Available online at: http://ijer.eab.org.tr/1/4/1_sibelcoban.pdf

http://eab.org.tr

Educational Research Association
The International Journal of Educational Researchers 2010, 4(1): 1-14
ISSN: 1308-9501

http://ijer.eab.org.tr

Relationship between the Motivation Levels of the Music Teacher Candidates related to Leaining Musical Instruments and Their Selections of Career Training

Sibel ÇOBAN* & Tuğba ÇALIŞKAN**
MarmaraUniversity & Private Açı Primary School, İSTANBUL

Abstract: This study examined the relationship between the motivation levels of candidate music teachers towards instrument lessons and their preferences for career education.

The research universe comprises music teacher candidates studying at Music Education Sections Departments of Fine Arts in Education Faculties and the study sample comprises first, second, third and fourth grade students studying at Music Education Sections Departments of Fine Arts in Education Faculties of Marmara University, Gazi University, Dokuz Eylül University and Abant İzzet Baysal University.

A "Personal Data Questionnaire" and "Motivation Scale for Individual Instrument Lesson" were applied as measurement instruments.

This study investigated students' motivational differences according to four sub-dimensions (interest, educational atmosphere, environment, professional expectation) of the Motivation Scale between

- Choosing musical teacher training willingly
- Planning to follow a different profession (except for Music teacher) after graduation.

The results showed that the motivation levels of the students towards instrument lessons differed significantly in accordance with the 'career aspirations' variable.

Participants who willingly pursued a career as a music teacher scored higher in the motivation scale sub-dimension of 'interest'.

Key words: Motivation, Instrument Education, Career Education

Introduction

One of the most significant characteristics that distinguish humans from other creatures is their capacity to learn. Being a product of life experiences, learning has a permanent impression and behavioral change necessarily occurs as a result of learning. Teaching is defined as the activity of enabling learning and guiding, whereas instruction refers to planned and systematic teaching (Erden and Akman, 1995: 119- 121) . Although "learning" is tried to be performed with planned activities at formal educational institutions which emerged in order to "provide the learning in a much more planned way".

Oral (2007: 563- 592), suggested that one of these reasons was related to "effective teaching", and explained the scope of "effective teaching" as "activities performed in an attempt to appropriate the learning experiences for students". On the other hand, stating that teachers are supposed to develop an "effective teaching environment" in order to appropriate the learning experiences for students, Oral specified the processes to be performed by the teacher, as follows:

a) Planning, applying the teaching activities and assessing the performance of the student,

b) Choosing appropriate strategies and instruments of teaching,

c) Effective classroom management,

d) Taking the educational requirements of students into consideration, such as differences in cognitive, affective and physical domains; differences in learning styles and creativity potential; differences originating from gender, cultural and socio-economic factors; and differences originating from insufficiencies or at-risk students,

e) Effective motivation.

Çırak (2007: 266), mentions many factors that affect learning, within which the concept of "motivation" is one of the required processes for an "effective teaching environment", which explained a part of these as factors originating from the "learning organism" and another part as factors originating from "the characteristics of the learning environment". While factors originating from the "learning organism" could be genetic and also originating from personal differences such as perceptions, values, attitudes and necessities, factors originating from the "characteristics of the learning environment" are environmental factors. Additionally, Çırak (2007:266- 283) stated "It is not possible to distinguish most of these factors from one another, to determine them with definite lines individually and environmentally. Interacting together on most occasions, these factors affect learning ". Çırak arranged the factors that affect learning, as follows:

- Maturation,
- Species-Specific Availability,
- Age and Intelligence,

- Motive and Motivation,
- General Emotive Condition,
- Preparedness,
- Timing, Practice Period,
- Transfer,
- Backwash – Inhibition,
- Attention,
- Biological – Physiological Condition,
- Learning – Teaching Methods,
- Language Development,
- Experience.

Çırak also indicated that "learning" is under the control both of powers such as maturation, which is inherent, and of environmental factors such as experience.

Duy (2007: 645) emphasized the significance of the concept of "motivation", which is one of many factors that affect learning and which is necessary for an "effective teaching environment" in learning, as follows, "like many other behaviours of humans, motivation is also one of the important factors that affects the behaviour of learning".

