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Abstract

The aim of this study was to determine prospective classroom teachers’ attitudes toward music in the classroom teacher education program in Turkey in terms of demographics, (a) including musical background and experiences, (b) comfort level integrating music with core and other subjects, (c) their perceptions of importance of subjects in the teaching program, and (d) the level of importance of outcomes of the general music education. During academic year 2014–2015, the Elementary Music Education Survey was applied to prospective teachers (\(N = 399\)). Participants stated that elementary classroom teachers should possess the skills to conduct music lessons but that they should be instructed by music teachers if possible. Results revealed that extramusical outcomes significantly more important than nonperformance and performance outcomes.
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Özet

Bu araştırmanın amacı, Sınıf öğretmeni adaylarının; (a) müzikal geçmiş ve deneyimleri, (b) müzik derslerini diğer derslerle bütünleştirmeye ilişkin algıları (c) eğitim programında yer alan derslerin önemi ve (d) genel müzik eğitimi çıktılarına ilişkin tutumlarını incelemektir. Veriler 2014–2015 akademik öğretim yılında sınıf öğretmenliği programında öğrenim gören \((N=399)\) öğrenciden Hash (2010) tarafından geliştirilen “Elementary Music Education Survey” ölçeği uygulanarak elde edilmiştir. Sınıf öğretmeni adayları büyük bir çoğunluğu okuma ve çalışmanın becerilerini aldığınnı belirtirken kendilerinin müzik dersini yönetme becerilerine sahip olmalarını gerektiğiğini ifade etmişlerdir. Mümkün olduğu takdirde ilkokullarda müzik derslerinin müzik öğretmenleri tarafından yürütülmesi gerektiğini inanmaktadırlar. Ayrıca; genel müzik eğitimi çıktılarına ilişkin; extramüzikal çıktıların (self-esteem, confidence) nonperformans (listening music, musical knowledge ve performans (playing instrument, singing, reading music) çıktılarından daha öne olduğu görülmüştür. Ayrıca, genel müzik eğitimi çıktılarına ilişkin; extramüzikal çıktıların (self-esteem, confidence) nonperformans (listening music, musical knowledge ve performans (playing instrument, singing, reading music) çıktılarından daha öne olduğu görülmüştür. Ayrıca, genel müzik eğitimi çıktılarına ilişkin; extramüzikal çıktıların (self-esteem, confidence) nonperformans (listening music, musical knowledge ve performans (playing instrument, singing, reading music) çıktılarından daha öne olduğu görülmüştür. Ayrıca, genel müzik eğitimi çıktılarına ilişkin; extramüzikal çıktıların (self-esteem, confidence) nonperformans (listening music, musical knowledge ve performans (playing instrument, singing, reading music) çıktılarından daha öne olduğu görülmüştür.
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1. Introduction

Efficiency in music teaching in schools is crucial for students’ cognitive, emotional, psychomotor and intuitive development and the impact of musical skills on language development, literacy, numeracy, measures of intelligence, general attainment, creativity, fine motor co-ordination, concentration, self-confidence, emotional sensitivity, social skills, team work, self-discipline, and relaxation (Hallam, 2010). In a study was found that there is a connection between the development of musical and language skills. Students who studied music were shown to have both better discrimination skills for perceiving language as well as better articulation skills for speaking language (Cutietta, Hamann & Walker 1995). “it is clear that there is robust evidence concerning the links between music and the cognitive development domain, including, but not limited to, neurological development, spatial reasoning, academic gains in the areas of mathematics and literacy, and the therapeutic use of music with children that have developmental delays or learning difficulties” (Nwokenna & Anike 2013).

In fact, music education field that has a tremendous impact on an individual’s development from many perspectives has been governed in Turkey and in around the world by classroom teachers who are not raised in the music profession (Battersby & Cave, 2014; Collins, 2014; Giles & Frego, 2004; Hash, 2010; Hennessy, 2001; Seddon & Biasutti 2008). In-service classroom teachers (ICT) and prospective classroom teachers (PCT) may have the awareness that music education is beneficiary for education and development of children, that it is necessary for performing their profession, while PCT, sometimes, may feel disqualified to conduct music lessons (Barış & Özahta, 2009; Kılıç, 2009; Kılıç & Acat, 2007; Kocabaş, 2000; Kurtuldu, 2009; Özmentes & Gürgen, 2010). However, education practices in most countries (including Turkey) considers classroom teachers as music teachers in elementary schools since classroom teachers spends their most time with the same students and they are more prone to associate music with other disciplines. Moreover, the fact that replacing classroom teachers with music teachers in music lessons will also provide an extra cost to economy brings to mind that the current application will be stable for a while.

