Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education

The refereed journal of the

Thomas A. Regelski, Editor

Wayne Bowman, Associate Editor

**Editorial:
"Music Teacher" – Meaning and Practice, Identity and Position**

Thomas A. Regelski

For further information, please point your Web Browser to http://act.maydaygroup.org

"Music Teacher" – Meaning and Practice, Identity and Position

Thomas A. Regelski, Editor

i

This special issue is devoted to responses to an article by Rhoda Bernard published previously in this journal, "Making music, making selves: A call for reframing music teacher education" (Bernard 2005), and includes a reply from the author. Bernard's original article aimed to "broaden the academic conversation about music educators and identity, to make room for a wider range of perspectives on identity" (7)[1] by proposing an understanding of teacher identity that departs from the social constructionist model of identity formation that Bernard regards as dominating both research and teacher education (Bernard 2005, 6-8). Whether any actual give and take between scholars that could be construed as "conversation" concerning this literature can be said to have existed in the past, Bernard's paper did provoke critical comment, feedback, and reaction from four leading figures in identity research whose work she referred to (a fifth was unable to follow through due to the press of other obligations).

Among the sources of contention in the present exchange are various expressions that are often used in identity research without much, if any, rigor; terms such as "conflict," "socialization," "roles," even "identity" itself, for example. A need for a much greater precision becomes evident as various researchers use these and related terms in often considerably different ways. Even if defined in a particular study (which is not always the case), the temptation exists (e.g., Scheib 2007; Ester 2006)[2] to use everyday expressions as formal generalizations that attempt to capture or convey a similarity or an overlapping of concepts in different studies when such agreement is not necessarily the case.

In the present exchange, for example, the term "discourse" is defined or used in ways that are significantly different enough to promote considerably diverse perspectives on its role in identity formation. Similarly, authors (herein, and in the literature) variously describe the (hypothesized or lived) relation between teacher and musician as one of conflict, tension,

struggle, war (etc.) and variously describe that state as needing to be balanced, harmonized, resolved, or maintained in some kind of dialectical synthesis or complementarity (etc.). However, these various chacterizations are sometimes treated almost as synonyms, when it is precisely the differences between them that can be most relevant.

Similarly, roles and role-typifications[3] remain undifferentiated and thus conflated when only passing reference is made to a musician or teacher "role."[4] "Socialization" usually refers to the developmental process by which an individual gains a functional understanding of society; and of the requirements and paradigms of a chosen profession or occupation in that society. But in discussions of music teacher identity, the term is sometimes used to imply a process that resembles "indoctrination"; or as a kind of imposed "acculturation" into the subculture of musicians or teachers; or as a matter of "social reproduction" of particular practices and forms, such as those associated with being a musician and teacher—or all of the above, often indiscriminately. It is precisely the differences between those meanings (and others), however, that need to be addressed, even if all may be relevant in some way.[5] Finally (though other terminology could be discussed), "self" and "identity" often get conflated in ways that are not helpful.[6]

Important aspects of the standpoints taken by the authors in the present exchange turn on differences in the precision and use of such terms. And, as mentioned earlier, even when terms are defined for purposes of articulating a position (or framing research), it is not helpful when the same term is defined at considerable variance with other research. Then, for example, literature reviews (including those serving as the basis of individual studies) too easily seize upon terms that have either not been defined (at all or adequately) in the studies cited, that have been defined or otherwise used to mean quite different things, or that are interpreted broadly and conflated with other terms (etc).

For example, central to the present responses to Bernard's original article is her understanding and characterization of terms used in the existing literature.[7]

> Writings [viz., "the literature in the area of the professional identities of music teachers"] have traditional pitted against one another music making and music teaching in the professional lives of music educators. This opposition has often been portrayed as disabling, as in need of some sort of resolution. I also notice that most of the individuals

who write about music education and identity ground their articles and studies in a conception of identity as roles, and in a notion of music teacher education as the socialization of individual from the 'musician' role to the 'teacher' role. (2005, 7)

Aside from exemplifying the foregoing discussion of the importance of key terminology (e.g., opposition, resolution, socialization, role), this interpretation of the literature is one of the points of contention shared by several of Bernard's interlocutors. In her response, she stands by and offers what she sees as further evidence for this depiction.

Another example of how a characterization of the literature can become contentious, whether because of vagaries in the literature (due most likely to the imprecision of terms mentioned earlier) or attempts to find some unity or at least points of agreement (due no doubt to the often major differences between research premises and modes), is Bernard's categorization of three general approaches taken by the literature on identity toward the assumed conflict between "music making and music teaching in the lives of music educators . . ." (2005, 7):

> With these three approaches[8]—arguing that [1] a successful music teacher must choose teaching music over making music, [2] presenting music making and music teaching as opposing forces to be balanced, and [3] seeking to resolve the opposition between performer and teacher by conflating the two into performer—the literature in the field of music education pits music making and music teaching against one another in its discussion of the professional lives of music educators. (8)

Based on this understanding, Bernard went on to conclude:

> Simply put, those working and writing in the field of music teacher education place a higher value on the teaching of pre-service music educators than on their music making. They aim for their programs to take individuals who come to them as musicians, and to transform them into teachers. Behind this point of view lies the implication that, somewhere along the way (and certainly by the time the students in these programs complete their studies), pre-service music educators' music making ceases altogether—or certainly that it ceases to matter in terms of who they are as professionals. Who these individuals are as teachers becomes primary. (10)

Several of the replies in the present issue take pointed exception to this interpretation of the literature and to the conclusions drawn and, in response, Bernard offers a revised position.

Bernard has been concerned to emphasize—rather than deny, downplay, or replace—the importance of music making in a music teacher's identity.

> Contrary to the discourse in the field, experiences of making music are not in conflict with effective music teaching. They are not something that should be abandoned by pre-service music teachers so that they can become socialized as effective teachers. Rather, experiences of making music are absolutely central in the way that musician-teachers make meaning of who they are and what they do. (13)

Thus she proposed not only the term "musician-teacher" but also the corresponding need to properly consider the personal relevance of musical experiences for the identity of musician-teachers.[9] The phenomenological aspects of such experiences, especially the emotional rewards, Bernard argued, are not properly addressed in conceptions of music teacher identity that are conceived in strictly social terms.

In her original article, she described the importance of music making in the lives of several music teachers; however, she acknowledges that the descriptions "of the ways that music is personally relevant" to the musician-teachers she studied "are my interpretations," and that "I would be quite surprised if any of the participants is aware of, or has even thought about, the ways that music making experiences are personally relevant to her [*sic*]" (18). Although none of her interlocutors took note of this qualification, the question of whether the various aspects of one's identity as musician-teacher actually *are* "thought about," are reflected upon, would seem to be relevant, both to the nurturing of music teacher identity formation and to a music teacher's musical and teaching experiences. As will be discussed in section iii, *who* one is—one's identity—is in part the result of reflecting on *what* one does and therefore involves the meanings experienced in connection with such reflections.

Although setting out to "broaden the academic conversation" on identity by offering a "vantage point" that includes, even emphasizes, a teacher's own experiences of music making,[10] Bernard subtitled her original article "a call for reframing music education" that, she concluded, "can dramatically alter the landscape of theory and practice in music teacher education" (27). Three areas for reframing were recommended. "First, rather than imposing a discourse about who music teachers are," music teacher educators "should recognize and celebrate the multiplicity of ways that our students understand who they are, what they do, and their individual processes of becoming a music teacher" (28). Secondly, "rather than giving lesser value to the music making of preservice and in-service music educators and giving greater value to their

teaching, music teacher educators should help their students to appreciate the importance of continuing to engage in music making experiences as music educators" (28). And, finally, rather than privileging "the aesthetic, structural, or conceptual aspects of music as a listener or performer," music teacher educators are urged "to listen to and validate the personal, individual meanings that people bring to their experiences with music" (28). The 'rather than' formulation of these recommendations presents them as correctives for problems identified and discussed earlier in the paper. The replies of the four authors in this issue variously take Bernard to task for the adequacy of the research and reasoning that leads her to these recommendations, or for assuming (or not demonstrating) that these concerns rise to the level of actual problems that need correction, or for suggesting that such matters are not already widely understood and appreciated by teacher educators and researchers in the identity field.

ii

However important music making is to the identity and professional practices of music teachers, it its clear that, for example, history teachers or chemistry teachers are very rarely historians or chemists in the way that music teachers are typically considered musicians. Music teachers are trained as musicians and many continue to be active in making music in addition to their teaching duties (though how often, why, where, when, and under what circumstances varies and can be relevant to identity).[11] Despite such training, however, everyone knows of individuals who were regarded by their professors and peers as weak musicians but who are very successful teachers, and of highly regarded musicians who are terrible teachers. That this lack of correlation between musical training and teaching success exists (or is common?) suggests that a music teacher's musicianship is used differently or to different ends in teaching than in performing, that such musicianship is not solely or sufficiently a matter of performance capability, and that successful music teaching is not associated with musical acumen alone. Given their extensive training, however, music teachers are typically regarded as professional musicians by the public. On the other hand, some of the music professoriate (and other professional musicians) at times complain that "those who can, do, and those who can't, teach";

and some argue that the major (if not only) requirement for effectively teaching music is to be a competent musician.[12]