The term "motivation" is used synonymously with the word motivation in our language. The term motivation comes from the Latin "movere", meaning "moving, mobilizing" (Ertem, 2006:1).

The literature defines different classifications and types of motivation. Exterior and interior motivations are the best-known types of motivation.

According to Moran (2001) et al., motivations are approached within three categories as interior, exterior and selfless motivation.

As Çırak (2007: 269) quotes from Ataman (2004: 220), "Motivation which constitutes the base of learning is related to processes such as stimulation, attention, anxiety, feedback, and reinforcement. Motivation is particularly important for education within the school environment. It is a challenging task to motivate students and direct them to a purpose. If one of two students whose maturation and skill levels are the same learns better, the difference is caused by the level of motivation between them."

When the selection of career training is in question, the issue of motivation becomes much more important.

Motivation for learning includes obtaining the necessary information, skills and attitudes in order to achieve the target behaviors at a level, to go into action and demanding with determination (Başaran, 2005: 410).

Günal (1999: 1) summarized the relationship between musical instrument training and motivation as, "Systematic, disciplined and progressive working is a prior condition in order to transform the visual perception into fine motor skill for the application area and accelerate this process, start and speed up the fine motors in series, bring the second hand coordination as required; in order to progress many similar physical competencies in parallel with theory and creating-interpretation within instrument training. Such a challenging working process, however, could only be provided by intense eagerness or, in other words, high-level motivation".

Musical knowledge is increased through instrument training, which is a dimension of the musical education and students are expected to produce music by playing their chosen instrument (Özen, 2004: 60). Within this process, which requires a planned, conscious and disciplined moving, the level of motivation that results in success and the types of motivation that students have is a subject to be searched.

The necessity for students to be motivated in order to succeed? This necessity, the present study examined the question "Do the motivation levels (in accordance with the sub-dimensions of concern, educational environment, environment and occupational expectation) of candidate music teachers related to learning differ according to whether they willingly select the career of music teaching?".

This study utilized a motivation scale developed by the researchers, based on the theory of self-regulation.

Theory of Self-Regulation and Motivation

The theory and studies of self regulation learning (SRL) are not limited to the asocial forms of education, such as exploratory learning, self teaching by reading, working, programmed education or computer-based education; it can also include the social forms of learning, such as modeling, counseling, and feedback from peers, coaches and teachers.

The key point in defining self-regulated learning is whether the student shows personal enterprise, ambition and an adaptive skill while still maintaining the education, rather than whether or not they are socially isolated (Zimmerman and Schunk, 2001: 1).

Self-regulation reserves activities, such as participating in education and concentrating; organizing, coding and repeating the knowledge in an attempt to remember; establishing a productive working environment and using resources effectively; self-belief; the value of learning, factors that affect learning; and expected advantages of activities and gratification experiences related to the efforts of the individual (Schunk, 1989) (Aktarım: Schunk and Zimmerman, 1994: 75).

Many additional factors may affect the educational success of students. These factors may be related to the family, school, peer group and personal characteristics of the student. In recent years, studies of academic success have focused on the concept of self-regulation, which plays an effective

role in the learning process of students. Self-regulation is considered one of the most important factors of success and academic performance, and has been defined and modeled by many theoretical perspectives (Üredi and Üredi, 2005: 251).

Learning theories with self-regulation describe how learning and success occur together with intellectual ability, educational infrastructure and environment. These theories include the process, strategy and self-regulation reactions of the students. Although each of them emphasizes different structures and mechanisms, they share several basic assumptions (Çetin and Gelbal, 2008: 1004).

As Çetin and Gelbal (2008: 1004) cite, Pintrich (2000) arranges the five basic assumptions shared by all self-regulation theories, as follows:

1) Students are active and structuring individuals during the learning process,
2) Students can observe and control their own behaviors,
3) A standard or a purpose should have been determined, so that students can measure their saved developments and make decisions when they are successful or need to make a change in their behaviors,
4) Demographic and cultural properties are greater influences on success than personal properties,
5) Individuals can self-regulate their motivations, behaviors and cognitions.

Methods and Procedures

The study examined the relationship between motivation levels and career training selections of candidate music teachers during personal instrument training. The population of the study comprised candidate music teachers studying undergraduate programs at Music Education Sections Departments of Fine Arts in Education Faculties.