In Turkey, PCTs’ music education process includes compulsory “music” and “music teaching” courses offered in two terms1. Music, music education, and music teaching concepts, in general, brings to mind the education process for the students who pass the music skill test. On the contrary, music education process for classroom teachers prepares students not only teaching music in primary schools but also improving the necessary skills for developing students’ readiness, determining students’ learning levels, applying appropriate music teaching techniques and methods, having the perceptions of music and music education approaches in the 21st century, and competing with the problems faced in the classrooms. Within this regard, it is considered that determining pre-service classroom teachers’ perceptions towards music education will be beneficiary in providing more meaning to the music education process since different applications in music education courses that pre-service class-
room teachers encounter during their undergraduate education may cause differences in their professional skills and their efficiency in teaching.

**Review Of Related Literature**

In Turkey, PCTs’ music education process has been discussed from different perspectives in many studies. Most studies investigated music learning levels and cognitive, affective and psychomotor skills relating music education (Bulut & Bulut, 2011; Kılıç & Acat, 2007; Kurtaslan & Koca, 2013; Kurtaslan & Köksoy, 2011; Özgürlü, 1997, 2001a, 2001b; Özgürlü & Ucan 1998a, 1998b; Özmentes & Gürge, 2010), pre-and in-service teachers’ views of music education courses applied in classroom teacher education programs (Eldemir, Umuzdaş & Umuzdaş, 2013; Kılıç, 2007; Kurtaslan & Koca, 2013; Kutluk, 2010a, 2010b; Şahin & Aksüt, 2002; Şaktanlı, 2004; Yünlü & Sağlam, 2004), students’ opinions regarding compulsory instrument learning (Kurtaslan & Koca, 2013; Önal & Aydoğan, 2012), music teaching self-efficacy and self-confidence beliefs (Afacan, 2007; Çevik, 2011; Kırcıoğlu, 2009; Kutluk, 2010a; Özmen, 2011; Topoğlu, 2014), different applications of music courses in different universities, instructors’ views, classroom applications, their comments and expectations, analysis of music course contents (Kalyoncu & Öztürk, 2009; Özgürlü, 1995, 1997, 2002, 2009, 2010). Only few study has been focused on PCTs’ attitudes towards music courses, and these studies were mainly superficial studies consisted of scale development or analysis of previous programs. (Ceren & Şeker, 2013; Demirbatır & Helvacı, 2006). In addition, some studies investigated Turkish PCTs’ reading notation. These studies indicated that PCT had difficulty in noticing notation values, correct and rhythmic reading, applying notation, and following with hand strokes completely (Afacan, 2007; Arapgirlioğlu & Karagöz, 2011; Kurtaslan & Koca, 2013; Yünlü & Sağlam, 2004). Another study that focused on PCTs’ self-confidence in conducting elementary music lessons resulted that 61% of PCT stated their efficacy in reading notes and teaching songs with notes while 71% of them felt themselves efficient in teaching recorder (Kutluk, 2010a). Aiming to assess PCTs’ knowledge on basic music theories, (Bulut & Bulut, 2011) indicated that majority of the participants determined the notes between “do1-do2” gap that is written in G clef, while their knowledge on other fundamental music theories were determined to be weak. Moreover, PCTs’ statements signaled weaknesses in their self-efficacy in both basic music subjects (such as determining musical terms and symbols) that were included in the primary school teaching program and using their voice while teaching music. In addition, undergraduate music education suffers from both a lack of supporting PCTs’ individual voice training and inefficiency in integrating instrument learning process with classroom activities (Barış & Özata, 2009; Kutluk, 2010a; Nurikadioglu, 2000).

Studies regarding classroom teachers’ levels of playing an instrument indicate teachers’ ability to play an instrument (recorder) as 40% (Kurtaslan & Köksoy, 2011; Özgürlü, 2001a; Şaktanlı, 2004). Another study also points out 71% of the classroom teachers could play recorder (Ercan, 2006). According to Tenkoğlu (2005) elementary
school students and reported that only 54% of the students declared that their teachers could play and teach how to play a recorder. Some other studies also present PCTs weaknesses in transferring their music knowledge to the classrooms, in using their voice, in song resources regarding school music (Barış & Özata, 2009; Ercan, 2006; Şahin, 2009; Yokuş & Avşar, 2014).