The paradigm of preparing music teachers as musicians first (in sequence) or foremost (in percentage of studies), and secondarily as teachers, is thus of interest in itself. It is a model that stems from the traditions, needs, and practices of the conservatory (traditions also instantiated in university schools of music and music departments) and, thus, from the history of the training of musicians—particularly the evolution of the concept of professional musician that was a consequence of the rise of public concerts, of the virtuoso, and of the pivotal influence of aesthetic theory and its sacralization of music.[13] Too often the completely different functions of schools and, hence, of school-based music education go unnoticed: music as a basic part of the general education of all students—the premise of including music education in schools—is entirely different than, even at odds with, the preparation of professional musicians.[14]

One fertile territory for research, then, is to study how members of the music professoriate see themselves as musicians and teachers. How do "musician" and "professor" figure in *their* identities (along with other important axes, such as "breadwinner" and "parent")? And, how and to what degree do their conceptions of the purposes and practices of music education in schools and, thus, their conceptions of the skills, dispositions, and values needed by music teachers influence the identity formations of the music education majors they teach— concepts that, hence, strongly influence the pedagogy and curriculum practices typical of music educators in today's schools? In particular, what value or weight do they give to music studies over those for developing teaching skills?[15] Does high weighting given to the former lead to some compensatory emphasis on the latter by music teacher educators?

Given this latter possibility, music education professors, too, should be researched along the same lines. To what degree do music teacher educators mindfully attempt such compensation? Do such attempts, as Bernard argues (2005, 7-8), actually involve (1) posing an either-or dichotomy between musician or teacher, (2) balancing the two, or (3) equating all teaching as performance and any performance as educative? Typically, at least in North America, especially in smaller schools of music and departments, music education professors also direct ensembles, even sometimes teach studio lessons, and some perform in public. Such

music making is likely to have consequences for their ideas of music teacher education, of what school music is or should be and, thus, concerning music teacher identity construction and its relation to effective teaching. The various specializations among music teacher educators, too, are of interest: will differences be found between those, for example, who specialize in band, chorus, and orchestra directing, and those who specialize in general music?[16] The existence of such specialization depends, of course, on the size of the faculty and student body. Thus, what differences in conceptions of developing a music teacher's identity and in conceptions of the nature of school music education will be found when comparing music education professors in large and small departments?

The decision to become a music teacher may be safely assumed to have been influenced, at least in part (even in large part), by the personal rewards of music making that young musicians have experienced during their school years. However, many different motivations, models, and influences end up being pivotal to the choice of music education as a career. Informal surveys of entering music education majors I conducted each fall at the large school of music where I taught for 35 years[17] revealed a range of notably different and sometimes not particularly noble or adequate reasons for becoming music educators. In fact, as against being 'called' to teaching (one key criterion some sociologists have associated with the helping professions, those serving people), the largest number were focused on teaching as a way of simply continuing the kinds of music pleasures they had experienced as students: they admitted having enjoyed their music making as students and wanted to continue such experiences from the other side of the podium or piano. Closely related was the desire to be just like this or that teacher whom they admired.[18] Somewhat lower in frequency were entering students who openly admitted they were "good at music," often more accomplished in it than in their other school studies, and thus wanted to pursue it as a career. However, they admitted, their parents deemed the pursuit of a performance (composing, etc.) career as too uncertain and risky, so they settled with becoming music teachers instead.[19] Next in frequency were students who avowed a love for music and the desire for sharing it with students. Bernard focuses on this motive, but what "sharing" was taken to mean by entering students was not at all clear.[20] Relatively rare were students who said they were entering teaching because they loved music but either had

experienced very weak teaching and wanted to be better than their teachers or who had been served reasonably well by their teachers but were critical of those teachers for not serving the musical needs of others, particularly their friends and classmates.[21] Last in terms of frequency were students who replied that one or both parents were music teachers. Many in this group appeared simply to seek to continue the lifestyle they had enjoyed in the home.[22]

These reasons high school graduates gave for choosing to become music teachers are no doubt still quite common. Many entering majors thus already appear to 'identify' with a conception of music teaching (or of "music teacher") that sets them off on a particular, often narrow, single-minded track (band teacher, chorus teacher, etc.) which conditions many key decisions on the way to achieving their instantiation of that identity.[23] Their identity development is often quite different than for students who did not begin their studies as music education majors[24] but who, by some happenstance, discovered an affinity for music teaching and made a commitment at a more mature age in comparison to those who—their earlier choice made once-and-for-all—sometimes seemed to be more or less going along with the assembly line that graduation and certification requirements often become in practice.

Bouij's research cited in the present issue follows changes over time in the identity-related values of many in the large group of music education students studied. It seems that more research which systematically investigates in depth the different motivations for entering music teaching, and which goes on to explore changes in values, motivations, and identity reported at various stages of subjects' eventual teaching careers (and which follows-up on reasons given by those who leave teaching, and what these former teachers do instead—if anything—with their musical training) would provide useful insights about the development of identity and its influence on teaching practice. As part of such research, greater emphasis might well be given to the various models and influences—especially musical, but also of other teachers, other people (such as family members)—that pre- and in-service teachers cite as important to their career choices. And their general attitudes concerning children and the institution of school are also worth investigating.[25] Finally, whether students have engaged in teaching, formally or informally, in school, giving private lessons, as camp or recreation

counselors (etc.) can also have considerable bearing on the formation of their identities as teachers.[26]

Much of the research on music teacher identity focuses on the binary of musician and teacher—hyphenated or not, conflicted or not. However, identities are likely to develop differently, according to a host of other variables, only some of which are suggested above. For example, Bernard researched six elementary general music teachers. However, music teachers who direct ensembles can be expected to identify more as conductors—as on-the-job performers—than will general music teachers. In her reply, Dolloff reports experiences of the on-the-job music making of teachers and, clearly, this is of a different kind of music making than what a teacher does outside the school day and has a different place in, and contribution to a music teacher's identity. School concerts provide public exposure and recognition (of the kind most other teachers, including general music teachers, are immune) that is often central to a music teacher's identity. Often, too, the out-of-school music making of music teachers is of a different kind (or involves a different level or literature, etc.) than what they focus on in their school programs and allows them to meet musical interests they have in addition to in-school music making.

As mentioned earlier, while music teachers are often considered professional musicians in their out-of-school music making, this status is granted not simply on the basis of their abilities, but because the distinction often made between amateurs and professionals involves being paid. However, music teachers' music making is often confined to membership in what are really amateur groups, or so-called "pro-am" groups that include both professionals and amateurs, and that may or may not be paid. Those who sing in choruses affiliated with orchestras often fit this category, and community groups often have such a mixture of members who have studied music 'seriously', who have music degrees but pursue other careers, and of those with little formal music education.

To the above considerations should be added local, regional and even national differences. In this issue Roberts, for example, mentions the different circumstances of music teachers who are the only music teacher in a building. Consider, too, the music teacher who is the only one, or one of two, in a small school system. Compare this further to teachers who,

however isolated from other music teachers they may be on a day to day basis, have regular contact with colleagues on a larger staff, usually a city or suburban school.[27] And, of course, in regions where competitions and other festivals are common, even *de rigueur*, the teacher's identity—at least the part influenced by considerations of professional reputation—is at stake in ways that can have direct consequences for curriculum and pedagogy. This intersection of identity and *reputation* points to the influence of "Other" (particularly, those whose judgment 'counts', such as other music teachers) on a teacher's identity just the way, for example, a music education major's reputation as a performer (e.g., as accorded by the studio teacher and other students in the studio, and by ensemble directors and other students in ensembles) tends to have a considerable bearing on the experiences and satisfactions of music making. Similarly, the repute given to a music teacher's in- and out-of-school music making by other musicians and by a community certainly has a bearing on a music teacher's identity.[28] Music is a social art and ignoring or denying that dimension is as limiting as a strictly social conception of musical identity can be.

Bernard's six teachers lived and worked in an urban area that offers an extremely rich range of options for personal music making that simply is not available to teachers who live and work where opportunities for music making outside of school are simply fewer in number. Furthermore, the choices of types of music are often equally limited; indeed, local music making options may even be discrepant with a teacher's own tastes or training. Given these conditions, how music teachers satisfy their musical needs is itself worthy of study. Having little opportunity for meaningful music making outside of school can have a strong influence on identity, even on teaching practice; for example, on-the-job music making with (or through) students can become correspondingly more important. Similarly, teaching in communities where school ensembles cannot perform the literature or reach the musical achievements typical of larger or more affluent communities can also have an influence on identity; for example, a teacher might well 'identify' more with 'teacherly' traits or with 'reaching' individual students.