The sample group of the study consisted of 403 students in the first-to fourth grades of Music Teaching at Marmara University Atatürk Teachers College, Gazi University Gazi Teachers College, Dokuz Eylül University Buca Teachers College, and Abant İzzet Baysal University Teachers College.

The study used a survey model and the data collection tools used in the study was: “Personal Instrument Training Motivation Scale” and “Personal Information Survey”. Factor analysis of the Personal Instrument Training Motivation Scale identified the following 4 sub-factors:

- Factor 1: ‘Concern’
- Factor 2: ‘Education Environment’
- Factor 3: ‘Environment’ and

• Factor 4: 'Occupational Expectation'.

Results

This section discusses the following issues:

• Intentional selection of a music teaching career;

• Differentiation of the music teacher candidates who constitute the problem of the study, in terms of other occupational fields they plan to perform after graduation, were approached in terms of the relationship between their Motivation Levels Related to Learning an Instrument and the findings and their interpretations were given place.

Findings

Participants were asked whether they intentionally chose to train as a music teacher. As shown in Table 1, 87.8% answered yes, while 12.2% answered no.

Table 1: Responses to the Question "*Did you intentionally choose to be a music teacher?"*

"***Did you intentionally choose to be a music teacher?***	***f***	**%**
Yes	354	87.8
No	49	12.2
Total	403	100.0

Table 2 shows responses to the question of intentionally choosing a music-teaching career, according to participants' gender and educational establishment.

Table 2: Transverse Table Distributions of Answers to the Question "Did you intentionally select the career training of University – Gender – to be a Music teacher*?"*

UN.			***Did you intentionally select to be a music teacher?***		**Total**
			Yes	**No**	
A.İ.B.U	**Gender**	**Female**	f 44	2	46
			% **95.7%**	4.3%	100.0 %
		Male	f 19	2	21
			% **90.5%**	9.5%	100.0 %
	Total		f 63	4	67
			% 94.0%	6.0%	100.0 %

D.E.U.	**Gender**	**Female**	f	49	3	52
			%	**94.2%**	5.8%	100.0 %
		Male	f	21	2	23
			%	**91.3%**	8.7%	100.0 %
	Total		f	70	5	75
				93.3%	6.7%	100.0 %
G.U.	**Gender**	**Female**	f	75	17	92
			%	**81.5%**	18.5%	100.0 %
		Male	f	28	3	31
			%	**90.3%**	9.7%	100.0 %
	Total		f	103	20	123
				83.7%	16.3%	100.0 %
M.U.	**Gender**	**Female**	f	71	11	82
			%	**86.6%**	13.4%	100.0 %
		Male	f	47	9	56
			%	**83.9%**	16..1%	100.0 %
	Total		f	118	20	138
			%	85.5%	14.5%	100.0 %

As is seen in Table 2, among female students, the highest proportion of yes answers was among those at Bolu İzzet Baysal University, while the lowest was among female students at Ankara Gazi University.

Among male participants, the highest proportion of yes answers was among students at Dokuz Eylül University, while the lowest was among those at Marmara University.

The following tables show the results related to the 4 sub-dimensions identified through factor analysis of the Motivation Scale of Personal Instrument Instruction Lesson.

Table 3: Relationship between Career Selection Status and Motivation / **Concern** Sub-Dimension

	Did you intentionally select to be a music teacher?	**N**	$\overline{X}$	**ss**	**t-test**		
					t	**sd**	**p**
Concern	**Yes**	353	32.68	6.413	2.657	400	.008
	No	49	30.06	6.893			

According to the result of the independent group t-test, there was a significant difference in scores obtained from the sub-dimension of **Concern** between those participants intentionally selecting or not selecting teaching as an occupation (*t= 2,65; p<.01*). According to this result, students who intentionally select the occupation of teaching have a significantly higher score for concern, compared to the students who did not intentionally select the teaching profession.

Table 4: Relationship between Career Selection Status and Motivation / **'Education Environment'** Sub-Dimension

	Did you intentionally select to be a music teacher?	**N**	$\overline{X}$	**ss**	**t-test**		
					t	**sd**	**p**
Education Environment	**Yes**	354	20.53	3.427	1.696	401	.091
	No	49	19.67	2.495			

According to the result of the independent group t-test, there was no significant relationship between scores obtained for the **Education Environment** sub-factor and whether students had intentionally or unintentionally selected the occupation of teaching (*t= 1.69; p>.05*).