**Importance Of The Study**

In-service classroom teachers have a special role in education society. In-service classroom teachers are required to have knowledge on multiple subject disciplines including interdisciplinary music lessons and their application besides pedagogy and psychology of education (Collins, 2014). Elementary music teaching program in Turkey provides a great emphasis on associating music lessons with other learning areas. Teaching program describes interdisciplinary approach in three dimensions: Associating within a subject, associating between subjects, associating between disciplines (Özgül, 2015; MEB, 1994, 2006).

“Holistic education” is at the center of practices of integrated approaches (Chrysostomou, 2004). Most of integrated approaches to teaching and learning creates a student-centered environment that lead students to understand the links between different content areas (McCullar, 1998). Most classroom teachers believe that learning in all subjects may be enriched by music (Stroud, 1981; Wiggins & Wiggins 2008) and they have found numerous ways to integrate the arts in the classroom. There are four integration styles that can be used in classrooms such as subservient, affective, social, and coequal-cognitive. According to Bresler (1995) the explanations of these styles are as follows:

“Subservient integration involves using the arts as tools for meeting other academic objectives. Affective integration involves using the arts to change the mood of individual students or the classroom. Social integration involves using the arts to participate in school or community events, programs, or assemblies. Coequal-cognitive integration places the arts and other core academic objectives on the same importance level, with the teacher working to meet objectives in music and other academic subjects.”

**Purpose Of The Study**

Following the Project for Improving National Education, conducted by Higher Education Counsel and World Bank to provide “pre-service teacher education” in 1994, teaching programs of education faculties that are responsible for preparing elementary and middle school teachers reformed in 1998. The latest adjustments in these programs were introduced in 2006. This update was also effective in the contents of the music and music education courses that were covered in the classroom teacher
training programs. PCTs’ undergraduate education includes two compulsory courses relating music. The first one is “music” course (3 credit hours during the first semester of the second year), and “music teaching” is the second course offered as 3 credit hours during the second half of the second year. The current study is important from two aspects. Firstly, determining PCTs’ attitudes and experience regarding music education, secondly determining PCTs’ attitudes regarding applicability and usefulness of the programs included in the compulsory music courses. Within this regard, four questions were investigated:

1. What musical abilities and experiences do PCTs have?
2. What are the level of PCTs beliefs with regard to music instruction and integration of music to other disciplines?
3. In the elementary curriculum, how do PCTs rate the importance of music in relation to other subjects?
4. What is the level of importance of outcomes of the general music curriculum?

2. Methodology

Being quantitative in nature, this study is a survey study. The survey is a method for collecting information or data as reported by individuals. Survey research provides a numeric or quantitative description of attitudes, trends or opinions of a population by studying in the sample. Cross-sectional is included in survey research using questionnaires for data collection (Creswell, 2009).

Participants

A total of 399 students, including 399 sophomores 113 (28.3%), junior 190 (47.6%) and senior 96 (24.1%), participated in the study. 95 (23.8%) participants were male and 304 (76.2%) were female. The participants of the study were students in the Department of Classroom Teacher Education at Kastamonu University during the academic year of 2014–2015 and completed compulsory “music” and “music teaching” courses.

Data Collection Tool

The study utilized Elementary Music Education Survey (EMES) developed by Hash (2010). EMES items were investigated in terms of their compatibility with music course contents applied in PCT training programs in Turkey (Kalyoncu & Öztürk, 2009; MEB, 1994, 2006, 2008; Özgül 2001b, 2002, 2014, 2015; YÖK, 1998a, 1998b, 1999, 2006), translated into Turkish, and re-inspected by two language and two field experts who instruct music courses in colleges.

There are 37 questions in the survey and these questions are divided into four different parts. The first part is about the demographic information of participants. Musical experience and background of participants are asked in this part. In the part
II, there are 8 questions that help to reveal participants’ perceptions about music instruction and integration. In the part III, participants are asked to rate the level of importance of all eleven courses. In the last part of the survey, there are 13 questions to evaluate the importance of outcomes of the curriculum.

In the Part II, III and IV, the used scale is of the 7-step Likert type (N=399). Part II includes 8 items with seven response categories from “1: strongly disagree” to “7: strongly agree”. Part III and IV includes 11 and 13 items with seven categories from “1: very unimportant” to “7: very important”. Moreover, the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients of each subscales are found 0.79 for Part II, 0.91 for Part III and 0.92 for Part IV. The measured total reliability is 0.94 as Cronbach Alpha. Since this coefficient is higher than 0.70, this survey can be considered acceptable (DeVellis, 2003).