Differences between the routes music teachers take through university and certification studies should also be considered. In instances where music teachers first earn a music degree, then enter graduate programs designed expressly to prepare and certify them as teachers, the

process of identity formation will likely be considerably different than with students who enter music education programs as first year university students. In the former instances, the decision is made after four or more years of maturing as a person and musician, including ample opportunity to compare one's musical standing with peers, and to learn more about and weigh possibilities of various musical careers.[29] In the latter cases, the decision is made by a much younger student on the usually limited bases of some of the criteria and motivations already discussed, and it is simply followed more or less unquestioningly until some discover they are uncomfortable or unfulfilled as music teachers. In fact, the age at which a music student decides to become a music teacher is itself very likely to be a factor in identity formation; or, to reinforce a point suggested earlier, identity in some nascent form may already be a factor influencing that choice.

All these issues, and others, are involved in questions of music teacher identity. Some have been addressed by research; but the likelihood should not be ignored that the interplay of so many important variables means that identity formation will be a highly idiosyncratic process and will vary in often considerably different and major ways between teachers. This likelihood leads to the question of whether any singular premise, perspective, or paradigm can ever be reached (or researched) that could by itself understand or guide the process, and whether the policies and practices that guide music teacher educators should be predicated, instead, on understanding each candidate and each teacher as unique? Music making experiences and all the musical skills, attitudes, dispositions, and values that result from a teacher's personal history will unavoidably be relevant to all music teachers, but in different ways, to different degrees, and to different ends as teachers. Similarly, a music teacher's personal history with teachers, especially music teachers (including university professors), schooling, and children will be a major factor in that teacher's identity, again in different ways, to different degrees, and to different ends and means of teaching practice.

In all cases, however, the oft mentioned observation that "teachers teach as they were taught" needs to be addressed in helping teachers become more reflective and critically aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the models and practices they have experienced and are motivated to follow, and of the potential influence—for good or ill—of such motivations on their

own teaching. Too often, the influence of these experiences is not acknowledged or analyzed critically by pre- or in-service teachers; and this lack of reflection—particularly when identity is largely the result of following narrow and limiting 'scripts' or models—too often breeds negative outcomes for particular teachers and their students, and for music education as a profession. Thus Froehlich (2006), writing from the perspective of symbolic interactionism stresses—correctly in my view—the need for teachers to reflect on and analyze their personal biographies in order to clarify not only issues bearing on identity but, more importantly, how a teacher's identity is actualized and personified in virtually every aspect of daily teaching.[30]

iii

Much of the research and thinking concerning music teacher identity has been based on sociology, psychology, and social psychology. However, the philosophical literature also offers insights. For example, Theodore Schatzki (2002), a leading proponent of "practice theory" (xii), analyzes identity in terms of the "arrangements" that constitute "social orders" of any kind, particularly "practices" and "positions."

> Order is the hanging together of things, the existence of nexuses. Ordering, furthermore, is the hanging together of things, the establishment of nexuses. Another way of capturing this is to equate orders with *arrangements* of things and ordering with *arranging*. An arrangement of things is a layout of them in which they relate and are positioned with respect to one another. To be 'positioned' is to take up a place among other things, a place that reflects relations among the things involved. . . . [P]ositions always depend on the events and activities that encompass, or are carried out by the components of arrangements. (18-19; italics in original)

Furthermore, "an order is an arrangement in which entities also possess meaning and identity. By 'meaning' I mean what something is and by 'identity' who (if anything) it is" (19). What something is, then, following Wittgenstein's lead (61), is a matter of what it does or accomplishes in typical use and that thus constitutes its meaning. For example, the meaning of "hat" involves the typical uses to which hats are put (i.e., why they are worn), and the meanings attached to "teacher" similarly involve considering what is done or accomplished, and why.[31]

Furthermore, "an arrangement is a nexus of entities in which they relate, occupy positions, and possess meanings" (21). "The hanging together of lives is itself an arrangement,"

although any arrangement involves "artifacts, other living organisms, and things in addition to people" (21). "Social orders are thus the arrangements of people, artifacts, organisms, and things through and amid which social life transpires, in which these entities relate, occupy position, and possess meanings" (22). Notably, "social orders are established in practices, themselves organized open sets of *doings* and *sayings*" (23; italics in original), and meanings and identities thus depend (in part) on the actions involved with particular practices (99-102). This applies to social order on a large scale—the practices that constitute society and culture (see, e.g., Tuomela 2002; Bauman 1999; Bourdieu 1990)—and a smaller scale—those that characterize individual social practices such as schools and teaching (e.g., Wenger 1999; Grundy 1987), even music and musicking (e.g., Scott 2002; Blaukopf 1992; Wolff 1984).

Regarding identity in particular, "entities with an identity are entities that have an understanding of their own meaning" (47). In this formulation, "a person's identity embraces two analytically distinguishable and possibly divergent components: that person's meaning and that person's understanding of his or her meaning" (47). The meaning associated with what one is (i.e., does)—for example, a music teacher—is thus distinguishable from a music teacher's understanding of what being a music teacher 'means' in practice, as lived. Identity, or who one is, then, also involves reflection on the meanings associated with what one does (e.g., with one's practices as teacher, musician, etc.). Such reflection by individuals can—and, as mentioned earlier in relation to music teachers, should—produce personal understandings (meanings) that diverge "from the identities attributed to and foisted on them by or through others" (47).[32]

Having analyzed social order and arrangements, and distinguished meaning and identity, Schatzki proceeds to a further analysis of identity that goes beyond functionalist[33] role theory or structuralist accounts of "subject positions." To begin with, "meaning and identity arise (in part) from where an entity fits into the mazes of relations that characterize the arrangements of which it is a part" (53). In the present instance, then, what a music teacher is is relative to, for example, where music teaching in general and one's unique practice of it fits into the social orders of a particular school and the local music world, and where in turn these fit in the larger arrangements of society and culture. (Some of the "mazes of relations" involved in music teacher meaning and identity were sketched in section ii.) Second, "the converse also holds: Where something fits

into these plexuses depends (in part) on its meaning" (53). Thus the meaning of "music teacher" is located in the mazes of relations of schools, and the meaning of "musician" is located relative to plexuses of the music world.[34] Given this bidependence, then, what one does (in part) defines *what* one is—for example, a music teacher—and, conversely, on-going awareness of how and why (and how well, etc.) the meanings of "music teacher" are put into situated practice and how those meanings are experienced have a strong bearing on *who* one is—on one's identity.

Furthermore, "meaning and identity must, third, be distinguished from position. An entity's position in a given arrangement is its location in that arrangement's plexus of relations" (53). However, such "positionality is not a spatial affair alone" (53); it also refers to, for example:

> the components and aspects of the arrangement the entity causes; the components and aspects that cause it; how it is understood, thought about, emoted, and acted toward by other components of the arrangement; how it itself is intentionally directed (if at all) toward features of the arrangement; and what of the arrangement it enables and constrains as well as how the arrangement enables and constrains it. (53).

Thus, in the case of a music teacher, position involves a certain location[35] in the interwoven relations of teachers, other music teachers, administrators, students, and the like—each with its own position with regard to the others, the community, society (etc.)—and with regard to other musicians, local or beyond. With this in mind, Schatzki concludes that "contemporary theorists who analyze identity as an amalgam of 'subject positions'[36] run the risk of reducing identity to location in a network (i.e., position), instead of *properly construing identity and position as codependent*" (53; italics added). Music teacher identity thus depends (in part) on one's position in the social orders and arrangements of both the school and the music world.

In consequence, and fourth, "meaning and identity are invariably multiple" (53). What one is is many things, and one's identity is thus understood multiply according to a host of ever-changing situated variables and positions. With this in mind, "musician" and "teacher" (or musician-teacher) at best suggests only two variables in what is an idiosyncratically complex maze of different practices and positions. The variable of position in one or several social orders (e.g., in a school or university, a community of musicians, among teacher and music teacher colleagues, etc.) is germane, then, to identity and needs to be accounted for in considerations and

studies of music teacher identity. Thus, a pre-service teacher's position as a musician in relation to other music education majors and peers in other programs of study is relevant; for example, to the meanings and identity variables that condition that individual's attitudes, values, and aspirations as a future teacher.[37] Furthermore, a teacher's position in a particular school and community and among other local musicians is especially relevant to the meanings and identity at stake for that teacher: for example, how well the music teacher 'fits in' and shares general responsibilities with other teachers (etc.);[38] how (and how much) a teacher's identity (and local reputation) as musician governs what is taught and how; whether (why, how, where) the teacher seeks music making opportunities outside of school; whether school-based music making with students is a music teacher's main outlet as a musician; and whether positional factors are involved when the individual changes jobs or leaves teaching. Thus position is one of the several important facets of a music teacher's identity.

However, "despite this multiformity, identity is sometimes organized, fifth, around central axes" (53-54) or "'nodal points,' which are subject positions of relatively greater fixity around which a person's other more ephemeral subject positions accumulate" (54). Thus, in practice, "insofar as who someone is is who he understands himself to be, a person's chief identity is what, if anything, he understands himself principally to be. Clearly, people can vary greatly in both the degree to which their identities are centered . . . and in how many centers their identities enjoy" (54).