Table 5: Relationship between Career Selection Status and Motivation/ **Environment** Sub-Dimension

	Did you intentionally select to be a music teacher?	**N**	$\overline{X}$	**ss**	**t-test**		
					t	**sd**	**p**
Environment	**Yes**	354	16.79	3.034	-.180	401	.857
	No	49	16.88	5.195			

As shown in Table 5, the independent group t-test showed no statistically significant difference between the points acquired from the **Environment** sub-dimension and students' career-selection status (*t= -0.18; p>.05*).

Table 6: Relationship between Career Selection Status and Motivation/ **Occupational Expectation** Sub-Dimension

	Did you intentionally select to be a music teacher?	**N**	$\overline{X}$	**ss**	**t-test**		
					t	**sd**	**p**
Occupational Expectation	**Yes**	353	17.93	5.068	.744	400	.457
	No	49	17.37	4.271			

As shown in Table 6, the independent group t-test showed there was no significant difference in the score from the **Occupational Expectation** sub-dimension according students' to career selection status (*t= 0.74; p>.05*).

B) ***RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MOTIVATION LEVELS AND POST-GRADUATION CAREER PLANS***

Table 7: Participants' Post-Graduation Career Plans

Which occupation do you plan to practice after graduation?	***f***	***%***
Music Teacher	148	36.7
Playing in orchestra	23	5.7
Soloist	13	3.2
Academic carrier	197	48.9
Any job	22	5.5
Total	403	100.0

As seen in Table 7, the largest group of students (48.9%) plans to have an academic career, followed by those who plan to teach(36.7%). It is also seen that, while 5.7% of the students plan to become orchestral artists, 3.2% of them plan to become soloists and 5.5% plan to practice an occupation outside of the music field.

Although the majority of the sample (87.8%) indicated that they selected the occupation of teaching intentionally, it is seen that they prefer academic careers to teaching (48.9%). Considering this result, it could be thought that the sample group assess and target the academic career within the occupation of teaching.

In terms of differences between educational establishments, Table 8 shows that the majority of those planning to practice teaching (53.7%) currently study at Abant İzzet Baysal University. In comparison, only 29% of participants from Marmara University are planning a career in teaching.

Table 8: Participants' Post-Graduation Career Plans according to Gender and Educational Establishment

UNV.				***Which occupation do you plan to practice after graduation?***					**Total**
				Music Teacher	**Playing in orchestra**	**Soloist**	**Academic carrier**	**Any job**	
A.İ.B.U	**Gender**	**Female**	f	26	3		17		46
			%	**56.5%**	6.5%		37.0%		100,0%
		Male	f	10	1		10		21
			%	**47.6%**	4.8%		**47.6%**		100,0%
		Total	f	36	4		27		67
			%	53.7%	6.0%		40.3%		100.0%
D.E.U.	**Gender**	**Female**	f	22	1	2	23	4	52
			%	42.3%	1.9%	3.8%	**44.2%**	7.7%	100.0%
		Male	f	11	1	3	6	2	23
			%	**47.8%**	4.3%	13.0%	26.1%	8.7%	100.0%
		Total	F	F	2	5	29	6	75
			%	44.0%	2.6%	6.7%	38.7%	8.0%	100.0%

G.U.	**Gender**	**Female**	F	28	3	0	57	4	92
			%	30.4%	3.3%	.0%	**62.0%**	4.3%	100,0%
		Male	F	11	1	2	15	2	31
			%	35.5%	3.2%	6.5%	**48.4%**	6.5%	100,0%
		Total	f	39	4	2	72	6	123
			%	31.7%	3.3%	1.6%	58.5%	4.9%	100.0%
M.U.	**Gender**	**Female**	F	26	9	1	42	4	82
			%	31.7%	11.0%	1.2%	**51.2%**	4.9%	100,0%
		Male	f	14	4	5	27	6	56
			%	25.0%	7.1%	8.9%	**48.2%**	10.7%	100,0%
		Total	f	40	13	6	69	10	138
			%	29.0%	9.4%	4.3%	50.0%	7.2%	100.0%