Data Analysis

Analysis of the data conducted through SPSS 17 software. Mean, mode, standard deviation and frequencies are calculated for each question of questionnaire. Differences also tested using nonparametric methods because of the severe non normality. Nonparametric tests are sometimes called distribution-free tests. Nonparametric tests are based on fewer assumptions that the outcome is not approximately normally distributed). Parametric tests involve the normal distribution and involve estimation of the key parameters of that distribution (e.g., the mean or difference in means) from the sample data. The cost of fewer assumptions is that nonparametric tests are generally less powerful than their parametric counterparts (wikipedia).

3. Findings

Musical Background and Experience

In Part I, prospective classroom teachers are asked to indicate their musical background and experience. A total of 399 students, including sophomore 113 (28.3%), junior 190 (47.6%) and senior 96 (24.1%), participated in the study. 95 (23.8%) participants were male and 304 (76.2%) were female. 76.7% (n = 306) of the participants stated that they are able to read notation and 42.4% (n = 169) of participants can play at least one instrument. Some prospective classroom teachers (30.3%, n = 121) stated that a certified music teacher is employed in the elementary school they attended. Meanwhile 69.7% (n = 278) of participants indicated that there is not any employed a certified music teacher in the elementary school they attended.
Table 1. Statements related to music teaching and learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mo</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Disagree (1-3)</th>
<th>No Opinion (4)</th>
<th>Agree (5-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel comfortable using my singing voice in front of others.</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>1.901</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel comfortable acting as the music teacher (teaching music as a subject) in an elementary classroom.</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.658</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel comfortable teaching the “core” subjects (e.g., math, reading, science, etc.) in the elementary classroom.</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.546</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would feel comfortable integrating music with other subjects (i.e., social studies, language arts) in an elementary classroom.</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.546</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The classroom teacher and should integrate music with other subjects (i.e., social studies, science, and math, reading...).</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.511</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An elementary classroom teacher should be capable of teaching music.</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music should be taught by a teacher certified in music education.</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.600</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>79.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music study can improve student achievement in other subjects.</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 presents prospective classroom teachers’ views regarding music teaching and learning. According to Table 1, 54.4% (n = 127) of participants would not feel comfortable using their singing voice in front of others, but majority of participants feel comfortable teaching the “core” subjects (81.0%, n = 323), acting as the music teacher (74.7%, n = 298), integrating music to different subjects (74.5%, n = 298). Participants have an agreement that music education may develop achievement in other subjects (71.9%, n = 287), and that a classroom teacher should be able to teach music (83.2%, n = 332). Participants also agree that music education should be given by a certified teacher (79.7%, n = 318) that classroom teacher and the general music specialist should integrate music with different subjects (72.2%, n = 288).

Table 2. Importance of subjects in the elementary curriculum (descending order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mo</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.062</td>
<td>-10.99</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language arts</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>-9.42</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.058</td>
<td>-8.71</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.199</td>
<td>-7.69</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social studies</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.185</td>
<td>-6.93</td>
<td>0.000**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 presents the prospective classroom teachers’ ratings the importance of eleven courses in the curriculum. Findings indicate that participants consider music less important than all other disciplines except foreign language in the curriculum. Moreover, statistically all calculated differences are significant (p < .001) except physical education and visual art. The difference in physical education is significant at p < .05. Despite the fact that music is ranked in the 10th place, the 87.8 % (n = 342) of PCTs possess positive attitude toward music (Mean = 5.66, Median = 6).

Table 3. Importance of General Music Curriculum Outcomes (Descending Order)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mo</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Unimportant (1-3)</th>
<th>Neither (4)</th>
<th>Important (5-7)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing self-esteem and confidence</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.180</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>94.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building social skills</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6.64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.313</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>92.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposing students to a wide range of musical styles, cultures, and time periods</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.364</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>89.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting reading and writing instruction</td>
<td>EM</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.450</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>90.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to music</td>
<td>NP</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6.47</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.521</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>87.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing instruments</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.531</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>7.27</td>
<td>87.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singing</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.515</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>85.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading music</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.539</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>9.02</td>
<td>85.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome | Outcome Type | N | M | Mo | SD | Unimportant (1-3) | Neither (4) | Important (5-7)
--- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | ---
Teaching musical information (e.g., composer biographies, terms, etc.) | NP | 399 | 6.41 | 7 | 1.615 | 6.52 | 6.77 | 86.72
Exploring connections between music and other subjects | NP | 399 | 6.35 | 7 | 1.630 | 6.27 | 9.02 | 84.71
Presenting public performances | P | 399 | 6.34 | 7 | 1.665 | 6.77 | 8.52 | 84.71
Teaching students to create music (compose, improvise) | NP | 399 | 6.12 | 7 | 1.941 | 10.53 | 8.27 | 81.20
Analyzing and describing music | NP | 399 | 6.00 | 7 | 2.010 | 11.28 | 10.78 | 77.94