This concept of identity as a central axis around which other variables cluster, and the possibility that different people exhibit a greater or lesser degree of such 'centering', raises some interesting possibilities for discussions of music teacher identity. For example, an often observed circumstance is a music teacher whose principle axis favors the values of professional music making more than the musical and educational needs of students. Bouij's article herein (7-8) reports an example of a music teacher who had very little direct interest in students or their musical wellbeing, and another who represents a more 'teacherly' axis. Roberts mentions the "failed performer" who enters teaching as a "back-up" (8). And it is clear that many music teachers, particularly those whose teaching duties consist mainly or entirely of ensemble directing, view themselves principally in light of university models, and their programs thus

amount to one concert (competition, festival, etc.) after another. Teaching, *per se*, is equated with preparing for the next performance; any educational benefits are assumed to be the automatic by-products of performing and thus are not planned in any systematic curriculum. In contrast, of course, are music teachers whose central axis disposes them in directions where music making with students is focused more on lasting musical, social, psychological, and other educational benefits than on approaching professional musical standards. However, a music teacher's principal axis may well be 'centered' (or biased) by the teaching assignment (e.g., ensemble directing versus general music teaching) and, in turn, the amount and type of music making on-the-job may have a bearing on whether or how often (etc.) a music teacher seeks out-of-school music making.[39]

Schatzki also suggests the possibility of multiple and thus *shifting* axes within the same identity-construct. This expands the number of key components of music teacher identity beyond musician, teacher, and position. For example, many music teachers effectively 'shift gears' between ensemble directing and general music teaching; the former, for example, evokes their musician axis more centrally and promotes associated musical meanings. Some teachers (regardless of subject taught) seem to gravitate toward some identity axis other than teaching (e.g., parent, a second job) so much that they "beat the school buses out of the parking lot" in their haste to invoke that axis and experience its meanings.[40] And, of course, music teachers, in common with all teachers, often complain that "we don't get proper respect as professionals."[41] This conclusion (i.e., concerning the axis that identifies with *teaching* as a profession) can especially be influential where local support for school music is lacking. It can result in uninspired, routinized teaching while, on the other hand, the teacher's out-of-school music making (i.e., identity axis as professional *musician*) compensates for meanings not experienced (or not experienced as meaningful enough) through teaching. This routinization of teaching is not recommended, and the disposition of seeking such compensation through out-of-school performing (or through 'performing' one's students) is itself worth investigating in understanding the identity constructs of music teachers under different conditions.[42]

The typical binary of musician and teacher (or musician-teacher) as the major construct for researching and understanding music teacher identity would profit, then, from being

expanded to include Schatzki's concepts of position, the 'centering' of identity, and concerning the possibility of having and shifting between several axes. Centering may not so much require or involve balance, resolution, harmonization, synthesis, symbiosis or the like but, instead, can be seen as a primary (yet always dynamic) disposition around which other aspects of a particular teacher's identity gravitate, or a matter of multiple axes that are invoked differently according to particular teaching circumstances. Furthermore, axes other than musician and teacher are typically central to a music teacher's identity, and identity is codependent with position in a school and local music world, and beyond.

Stephens refers to the binary of musician and teacher in terms of the complementary relation of the two sides of a coin (1995, 10; cited herein by Bernard, 3). However, given Schatzki's additional variables, a more inclusive analogy may be of a three-dimensional, multisided form (e.g., a pyramid) where the whole rests *primarily* on one base, with the other 'sides' always dynamically contributing to the whole and its functions and meanings; or where it rests on one base according to the *circumstances* of the moment, while for other situations another of its sides functions as the base. In either case, identity would always involve the maze of relations within a holistic identity structure that, according to personal history, has many 'sides'[43] and that shows or favors one 'face' over another—either centrally, or according to circumstances—but always in dynamic relation.

Helping pre- and in-service teachers in identifying their own axes (what their primary dispositions are, how many, whether one is central, how congruent, etc.), scrutinizing how and why a particular arrangement of meanings, identity, and position has been formed, and understanding the potential impact (for good or ill) of it on teaching (i.e., the circumstances likely to evoke one axis as against another, and ways of dealing with such circumstances mindfully rather than uncritically) would promote greater awareness of, and attention to the many 'sides' or 'faces' of identity that are central to music teacher preparation and practice. Such critical awareness is perhaps even more important than discrete musical and teaching skills since such dispositions influence whether, how, when, why, and how well those skills are actually put into teaching or musical practice.[44] Attending in research or teacher preparation only to the binary of teacher and musician can simply fail to account for other axes and positions

that are functionally relevant to the why, what, and how of teaching and, thus, to teaching success and satisfactions, and to identity.

iv

This issue of ACT involves some of the give and take that is expected of the Habermasian "communicative rationality" that has served as a guiding ideal of the MayDay Group and, hence, of this journal. Throughout his writings, Habermas has distinguished between two forms of reason. The first, technical or *instrumental rationality*, is used in coordinating actions of and between the various structured contexts of the "system"; the infrastructure and institutions by which the modern world is organized (e.g., government, politics, markets, bureaucracies). The second, *communicative rationality* involves the "lifeworld"; the 'everyday' world we experience with others and understand largely on the basis of language, but that also involves consensual practices and other interactions (not the least of which is through music).

For Habermas, an individual engaged in *strategic action* is not mainly (or at all) concerned with mutual understanding, as such, but with achieving certain goals. Such action is success-oriented and can sometimes be highly manipulative or serve the goals of the Actor more than, or at the expense of others in the lifeworld. Both can be characteristic of teachers and of researchers.[45] In contrast, *communicative action* involves the pursuit of goals that depend on mutual understanding—concerning the merit of the goals in question, and involving the kind of ever-refined, inter-subjective consensus by which subsequent actions can be mutually coordinated and advanced. Communicative action, in turn, depends the conditions of an *ideal speech situation*: no one capable of contributing is excluded, everyone has an equal voice, all are free to make a contribution (and do so without deception—or self-deception—that serves a strategic purpose), and where coercion by anyone and of any kind is avoided. The "ideal" in question does not assume a utopian situation but, rather, is an action or regulative ideal; a desirable direction, like "happy marriage," towards which communicative actions are guided but that can never be perfectly realized.

Assuming such reasonably conducive circumstances, attempts at linguistic communication,

Regelski, T. (2007) "'Music Teacher' – Meaning and Practice, Identity and Position" *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 6/2: http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Regelski6_2.pdf

Habermas argues, presuppose four validity-claims: that what we say is comprehensive, that it is true, that is right, i.e., that there is a normative basis for the utterance, and that it is a sincere (*wahrhaftig*) expression of the speaker's feelings. The 'background consensus' between speaker and hearer includes the fact that they implicitly make these claims and could if necessary justify them. Thus we can ask a speaker 'What do you mean?', 'Is what you say true?', 'Are you entitled to say that?' and 'Do you really mean it?' In other words, at the back of every act of communication is the implication that we could reach a consensus on the validity of these claims. (Outhwaite 1994, 40).[46] [47]

In this view, communication entails that reasons are given or, if needed, could be given to convince others that a validity-claim is warranted. In other words, claims require reasons, data, evidence, and the like, that are themselves open to criticism and that, in turn, require justification. When understanding is not (at all or fully) achieved—reasons are not given, not given competently, convincingly, accurately, thoroughly (etc.)—discourse ensues that assesses, challenges, or counters the rational justifiability of the claims in question with alternative arguments.

For Habermas, genuine consensus results from discourse in which the "force of the better argument prevails" (Outwaite 1994, 40) and when, as a result, others take an affirmative position (or a more affirmative position) towards a claim, argument, findings, and the like. In practice a "better argument" involves communicative competence that is persuasive enough to elicit affirmation or greater consensus among those with a stake in a discourse. However, such consensus is only the basis for even further exploration and discourse: as with all science, a perfect or final agreement, understanding, or conclusion is not assumed:

> "Working scientists don't think of science as 'the truth,'" said [biologist] Darcy Kelley. "They think of it as a way of *approximating* the truth." By accepting the proximate and provisional nature of what they're working on, scientists leave room for regular upgrades, which, unlike many upgrades to one's computer operating system, are nearly always an improvement on the previous model. . . . "As our concepts become more precise, more sophisticated, the absolutes become less absolute" [quoting Nobel Prize winning biologist David Baltimore]. In other words, by accepting that they can never *know* the truth but can only approximate it, scientists end up edging ever closer to the truth. (Angier 2007, 37-38; italics in original)[48]

In Habermas' analysis of communicative rationality, the projection or likelihood of eventual or improved consensus is central. Otherwise, a claim may be "not even wrong," as

scientists say; it is neither predicated on any likelihood of potential consensus, nor can its failure to be affirmed provide new knowledge.[49] *Communicative competence*, what Habermas later expanded to *interactional competence*, includes not only the ability to adequately warrant or provide evidence of a claim or argument, but the further ability to "preserve processes of mutual understanding even in conflict situations, without breaking off communication or preserving it only as an illusion" (Habermas, in Outhwaite 1994, 43[50]).