Table 9: Relationship between Post-Graduation Career Plans and Motivation / **Concern** Sub-Dimension

Groups	N	Arithmetic Averages	Sd	x^2	p
Music Teacher	148	167.79			
Playing in orchestra	23	229.67			
Soloist	13	181.23	4	31.998	.000
Academic Carrier	196	231.17			
Any Job	22	146.45			
Total	402				

According to Table 9, there is a significant difference in the points obtained from the concern sub-dimension according to students' future career plans (x^2 (4) =31.99, p<.01). Those students who are planning an orchestral or academic career and score significantly greater than the points of students who want to practice an occupation except of teaching from the lower dimension of concern of motivation scale are.

Table 10: Relationship between Post-Graduate Career Plans and Motivation / **Education Environment** Sub-Dimension

Groups	N	Arithmetic Averages	Sd	x^2	p
Music Teacher	148	201.00			
Playing in orchestra	23	206.48			
Soloist	13	162.35	4	1.823	.768
Academic Carrier	197	205.57			
Any Job	22	195.50			
Total	403				

According to the results shown above in Table 10, there is no significant difference in scores from the education environment sub-dimension according to the occupation that students plan to pursue in the future (x^2 (4) = 1.82, p>.05).

Table 11: Relationship between Post-Graduate Career Plans and Motivation / **Environment** Sub-Dimension

Groups	N	Arithmetic Averages	Sd	x^2	p
Music Teacher	148	181.18			
Playing in orchestra	23	247.74			
Soloist	13	217.23	4	17.964	.001
Academic Carrier	197	217.86			
Any Job	22	143.23			
Total	403				

According to the results shown above in Table 11, there is a significant difference in points obtained from the environment sub-dimension of according to participants' future career plans ($\square^2$ (4) = 17.96, p<.01). When examining, among which groups this difference, which emerges statistically, is, it was found that the points obtained by students, who want to practice orchestra artistry from the sub-dimension of environment of motivation scale are significantly greater than the points of students who want to practice an occupation outside of teaching.

Table 12: Relationship between Post-Graduate Career Plans and Motivation / **Occupational Expectation** Sub-Dimension

Groups	N	Arithmetic Averages	Sd	x^2	p
Music Teacher	148	188.64			
Playing in orchestra	23	202.30			
Soloist	13	154.12	4	12.009	.017
Academic Carrier	196	219.34			
Any Job	22	156.23			
Total	402				

As shown in Table 12, there is a significant difference in occupational expectations according to students' future career plans (x^2 (4) = 12.09, p<.05). Students who want to have an academic career score significantly higher in the occupational expectation sub-dimension than students who want to practice an occupation except of teaching and being a soloist.

Conclusion

The results show that candidate music teachers intentionally selecting their occupations have higher scores in the concern sub-dimension of the motivation scale. This result could be interpreted as

indicating that students who intentionally selected the teaching occupation also have an interest in personal instruments and are motivated towards instrument teaching.

Tuzcuoğlu (1994) expressed the significance of occupation selection as "the most important power that motivates a person is the motivation to realize oneself" (Corey 1982), accordingly, it was emphasized that if the chosen occupation is appropriate for an individual's personal characteristics, then the person can realize themselves and function in a literal sense.

Motivation levels directed at personal instrument lesson differ significantly according to participants' future career plans.

It was found that the points obtained by the students, who want to practice academic career and orchestra artistry, from the sub-dimension of concern of the motivation scale were significantly greater than the points obtained by the students, who want to practice an occupation outside of teaching.

It was found that the points obtained from the environment sub-dimension by students, who want to practice orchestra artistry, were significantly greater than the points obtained by the students, who want to practice an occupation outside of teaching.

It was found that the points obtained by the students, who want to practice academic career, from the sub-dimension of occupational expectation of the motivation scale were significantly greater than the points obtained by the students, who want to practice an occupation outside of teaching and soloist artistry.

Suggestions

Candidate music teachers select an instrument at the beginning of their education by taking into consideration the factors of concern, occupational expectation, education environment and environmental motivation; and the relationship of these factors both with one another and with the personal characteristics and the potential of the candidate.

