social-emotional strategies (28.1%), school-wide behavior initiatives (25.0%), and culturally responsive classroom management (21.9%); and very dissatisfied with content related to trauma-informed care (25.0%).

**Research Question 3: For K-12 music educators, what is their rating of sufficiency of classroom management preparation within their music teacher preparation programs?**

Participants rated the overall sufficiency of their program as very insufficient \(n = 9; 9.4\%\), somewhat insufficient \(n = 15; 15.6\%\), insufficient \(n = 28; 28.1\%\), neither insufficient nor sufficient \(n = 3; 3.1\%\), sufficient \(n = 12; 12.5\%\), somewhat sufficient \(n = 18; 18.8\%\), or very sufficient \(n = 12; 12.5\%\).

**DISCUSSION**

The purpose of this follow-up study was to explore classroom management preparation and content in music teacher preparation programs. In this follow-up investigation, I examined classroom management sources and content experienced in music teacher preparation programs and participants’ ranking of satisfaction and sufficiency with those sources and content. Similar to the responses of elementary general music teachers (Gee, 2022), K-12 music choral and instrumental music
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>51</th>
<th>61</th>
<th>141</th>
<th>40</th>
<th>152</th>
<th>121</th>
<th>122</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>121</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>n = 8</th>
<th>n = 9</th>
<th>n = 11</th>
<th>n = 15</th>
<th>n = 18</th>
<th>n = 21</th>
<th>n = 23</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Management Seminar</td>
<td>Course Management from Mentoring</td>
<td>Course Management from Mentoring</td>
<td>Course Management from Mentoring</td>
<td>Course Management from Mentoring</td>
<td>Course Management from Mentoring</td>
<td>Course Management from Mentoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>Supervised Fieldwork</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>Supervised Fieldwork</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>Supervised Fieldwork</td>
<td>Lecture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Classroom Management Sources and Content (N = 99)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supervised Fieldwork</th>
<th>Licensed Teacher Mentoring</th>
<th>Outside Mentoring</th>
<th>Lecture</th>
<th>Seminar</th>
<th>Practicum</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Semester Long</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>15.0%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
educators reported similar experiences, levels of satisfaction, and perceptions of sufficiency within their music teacher preparation programs.

The majority of participants did not report taking a semester-long course in classroom management, similar to other findings (Christofferson & Sullivan, 2015; Gee, 2022; Oliver & Reschly, 2010). Other researchers recommended coursework in classroom management as part of music teacher preparation programs’ curriculum because of various challenges within music classrooms (Legette & McCord, 2014; Miksza & Berg, 2013). Regier (2021) recommended music teacher educators explore connections between preservice teachers’ confidence and the content presented in music teacher preparation coursework. This might enable music teacher educators to pinpoint specific sources and content to better prepare future music educators to meet students’ needs. A future study could compare participants’ level of satisfaction and sufficiency with the effectiveness of the sources of classroom management among undergraduate and graduate music teacher preparation programs. Another study might compare the results of the initial study (Gee, 2022) and the current investigation with those teaching in general elementary and secondary classrooms. One might wonder if those educators respond similarly and if they face the same challenges and successes in their preservice teacher preparation with respect to classroom management preparation.

From the twelve options within the survey, the most commonly reported classroom management content included creating classroom rules and expectations and teaching procedures, which mirrors the responses from elementary general music teachers (Gee, 2022) and the “Big Five” classroom management techniques Greenberg et al. (2014) recommends for teacher preparation coursework. Similarly, in a study of general education teacher preparation programs, Flower et al. (2017) appeared to address foundational approaches to classroom management, which are important for teachers to learn for any classroom setting (Alter & Haydon, 2017; Bicard, 2000). Mathews and Johnson (2019) reported that secondary choral and instrumental directors shared a similarity in emphasizing the importance of structure and clear expectations for success in their respective classrooms. Roseth (2020) suggested further exploration of the relationship between the classroom management strategy of proximity in conjunction with student affect, engagement, and learning. Music teacher educators might further explore which of those approaches are most pertinent for future music educators, given the uniqueness of classrooms and content. Another potential study might warrant investigating music teacher educators’ perspectives on what they do or do not address, in terms of classroom management, in their respective music teacher preparation coursework.

Mentoring from a licensed teacher and supervised teacher were the top-ranked sources of classroom management among the participants, which is similar to those reported by elementary general music teachers (Gee, 2022). Experiential learning opportunities have been cited as a beneficial method for teaching to practice and implement how one might approach classroom management (Baumgartner, 2014; Beck et al., 2020; Hourigan & Scheib, 2009). Perhaps music teacher educators can allocate
time, through professional music education coursework, for preservice teachers to work with their future supervisory teachers in order to acquaint themselves with the expectations, routines, and general classroom management procedures of that music classroom (e.g., Regier, 2021). A future study could investigate K-12 music educators’ professional development experiences and opportunities for classroom management beyond their undergraduate music teacher preparation programs.

Participants reported greater satisfaction from experiences such as mentoring from a licensed teacher and supervised fieldwork, similar to previous findings (Christofferson & Sullivan, 2015; Gee, 2022). One might posit that classroom management content embedded within experiential learning opportunities are valuable, if not crucial, to the preparation of future music educators (e.g., Bartolome, 2017; Conway, 2002). It might also be helpful for music teacher educators to bring in cooperating teachers in an early stage of music teacher preparation coursework to facilitate discussions between preservice teachers and experienced music educators regarding successful teaching and approaches to student behavior.

Finally, participants also appeared to be relatively satisfied with their classroom management preparation in creating classroom rules and expectations and teaching procedures, while fairly dissatisfied with preparation in social and emotional learning, culturally responsive classroom management, and trauma-informed care. Perhaps, future music educators could find benefits from music education specific materials such as Edgar’s (2017) *Music education and social emotional learning: The heart of teaching music* and Gay’s (2000; 2018) writings on culturally responsive teaching.

**CONCLUSION**

Overall, participants ranked their music teacher preparation program’s preparation in classroom management as insufficient. In the first iteration of this survey, elementary general music teachers responded similarly (Gee, 2022). A future study could examine K-12 music teachers’ perspectives on specific classroom management content and topics for inclusion within music teacher preparation programs. As the music classroom evolves with students, educators, and the world around us, it could be that teachers’ preparation could be focused on more social and emotional, trauma-sensitive, and culturally responsive content.

The findings of this study suggest that those educators in music teacher preparation programs are focusing on classroom management content; however, the K-12 elementary, choral, and instrumental educators in this investigation reported the greatest satisfaction through experiences in which they could actively engage and implement classroom management strategies and techniques. Implications could be that, in music education preparation coursework, teacher educators might find more ways to include micro-teaching sessions and early field experiences to further support future music educators.
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