Note: EM = extramusical; NP = nonperformance; P = performance. Percents do not equal 100 due to rounding.

Prospective classroom teachers order all 13 outcomes of the curriculum according to the importance. Outcomes of curriculum are also categorized as “performance,” “nonperformance,” or “extramusical” (see Table 3). In order to determine the perception of prospective classroom teachers’ according to types of outcomes, mean score of each item is combined (see Table 4).

Table 4. Importance of outcome types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>Mo</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extramusical</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonperformance</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To measure statistical difference between the mean score of these outcome categories, Friedman test is conducted ($\chi^2 = 175.137$, df = 2, N = 399, $p < .001$). A post hoc analysis using a series of Wilcoxon Signed Ranks tests, furthermore, revealed significant differences between some combinations with participants rating extramusical outcomes significantly more important than nonperformance ($z = -12.308$, $p < 0.001$) and performance ($z = -11.390$, $p < 0.001$) outcomes. Nonperformance outcomes did not significantly differed than performance ($z = -.873$, $p = 0.383$) outcomes.

Most of prospective classroom teachers stated that the most important outcomes of the curriculum involved “developing self-esteem and confidence” ($M = 6.72$), “building social skills” ($M = 6.64$), “Exposing students to a wide range of musical styles, cultures, and time periods ($M = 6.56$), and “supporting reading and writing instruction” ($M = 6.55$). Similarly most of participants agreed that the least important outco-
mes of the general music curriculum involved “Analyzing and describing music” (M = 6.00) and “Teaching students to create music” (M = 6.12).

4. Conclusions and implications

According to the findings of the study, 76.7% of the prospective classroom teacher have indicated that they can able to read notation and 42.4% of participants stated that they can play at least one instrument. PCTs’ perceptions of read notation were similar in some studies (Kutluk, 2010b) while some studies contradict our findings (Afacan, 2010; Ercan, 2006; Kurtaslan & Koca, 2013; Yünlü & Sağlam 2004). An explanation for about half of PCTs’ statements of playing at least one instrument may be as following. A majority of PCTs begin to play an instrument firstly during their undergraduate education. Moreover, PCTs also carried the beliefs that instrument play training would provide a partial contribution to their classroom instruction (Barış & Ozata 2006). In a study conducted with the college students in their final year, PCTs stated that instrument play skills that they were improved in their training process in college would also have a slight contribution to their teaching profession (Tebiş, 2011). Moreover, in-service classroom teachers also indicated that they, most of the time, do not use their education regarding play an instrument in their profession (Kılıç, 2009). The reasons for differences in PCTs’ perceptions of reading notes and playing an instrument need to be searched in students’ readiness for university education, faculties’ quality of teaching music, PCTs’ music teaching goals and their planned working levels towards the goal, applications related with music education in schools.

The current study indicated that in the most of the elementary schools that PCTs attended, a music teacher has not been employed. Therefore, it is unfeasible that in every elementary school, a music teacher may attend in music course instead of classroom teacher. In this regard, the issues regarding need for music teachers still remained unsolved in Turkey. Ministry of National Education declared that there is a need for 3059 music teachers in 2015. However, the ministry could only contact with 30% of music teachers (MEB, 2015).

Findings indicate that a majority of PCTs would not feel comfortable using their singing voice in front of others (54.4%, n = 217). This finding is similar to those obtained in other studies (Barış & Özata, 2009; Ercan, 2006; Küçükköncü, 2000; Kutluk, 2010b). The singing song is professional issue in front of the crowd, needing quite special education in voice, breath and conservation. Despite everything; PCTs’ music education process should mainly focus on enriching PCTs’ school song resources and improving their skill of singing a song. Singing skills have a key role in integrating music with other subjects. Within this regard, PCTs education should prepare students to allow them to use their all potential in line with the principle of “every individual has a skill” (Özgül, 2014).