Additionally, the results indicate several important points in terms of personal instrument selection and personal instrument training. Instrument lessons become increasingly important within the occupational training of music teaching. The results of the study should be assessed in order to qualitatively and quantitatively evaluate the instrument training and occupational training of music teaching at these institutions and regenerate even further.

References

Ataman, A. (2004). *Öğrenme: tanımı, niteliği, öğrenmeye etki yapan etmenler, öğrenme türleri, nörofizyolojik öğrenme kuramı. Gelişim ve öğrenme.* 2. baskı. Ataman, A (Ed.) içinde. S. 217- 237.

Ankara: Gündüz Eğitim Vakfı ve Yayıncılık Turizm Sanayi Ticaret LTD. ŞTİ. S. 219. (Aktaran: Çırak, Y., 2007).

Başaran, İ. E., (2005). *Eğitim psikolojisi. Gelişim, öğrenme ve ortam.* 6. basım. Ankara: Nobel.

Çetin, S., Gelbal, S., (2008). *Öz düzenlemeli öğrenme üzerine bir çalışma.* 1002- 1005. (http://www.ietc2008.anadolu.edu.tr/online.php). Web adresinden 3 Eylül 2008 tarihinde edinilmiştir.

Çırak, Y., (2007). Öğrenmenin doğası ve temel kavramları. *Eğitim Psikolojisi.* 2. baskı. Ankara: Pegem.

Duy, B., (2007). *Güdülenme ve bireysel farklılıklar. Eğitim psikolojisi*. 2. baskı. Ankara: Pegem.

Erden, M., Akman, Y. (1995). *Eğitim psikolojisi. Gelişim- öğrenme- öğretme*. 2. baskı. Ankara: Arkadaş.

Ertem, H. (2006). *Ortaöğretim öğrencilerinin kimya derslerine yönelik güdülenme tür (içsel ve dışsal) ve düzeylerinin bazı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi.* Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Balıkesir Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Günal, F. (1999). *Piyano eğitiminde motivasyon değerlendirme ölçeği oluşturma*. Yayınlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi, Gazi Üniversitesi Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü.

Moran, A., Kilpatrick, R., Abbot, L., Dallat, J., and Mc Clune, B., 2001, Training to teach: motivating factors and implications for recruitment, Evaluation and Research in Education, 15, 1, 17-32.

Oral, B. (2007). *Etkili öğretim ve etkili öğretim ilkeleri*. *Eğitim Psikolojisi.* 2. baskı. Ankara: Pegem.

Özen, N. (2004). Çalgı eğitiminde yararlanılan müzik eğitimi yöntemleri. *Gazi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi. 24*(2), 57-63.

Pintrich, P.R. (2000). *The role of goal orientation in self regulated learning*. M. Boekaerts, Paul R. Pintrich, Moshe Zeider (Edt.). San Diego, CA: Academic Pres, 451-502. (Aktarım: Çetin ve Gelbal, 2008).

Schunk, D. H., (1989). *Self- efficacy and cognitive skill learning.* In C. Ames & R. Ames (Eds.), *Research on motivation in education: Goals and cognitions* (Vol. 3, pp. 13- 44). San Diego, CA: Academic Pres. (Aktarım: Schunk ve Zimmerman, 1994).

Schunk, D. H., Zimmerman, B. J., (1994). *Self-regulation of learning and performance: issues and educational applications.* Edition: illustrated. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tuzcuoğlu, S. (1994). Meslek seçimi ve önemi. *Marmara Üniversitesi Atatürk Eğitim Fakültesi Eğitim Bilimleri Dergisi* 6, 265-280.

Üredi, I., Üredi, L., (2005). İlköğretim 8. sınıf öğrencilerinin öz-düzenleme stratejileri ve motivasyonel inançlarının matematik başarısını yordama gücü. *Mersin Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, *1* (2), 250- 260.

Zimmerman, B. J., Schunk, D. H., (2001). *Self- regulated learning and academic achievement*. (2nd edition). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

About the Author(s):

* Sibel ÇOBAN, MarmaraUniversity, İSTANBUL
cobansibel@gmail.com

**Tuğba ÇALIŞKAN, Private Açı Primary School, İSTANBUL
tugbacaliskan@gmail.com