　　Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education has sought to promote communicative rationality, communicative action, and communicative and interactional competence, especially in its review issues. However, in retrospect, it is fair to say that authors whose actions were more strategic than communicative have intended to preserve only the illusion of communicative competence, usually by asserting claims of differences between disciplines, different theoretical schools, differences of methodology (etc.). Such strategic action—by taking a fixed and inflexible stance (thus shutting off the possibility of discourse that might build consensus), or by claiming to speak only to a narrow community (where only certain paradigms are respected), or by relying on supposedly unique or innovative methodology or theory (that others are rationalized as not understanding or accepting)—falls short of the potential for consensus *building* that might fairly be described as pragmatic, or progress.

　　I have from time to time referred to exchanges that fall short of the give and take required of interactional competence as 'duo-logs'—not in the usual sense of an extended dialog between two actors in a play, but where one party, rather than really attempting to "hear" and understand another's argument or evidence, instead 'strategically' waits for an opportunity to defend— unchanged—a previously held stance.[51] Something similar is illustrated by the experiment in which linguists put two apes who knew sign language together, hoping to observe communication. Instead, "they started madly signing at each other, a manual shouting match, and in the end, neither appeared to actually listen to the other."[52]

　　As I suggested in my previous editorial (2007; Vol. 6, No. 1), much research in music education today amounts to strategic action for advancing an author's career or indulging pet interests more than contributing to the research discipline and the down-to-earth needs of teachers.[53] Whether authors in the present issue (including its Editor) are engaged in

Regelski, T. (2007) "'Music Teacher' – Meaning and Practice, Identity and Position" *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 6/2: http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Regelski6_2.pdf

communicative action with interactional competence and, thus, whether these contributions have the potential of moving our understanding of music teacher identity closer to consensus will be judged by readers. ACT, however, seeks to improve with regard to its action ideal of communicative rationality; for individual articles—that is, their potential for building consensus or promoting understanding—and for interactional competence in exchanges between authors.

In order to promote greater communicative rationality, the MayDay Group website features a variety of eColumns (http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/ecolumns.php) that focus on a range of issues, each with its own dialog forum. These forums provide an on-line approximation of a Habermasian ideal speech situation: no one is excluded (even non-MayDay Group members can participate), all have an equal voice and can thus contribute a wider range of perspectives than journals and disciplines typically accommodate, and coercion is absent. Members (and others) are encouraged to propose additional eColumns to help promote understanding and consensus of the kind that can serve as a basis of "action for change" in music education, the overall guiding ideal of the MayDay Group and of this journal.

The focus on teacher identity in the present issue[54] offers an opportunity for such on-going dialog among teachers, teacher educators, and researchers in helping move music educators toward greater consensus about the process of identity formation and concerning the influence of identity on the personal lives of music teachers and their effectiveness as teachers. While the articles herein offer some potential for an improved understanding of the factors that contribute to a music teacher's identity, many key issues remain unresolved or are still contentious; continuing discourse is thus needed. Such give and take is usually difficult given the formal and temporal conditions of academic publishing. However, the ACT eJournal dialog feature of the MayDay Group website (http://maydaygroup.org/app/phpbb/viewforum.php) provides an ideal forum for researchers and other readers to contribute to the discourse. Observations and perspectives on identity from music education students and in-service teachers would be especially useful in understanding the process of identity formation and its impact on teaching practice.

* * *

Regelski, T. (2007) "'Music Teacher' – Meaning and Practice, Identity and Position" *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 6/2: http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Regelski6_2.pdf

With this issue ends the editorship that I have held since the inception of ACT in early 2002. Getting this journal started and in operation to the point where it is now recognized for its contribution to music education research (e.g., see "About Us" on the ACT homepage) has involved many challenges, but has always been rewarding. My heartfelt thanks go to contributors and to the reviewers whose expertise has helped insure the quality and relevance of what ACT has published. Special thanks are due to the MayDay Group members who have volunteered their services as 'publication staff': without them ACT would not have been possible (and new volunteers are always welcomed to carry the project forward). Particular thanks are due to Wayne Bowman for his contributions and support as Associate Editor, and in his capable hands as the new Editor I look forward to a bright future for ACT.

Notes

[1] As to the breadth of the research literature on this topic, Peter Miksza's extensive table, constituting the first 40 pages of the SMTE literature review (Ester 2006) and entitled "Musician/Performer Conflict," includes a remarkably large number of studies, and a wide range of methodological and theoretical approaches, quantitative and qualitative, among which is Bernard's own thesis project. That attempt (and that of Scheib 2007) to make sense of the diversity and depth of this research does not, however, appear to get at many of the key issues, particularly differences and disagreement between researchers, some of which surface in, and are highlighted by the present exchange—for example the concept of conflict.

[2] It should be noted that Ester 2006 and Scheib 2007 (both are listed as "facilitators" on the reports that contain contributions by other committee members) appear to be reviews of the same body of research. Furthermore, it does not appear that, even though the work of a committee, the conclusions, recommendations, and analysis of research into various labeled categories and types have been peer reviewed in the usual sense expected of a literature review article in a professional journal that attempts to make its own contribution to the literature. For example, the terms used (role, identity, socialization, conflict, transition, etc.) and the categories created for grouping studies often seem to be inadequately described, defined, or defended.

[3] For example, whether roles are assigned (institutionalized, or normative), taken, embraced, or achieved; specific or general; fixed, dynamic, and/or situated; and the idea of a *role-sets* that involve multiple identities (e.g., teacher, musician, mother, breadwinner, wife, union leader, daughter, daughter-in-law, etc.), each with its own expectations with regard to others. Among the respondents to Bernard's original article, some clarification is provided. However, at the heart of the broad issue of music educator identity and especially concerning the putative conflict

between teacher and musician (and related issues) may well be important distinctions (and disagreements) in sociology/social psychology concerning *role theory*. For example, *role conflict* is a staple of role theory and describes aspects of roles that are incompatible or otherwise problematic, such as when a parent is also a child's teacher (a conflict that arises when teachers have their own children in class, but also when, as parent, a teacher stays home from school to care for a sick child). And *role-models* certainly influence a music educator's identity development, beginning with early experiences with music (and other) teachers in schools, through models of musicians and teaching in higher education, in the teaching internship (which can be analyzed as *role-playing*), and of colleagues on the job. While the perspective of normative roles advanced by functionalist sociology (about which, see n. 33) has been aptly criticized (herein, by Roberts), the concept of role is still used—even though with qualifications—by leading perspectives in sociology and social psychology such as social constructionism, phenomenological sociology, symbolic interactionism, and dramaturgical theories. Researchers in teacher identity who are unaware of this body of theory, ignore it, or whose theories rely on only one facet of it without due consideration of the overall literature, can provide only a limited, even misleading, account of music teacher identity.

[4] More on roles follows in section iii.

[5] The literature review of Ester 2006 is entitled "The Transition from Music Student to Music Teacher." However, this so-called "transition" is differently characterized by the many studies reviewed; and it is these differences that can be most relevant for understanding and informing the process of preparing music teachers. Switching gears to "Occupational Role Development" (the title of the bibliography on p. 42 of Ester 2006) only complicates matters; for example, in not distinguishing teaching music as just any occupation from a teacher's identity axis and position as a professional. (More on position and axes in relation to identity follows in section iii.) In any case, the transition from the routines, paradigms, life-style, and intense daily musicking of the university years to those of the typical school day—particularly the socio-musical lacuna beginning teachers face in comparison to their university days—is a major social adjustment of its own that no doubt greatly complicates the formation of a music teacher's identity and is worthy of study in itself.

[6] The discussion above refers to identity research in general; in fact, several authors in this issue do seek to define or clarify their use of some of these terms.

[7] No attempt is made in what follows to provide a précis of Bernard's original paper, only to highlight key aspects of it. Bernard's original article should be read in its entirety as a basis for the best understanding of the articles in this issue.

[8] This quotation is Bernard's summary of her previous outlining of these three categories.

[9] However, it is not clear whether this hyphenated term is to replace "music teacher" or whether it is a concept that should guide teacher educators in avoiding any tendency or temptation to deny or ignore that the identities of music education majors and music teachers are strongly defined by their musical experiences. In following the precedents of other school subjects, music teacher (band teacher, chorus teacher, general music teacher), like history teacher, typically identifies the specialty a given teacher is engaged in teaching. Not addressed by Bernard is the question of whether all music teacher specialists are, *ipso facto*, musician-teachers, or what

would distinguish musician-teachers from other music teachers: whether or not the teacher is an active musician outside of school? If all certified music teachers are musician-teachers (by virtue of the importance of music in their formative years, its emphasis in their formal educations, and central place in their adult lives—at home or in public) we may be faced with the kind of distinction without a difference that, as philosophers note, risks making no difference; and any (alleged) attempt by music teacher educators to replace the musician with the teacher identity must be failing and, therefore, is not a problem as regards a typical music teacher's identity and teaching practice.