PCTs feel comfortable teaching the “core” subjects and integrating music with ot-
her subjects. Moreover, PCTs believe that music education improves the achievement in other courses. Being similar to the current study, many studies indicate that PCTs as classroom teachers possess a strong self-confidence and self-efficacy beliefs (Afacan, 2007; Çevik, 2011; Kırcioğlu, 2009; Kutluk, 2010a; Özmenteş, 2011; Topoğlu, 2014).

These result can be explained the fact that PCTs in the current study attend in that music courses include research-based teaching applications related with listening, playing, singing, creativeness, material development, and integrating (mathematics, science, art…).

PCTs also carry the belief that music should be taught by music teacher Some studies also support the idea of “teaching music by music teachers” (Ercan, 2006; Kılıç, 2011; Tenkoğlu, 2005). Although this belief seems to contradict the view “classroom teachers are required to have the skill of conducting music lessons,” only middle school music lessons are instructed by music teachers in Turkey, and there is huge need for music teachers in primary schools. Hence, it is obvious that music courses in Turkey have to be taught classroom teachers for a while, and undergraduate music courses for PCTs should be offered as compulsory courses to train them better for teaching elementary school music.

Results obtained in the current study show that PCTs provided more emphasis on extramusical outcomes than nonperformance and performance outcomes of the general music education program. These findings may call into question what PCTs believe about the content, purpose, and musical quality of public performances. According to McClung (2000), “extramusical skills are influential and highly valued in the music classroom. Research has shown that extramusical factors, such as attitude, participation, and attendance, constitute a major portion of many music student’s academic grade, a point that is especially true in music ensembles. Music educators who successfully infuse music curricula with formal strategies to teach extramusical skills will contribute to an instructional model that could positively affect the emotional literacy of every child, in every classroom, in every school.” Deep investigation of PCTs view regarding this issue revealed that musical activities including singing-playing, listening, performing, exploring the relationships, defining music, understanding music, and performing creative activities develop self-esteem and confidence, building social skills, supporting reading and writing instruction. In fact, music lessons should focus on the objectives and skills that music can reach at most rather than defining skills relating musical learning.

According to the results, analyzing and describing music is the least scored item in the PCTs Importance of General Music Curriculum Outcomes. Being similar to the scores of the item “exposing students to a wide range of musical styles, cultures, and time periods.” this situation in not unexpected when the applications during the education process are taken into consideration. While preparing their projects/research regarding components of music, students bring music pieces from different time
periods, culture and style to the classroom. However, they cannot make the analysis of these differences in music preferences due to time limit. In this regard, this results related to “Analyzing and describing music” could be expected. In addition, PCTs also deemphasized composing, improvising. Berke & Colwell (2004) and Colwell (2008), however, found that PCTs and IECTs believed composing and improvising were the least important National Standards. In addition, nearly 59% of PCTs in Morin (2004) rated “creating music” as “least useful” to them in the classroom. The above results may be caused the fact that PCTs have not found enough chance to conduct activities requiring composing and improvising because of time discrepancy.

To sum up, this study investigated (I) PCTs’ demographics musical background and experiences, (II) comfort level with regard to integrate music with core and other subjects (III) their perceptions regarding importance of the subjects included in the elementary school teaching program, (IV) their attitudes regarding the importance of various outcomes -extramusical, performance and nonperformance- of the general music education program. Compare to the results obtained in the other studies, it may be sorted that the participants of the current study possess better attitudes towards music teaching program. Moreover, the current study has a common point with Hash (2010) in terms of the view that music courses should be taught by music teachers rather than classroom teachers. Classroom teachers spend a great deal of time with their students and therefore are responsible for contributing to their total development including opportunities for aesthetic development as a way to support a student’s “sensitivity to the expressive qualities found in an artistic experience”. The fine arts offer this expressive opportunity for all students and should be accessible for students in daily classroom situations (Battersby & Cave 2014; McCullar, 1998). During their education process, PCTs’ close relations with music and music education will be beneficiary in students’ better understanding of music contents and heir integrating of music with other core subjects. Moreover, it would also support their gaining of profound aesthetic experience that is related with teachers’ culture, experience, and appearance.

Results of this study should not be generalized to the larger population because the survey was conducted among a relatively small. In this regard, this questionnaire, similar ones or developed instruments could be applied by researchers, instructors at other colleges and universities to larger population in order to reach more generalizable, to discuss, and to compare results obtained in the current study.
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