[10] Unlike Dolloff and Bouij whose articles mention the importance to teachers of their on-the-job music making, Bernard's account of the importance of music making on identity formation dwells on a music teacher's out-of-school, even earlier history of music making. The conclusion that "music teacher educators should help their students to appreciate the importance of continuing to engage in music making experiences as music educators" (2005, 28) suggests that music teacher educators are not already doing this (or not doing it enough or well, or are—as is argued earlier in the article—too often guilty of ignoring or discounting the music making of future and in-service teachers); or suggests that a problem exists of music teachers who do not make music in addition to their daily teaching—the claim being that such music making directly benefits a teacher's professional development (28) and, thus, teaching effectiveness. This raises the question posed in n. 9 of whether music teachers who are not active as performers outside of school are therefore not, despite their usually strong musical backgrounds, musician-teachers or not the musician-teachers they should be. The importance of musical experiences other than as performers—arranging, composing, listening, home performing, learning new instruments (etc.)—is also not addressed in this regard.

[11] The binary of musician and teacher (or musician-teacher) typically assumes a music specialist who has considerable musical training and expertise. The question, then, is whether, how, or to what degree the musician part of a music teacher's identity is sufficiently acknowledged and promoted by music teacher educators, or is actualized by typical music teachers in their out-of-school lives; and whether, then, out-of-school music making has any direct influence on teaching effectiveness?

[12] These impressions seem to stem principally if not exclusively from their own school music experiences, since few have spent much time in today's schools observing teaching. Some from the music professoriate who once were music teachers may have a more informed understanding of the kind of musicianship and other skills and dispositions it takes to teach music in schools. Others may adopt a "cream rises to the top" rationale in distinguishing the 'elevation' of their present status. In any case, the position (and thus identity) of music education faculty in relation to other music faculty is in itself a variable that can influence how pre- and in-service music teachers construct their identities. (More on position in relation to identity follows in section iii.)

[13] One consequence of this tradition is continuing disagreement about whether school music should focus solely or mainly on classical music rather than on popular or other musics; and, thus, whether the goal of school music is properly (or solely) one of promoting music appreciation of "good music" among the masses (viz., as a corrective to the alleged superficialities of other musics) and, thus, of building audiences for classical music. Against

these assumptions are concepts of curriculum and pedagogy that address musics and musicking in addition to classical, and their contributions to a life well-lived through music.

[14] Of which, in any case, there are already too many to find gainful employment in music. One consequence, as Bouij and Roberts report herein, is the number of such graduates who, not finding work as musicians, seek employment as music teachers, even though they feel little or no 'calling' to teaching; instead, teaching is seen as a means of earning a living by making music with students. Such teachers are too often known to 'perform' student ensembles in meeting their own needs (identities) as musicians, rather than having a considered program of educational benefits of a lasting nature in mind (as teachers) for their students.

[15] The very high percentage of music studies that are typically required by music education programs of study in comparison to pedagogical and teaching studies might seem to be *prima facie* evidence of the professoriate's judgments on this issue. However, professors may well rationalize that they also model teaching and that their models are those most appropriate for *any* music education (thus not recognizing or appreciating important differences between the *training* of professional musicians and music *education* as part of the general education provided by schools). To the degree that such a perspective is found to be taken for granted (by professors *and* their music education students), music teacher educators can understand more clearly the issues to be addressed in preparing music teachers for the very different world and demands of school music. Such research would also be useful in advancing a case (for example with education ministries, teacher accreditation agencies, and certifying bureaus) for rethinking music teacher education so that at least the axes of "musician" and "teacher" are not dichotomized and reified in un- or counterproductive ways. (More on axes in relation to identity follows in section iii.)

[16] A aspect of identity worth researching in itself is the distinction, if any, that is understood by teachers and teacher educators between "teacher" and ensemble "director." In other words, do teachers who direct ensembles automatically equate their directing of ensembles as being teaching; that in and by itself just performing music is inevitably educational? If so, what— beyond the literature 'covered'—do directors claim has been taught (or typically learned)? What, beyond their rehearsal practices do directors take to be their discrete acts of teaching? Do their ensemble programs have any kind of curriculum *per se*? Do directors make any distinction between rote teaching and teaching practices that develop independent musicianship—viz., musicianship that can be and is used outside of school and later in life? Are there differences in these regards between music teachers whose work involves both classroom teaching and directing ensembles, and those whose responsibilities only or mainly involve one or the other? When asked, are teachers more inclined to identify themselves as a music teacher or as a band teacher (etc.)? The latter distinction is not irrelevant to identity. Take, for example, the instrumental music education student (who later went on to become president of the state music teacher association!) who memorably pledged (in a general music 'methods' class required of students who intended to become band or orchestra directors), "I'd rather eat dead rats than teach general music"; or of those wind and percussion players among music education majors who endured the semesters they were required by studio teacher policy to play in the orchestra; or of

the instrumentalists among music education majors who suffered having to sing in a chorus as part of their ensemble requirements.

[17] SUNY Fredonia, NY. These were typically very large classes since the percentage of music education majors in this large School of Music was high compared to other programs.

[18] Whether this admiration was connected with the teaching or the musicianship of the model was not clear; but it can be safely assumed that these teacher-models were successful at least in serving the musical needs of the entering majors in question. Some students belatedly became aware of certain failings of their models—as musicians, or as teachers, or both. On the other hand, many gave evidence, even lasting into student teaching and to their own professional careers, of mainly replicating the paradigms bequeathed by their favored model, thus adding strength to the observation that "teachers teach they way they were taught." However, some favorite music teachers were described in terms of their 'teacherly' traits: qualities such as being kind, understanding, fair, helpful, "my friend" (etc) were used more, or rather than, explicit references to music making as such. The impression was that these models just happened to be music teachers.

[19] Many of these students became "double majors" in performance and music education and either wore their performer hats more proudly or prominently than their teacher hats, or saw teaching as a "fall back" option in the event their hoped for career in performance failed to materialize. Some aspired to become music professors. The number of music professors who have never supported themselves as performers has grown thanks to D.M.A. degrees that send graduates directly into university teaching with little in the way of professional experience in the highly competitive music world.

[20]In fact, use of the term "sharing" was so consistent that an analysis of its meaning in practice would be revealing. "Sharing" can refer to joint responsibility, joint use, dividing something equally, telling something to someone (as in lecturing), or having similar experiences. Teased out in terms of curricular and pedagogical practices, each sense can have considerably different implications, especially if only one sense predominates. Some students who looked forward to such "sharing" gave evidence of simply liking and of wanting to work with children. Given their strengths in music, they saw teaching as a natural way of combining the two interests. Over time many of these seemed to gravitate into either general music or to teaching instrumental music at the elementary school. The larger number of students who were motivated to perpetuate the musical pleasures they had experienced in school seemed to gravitate, instead, to becoming high school ensemble directors. Longitudinal research that compares entering motivations, interests, and values with eventual teaching (levels, specialization, even curricular and pedagogical differences) would provide music teacher educators with a better idea of the relevance or power of such dynamics.

[21] Often, these reports were accompanied by horror stories (as seen by the student) of the ill-effects of challenge systems, failed auditions (particularly for major roles in the school musical), loss of face through musical embarrassment, etc., that the music education major had personally avoided but reported as having strikingly negative consequences for others. A surprising number of these stories told of teaching that directly caused a friend or classmate either to drop-out of the music program (or a particular ensemble) or to seek a career outside of music (e.g., their

failure to win a seating challenge or audition, etc., led them to conclude they weren't "good enough" to pursue music as a career).

[22] Some, however, later admitted that, while they had enjoyed a good music education in the home, they did not admire or respect the conversations about teaching, other teachers and students (etc.) they were exposed to at home. Investigating a music teacher's identity as manifest in *attitudes* about school, teachers, other music teachers, music students, local music making options, and about their musical and educational training (etc.) may reveal heretofore unidentified variables that may otherwise surface only at unguarded moments, but that are likely to have an impact on teaching and a teacher's own musical life (e.g., complaints about the irrelevance or 'merely theoretical' nature of their music education coursework). Surveying such attitudes on the part of pre- and in-service teachers can help in the process of guiding identity formation.

[23] See notes 16 and 18.

[24] Or who started their studies with the intention of becoming ensemble directors and who latter discovered the pleasures and rewards of teaching classroom music, or vice versa.

[25] It often seemed as though many students' experiences with siblings—an older sibling who functioned as a kind of teacher or mentor; or where the student served that function for younger siblings; or, in particular, where a 'special needs' sibling was involved—had a positive impact on the teaching axis of their identities. On the other hand, there was the second year student, in a course focused on developmental psychology in relation to pedagogy, who, with memorable exasperation, asked, "Why do we have to cover this? I don't even like kids!" . . . whereupon, one could almost hear the sound of heads snapping around in her direction. It is instructive to realize that among music education majors are those whose focus is more singularly on music than on teaching it and, thus, whose main interest is in fulfilling their own musical needs.

[26] Of course, it would be ideal if such variables were determined more systematically as part of the entrance requirements to music teacher education programs. Some programs make an attempt but, more often than not the student's audition and musicianship skills tests (and whether the instrument played is in short supply) prevail. This, once again, emphasizes the need for identity researchers to investigate the institutional setting and practices of music schools or departments and the influence of the professors and the curriculum—particularly the relative percentage of music courses to music education courses—on the formation of a music teacher's identity.

[27] For example, the beginning middle school band teacher who, employing practices recommended during her university preparation, based her initial concert not only on full band literature, but also on solos, duets, and various chamber groupings and who, in consequence, was critiqued by her departmental colleagues (all older, all male) for "not being good enough to put on a full band concert." Rather than suffer a wounded identity, the next year she took her skills to a new school system where she was responsible only to her students and her own ideas and ideals.

[28] In a certain conservative communities, playing in bars and clubs may be regarded as morally or socially (if not musically) dubious. And performing rock or other 'lowbrow' or 'downtown' musics can seem to be a denial of the virtues of "good music—at least as seen by some

classically-minded musicians and music teachers. In one community, the "marching band boosters" were so vocally critical of the marching band teacher, even in the presence of students, that the school board no longer accepted their fund-raising contributions and assumed full financial (and, thus, educational) responsibility for the marching band program. Teaching the children of musicians can sometimes be unnerving, too, especially if musician-parents complain about the quality of the teaching, the literature, etc.

[29] Given the additional years, students' identities may also be influenced by the dimensions of marriage and parenthood, responsibilities that can influence music graduates to seek the more predictable and secure living provided by teaching music. Many graduate programs designed for students who already hold music degrees offer only (or mainly) music education courses while undergraduate music education programs tend to combine both music and teaching studies. That such graduate programs do not require further musical studies does not mean that students' music making is de- or under-valued; just that time is limited and musical competence is affirmed by having already earned a music degree. It would be odd, indeed, for music graduates in such music education programs to suddenly give up the pleasures of performing that led them into a musical career to begin with.

[30] Fortunately, some of the literature concerning teacher identity does explore various means by which such reflection can be advanced. In the present issue, Dolloff gives some examples of such strategies and of their importance to pre-service teachers.

[31] However, taken at face value, this can leave unresolved whether 'what' a teacher does, teaching, *means* instructional acts alone (i.e., presenting lessons); or, since the meaning of "hat" depends on the various purposes for which (i.e., reasons why) hats are used, is the meaning of teaching properly tied to the useful result called learning? Isn't' the 'why' of teaching to promote learning? What, then, are we to make of, "I taught it to them; but they didn't learn it"? Or the teacher who observed: "I taught it to them, but they didn't understand; so I taught it to them again a different way, and they still didn't understand; so I taught it to them a third way and, finally, *I* understood!"? Aside from the pointing to the relationship between a teacher's own understanding and teaching methods used, the story rightfully emphasizes the relationship between reflective practice and learning.

[32] As mentioned earlier, Bernard's caveat that the accounts given of the participants in her original study were her own interpretations and that she "would be quite surprised if any of the participants is aware of, or has even thought about, the ways that music making experiences are personally relevant" (2005, 18) bypasses, even systematically ignores, how the participants understood their own identities and risks attributing interpretations that, as Schatzki suggests, might well diverge from the participants' own reflections on the meaningfulness of their history of music making and, thus, on their identities. The conclusions participants draw from reflecting on their narratives about music making and teaching would therefore be central to any account of their identities. Such involvement is a central criterion of narrative research and is, in any case, an important part of what distinguishes "participants" from "subjects."

[33] A key aspect of functionalist theory involves understanding social systems on the basis of an analogy to the human body (or other living organisms) where particular organs evolved according to the specific needed functions they provide (deMarrais and LeCompte 1999, 5-6).

_____

For example, according to functionalist theory, schooling evolved to provide certain useful functions, among which is the transmission and thus perpetuation of 'accepted' culture (deMarrais and LeCompte 1999, 6-7). Accepting this assumption, the public complains when schools are not seen as providing these functions, or not 'functionally' or usefully enough, or when what is 'accepted' is in dispute (e.g., sex education, evolutionary theory). Correspondingly, music education is challenged to the degree that the functional contributions it promises are not provided, or not provided for enough students (only an elite few), or what is provided is not valued by society as useful (functional, needed) or 'accepted' (e.g., classical music). However, the concept of *role* in functionalist sociology is a highly normative one; one that narrowly understands roles as standardized collections of functions, or roles as types of people (see n. 36). Functionalism has been criticized for not addressing the *individual agency* of Actors and thus of how, for example, the 'scripts' or role-typifications widely associated with being a teacher, a parent, a student (etc.) can be creatively 'acted out' or 'improvised' upon in creating such an infinite array of instantiations that differences between Actors become more relevant than similarities; and for neglecting the inescapable and thus central role of *interactions* with others. As a "social transmission" theory it is also opposed by "interpretive" theories (e.g., symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology, phenomenology) and "social transformation" theories (in particular, critical theory). For details, see deMarrias and LeCompte 1999, 5-42.

[34] Those who teach from their homes (etc.), tend instead to be known as (i.e, are given the meanings associated with) "piano teacher" (etc.) and typically function in a network of professional relations with other such teachers (e.g., in the U.S., the National Guild of Piano Teachers, the Music Teachers National Association). "Professors," in turn do their 'professing' in higher education. The idea of "teacher" and "musician" as located in different "mazes of relations" has too often led to school music being separated from music making in the music world that thrives outside of schools. School music, then, becomes its own musical practice; one that too often is a musical dead end for most graduates, and one that may be the only 'professional' music making of some music teachers. Furthermore, the equation of the 'function' of music education as one of creating the autonomous world of school music is assumed by most music teachers; and the vague concept of "music appreciation" is claimed to be the overall outcome and automatic by-product of all school music making or classes. However, to the degree that students and graduates sense a 'disconnect' between school music and 'real' music making (and appreciation; i.e., graduates' actual out-of-school musical tastes and dispositions), music education in schools is likely to continue under siege concerning its 'function' (valued contribution) to schooling (viz., to general education) and to society.

[35] However, not one necessarily understood in terms of status (e.g., more or less valued) or in other hierarchical terms (e.g., of power or authority), though those are often a part of such positioning, but as concerning what the music teacher contributes to the collective undertaking (i.e., of general education); where and how that teacher's efforts 'fit' into the total arrangement of schooling. "Position," here and in what follows, refers specifically to a certain location in a particular plexus of social relations, not to "job," as in a "teaching position"—though the position of teachers in the social ordering of schools, society, their disciplines (etc.) is relevant in itself to their identities.

---

[36] Or, theorists such as "structuralists, systems theorists, and some Marxists [who construe] the people involved not as concrete individuals, but as types thereof. One paradigm category of such types is roles. According to theorists of this sort . . . social relations hold between roles, and the totality of relations characteristic of a particular social phenomena such as an institution [e.g. schooling, music education, etc.] is the texture of relations that hold among the roles that individuals occupy in that institution or sector" (Schatzki 2002, 39).

[37] And thus, for example, how diligent aspiring music teachers are in their musical and teaching studies, the choices they make among elective courses, the criteria for the kinds of teaching positions they seek and accept, their continuing professional development as teachers, and so on. Some examples of the intersection of meaning, identity, and position for pre-service music teachers were suggested in section ii.

[38] A case in point concerning position was the band teacher who resisted attending general faculty meetings on the rationalization of, "I have the best band in the state and have better things to do." Music facilities in schools are often intentionally placed away from other classrooms so as to not disturb other teaching. However, aside from coffee break chats, some music teachers 'distance' themselves from other faculty—if only in effect by spending so much of their free time giving extra help to students. One music faculty group took an interest in its position after a contract was negotiated between the union and school mandating that a teacher's free time be free of teaching (the intent was to protect teachers from being used as substitute teachers during their free periods). As a result, it became very active in clarifying that, as professionals, teachers should be able to *choose* to use their free periods to teach, coach, give extra help to their students. Even so, music teachers can sometimes not 'fit in' comfortably simply because the extra time they typically give to students can be seen by other teachers as 'making them look bad' for only "teaching to the contract" (i.e., fulfilling only assigned duties). Given its position on the use of free time, the faculty group mentioned above probably did not endear itself to the union or to certain other teachers. The teacher cited in n. 27 didn't 'fit in' with her music teacher colleagues due to different conceptions of curriculum and pedagogy (i.e., different meanings understood as to what a "music teacher" does or should do) and such differences among music teachers in the same school are far from rare.

[39] Certainly I am not the only music teacher educator who has encountered music education majors who complained (rationalized their weaknesses as performers?) that they saw little value in their studio studies since they intended to be teachers not professional soloists. Music teacher programs that require a graduation recital (by whatever name), and studio teachers who treat virtuosity as an end itself, can thus mislead students to misunderstand the purpose of such studies in developing the musicianship skills teachers regularly drawn upon. This misunderstanding can influence the identities of both music education candidates who have strong performance skills and interests and those for whom such requirements are seen as a burden. Music teachers who plan and teach diligently in pursuit of conceptions of musical learning that are not focused on professional musical standards would seem to center their identities as teachers around conceptions of music education that are predicated more in terms of the unique nature and needs of music education in schools, and of the age groups with which they work. These teachers may well be the source of complaints about the musical "quality" of school music that some among

the music professoriate claim should aspire, instead, to professional performance standards—a "quality" ensemble teachers who favor the identity axis of musician do everything in their power to achieve, including rote teaching, extrinsic motivations of challenge systems (etc.), autocratic methods, and the like.

[40] As mentioned, most music teachers are innocent of this, spending plenty of extra time after school and during 'free periods' working with individuals and groups. Music teachers whose assignment is exclusively general music, however, are free to fit this description and no doubt some do—when they could be helping individuals whose needs can't otherwise be adequately addressed in the larger class setting; for example, pitch matching exercises, helping a transfer student catch up with the rest of the guitar class, etc.

[41] Identity seems to be a major issue for many who enter teaching of any subject. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future "has calculated that these days nearly a third of all new teachers leave the profession after just three years, and that after five years almost half are gone—a higher turnover rate than in the past" (Dillon 2007). Teachers who enter the field for what they see as a comfortable living and who expect only 'smooth sailing' can be compared to sailors who expect no rough weather or other challenges. Research on music teacher turnover and job satisfaction might well provide insights about music teacher identity (including the expectations entering teachers have and the role these play in job satisfaction) that could be addressed as part of teacher preparation programs. Similarly, research that explores differences (if any), for example in the principal or central "nodal points" of a given teacher's identity, and between music teachers who work in communities where opportunities for their own music making are ample and rich versus communities where opportunities are minimal might also yield results that should be addressed in teacher education programs. Being aware of the importance of position to identity and meaning can arm help new teachers cope with the realities they are likely to face.

[42] For example, as mentioned earlier, when such compensations are not available to music teachers due to the paucity of opportunities in a community, or when a teacher's other obligations (as parent, spouse, etc.) do not allow.

[43] Though they need not be conceived of as equal, as would be the case if an equilateral pyramid or a cube is envisaged. Thus, circumstances that incline (or require) a teacher to 'base' teaching on a less developed or preferred 'side' (e.g., a band specialist whose teaching assignment includes some general music classes) might experience some insecurity or instability, while other 'sides' feel more comfortable and satisfying (e.g., directing the band, giving instrumental lessons).

[44] Some of the research literature involves studies and teaching strategies predicated on such individualized and individuating aspects of identity. Dolloff's contribution herein gives some examples. Bouij's reply also points to the role of such variables over time, including the importance of researching the identity profiles of those who have left music teaching.

[45] For example, teachers, coaches, even parents (etc.) who exploit young people in meeting their own needs. Researchers can have career success strategically in mind more than contributing to a research base (e.g., generating seemingly endless articles out of the same study or data), or do research as though for its own sake rather than with a view to any likelihood for improving

teaching. In practice, the concept of "teaching strategies" often entails strategic manipulation of students rather than communicative action for reaching functional consensual agreement on teaching ends and means. For the application of Habermas' philosophy to education, see the two articles on Habermas at http://www.vusst.hr/ENCYCLOPAEDIA/main.htm . As regards music education, see Stephen Bladh and Marja Heimonen, "Music Education and Deliberative Democracy," *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, Vol 6, No. 1 (2007): http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bladh_Heimonen6_1.pdf.

[46] Various validity-claims are at stake in the responses to Bernard's original article. In reply, Bernard is concerned to justify or further clarify them.

[47] Outhwaite's monograph (1994) is recommended as an in-depth introduction to Habermas' evolving concepts of communicative rationality and discourse ethics; a concise but useful summary of the overall development of Habermas' thinking, including an extensive bibliography (through May 2007), is offered by James Bohman and William Rehg in the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, on-line at http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/habermas/.

[48] Failure by the scientifically unsophisticated to understand the provisional nature of scientific 'truth' or 'progress' leads to, for example, absurd claims that evolutionary theory (the basis of all biology today) has not been "proved," or that lack of perfect consensus on environmental warming means that no such problem exists worth doing anything about. "This is one of science's bigger public relations problems. How do you convey the need for uncertainty in science, the crucial role it plays in nudging research forward and keeping standards high, without undermining its credibility?" (Angier 2007, 39). On the other hand: "Despite this doubt at the very core of the scientific endeavour, we are not in a position to assert that 'anything goes'. Although the observations we make about the world are theory- and ideology-laden before we start, and the joints into which we carve nature are provided less by *a priori* definitions than by operational needs, they must still make a reasonably good fit with the world, or we could not proceed." Thus, hypotheses "are constantly confronted by a reality test" (Rose 2005; 68-69).

[49] Too often this seems to be the case with music education research. Studies that begin with perspectives or frameworks that are then proven, affirmed, or confirmed through the *strategic* (in the Habermasian sense) use of methods, subject selection, and data risk of being "not even wrong"; i.e., they are unlikely to make any important contribution at all to the knowledge base. One criterion of effective science is that something valuable is learned when hypotheses are found wanting: at the very least, future efforts will be directed elsewhere. Thus, "if things are turning out the way you want them to, you should think harder about how you're doing your experiments, to make sure you're not introducing some bias" (biologist Elliot Meyerowitz, quoted in Angier 2007, 31). While it was not experimental as such, several authors in the present issue challenge the methodology of Bernard's original study on similar grounds. In response, Bernard refers readers to that study.

[50] Quoting and translating Habermas from a text not available in English.

[51] This is entirely likely when competing strategic actions are at stake, rather than communicative action intended to improve understanding and build consensus.

[52] Editorial, "We never really talk anymore," *New York Times*, August 6, 2007, describing an anecdote related by linguist Christine Keneally in *The First Word: The Search for the Origins of*

Language, Viking, 2007. Accessed August 6, 2007 from
http://www.nytimes.com/2007/08/06/opinion/06mon4.html
[53] And tenure and promotion committees that pass judgment on such research are often more concerned with the reputation of the department or university than, in the case of teacher education, with its relevance for improving teaching.
[54] See, also related articles in Vol. 3, No. 1 (2004), a special issue on musical identity; Vol. 3, No. 2 (2004), containing several articles relative to teacher identity; and Vol. 3, No. 3 (2004), the *Proceedings* of the 2003 Symposium on Sociology of Music Education, that also contains research relative to both musical and teaching identity.

References

Angier, Natalie. 2007. *The Canon: A Whirligig Tour of the Beautiful Basics of Science*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1999. *Culture as Praxis*. London: SAGE Publications.

Bernard, Rhoda. 2005. "Making music, making selves: A call for reframing music teacher education." *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, Vol. 4. No. *2* (September). http://mas.siue.edu/ACT/v4/Bernard4_2.pdf

Blaukopf, Kurt. 1992. *Musical Life in a Changing Society, Rev. Ed*. Translated by D. Marinelli. Portland, OR: Amadeus Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre. 1990. *The Logic of Practice*. Translated by R. Nice. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

deMarrais, Kathleen Bennett and Margaret LeCompte. 1998. *The Way Schools Work: A Sociological Analysis of Education, 3rd Ed.* New York: Longman.

Dillon, Sam. 2007. "Schools fight for teachers because of high turnover," *New York Times*, August 27, 2007: http://www.nytimes.com/2007/08/27/education/27teacher.html?hp

Ester, Don (facilitator). 2006. The transition from music student to music teacher: A summary of the research literature. *Society for Music Teacher Education (SMTE)*. Accessed September 8, 2006 at: http://smte.us/wp-content/uploads/2006/10/preserviceaspalitreviewmaster.pdf.

Froehlich, Hildegard. 2006. " 'Mirror, mirror on the wall . . . ' or The challenge of jumping over our own shadows," *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, Vol. 5, No. 2 (December): http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Froehlich5_2.pdf

Grundy, Shirley. 1987. *Curriculum: Product or Praxis*. London: The Falmer Press.

Outhwaite, William. 1994. *Habermas: A Critical Introduction*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.

Rose, Steven. 2005. *Lifelines: Life Beyond the Gene* (Rev. Ed.). London: Vintage Books.

Schatzki, Theorore, E. 2002. *The Site of the Social*. University Park PA: The Pennsylvania University Press.

Scheib, John W. (facilitator). 2007. Roles, identity, socialization, and conflict: The transition from music student to music teacher (a literature review). *Society for Music Teacher Education (SMTE)*. Accessed September 8, 2006 at: http://smte.us/wp-content/uploads/2007/02/rolesidentitysocializationconflict.pdf .

Scott, Derek B., ed. 2002. *Music, Culture, and Society: A Reader*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stephens, Jonathan. 1995.   Artist or teacher? *International Journal of Music Education*, Vol. 25: 3-15.

Tuomela, Raimo. 2002. *The Philosophy of Social Practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wenger, Etienne. 1999. *Communities of Practice: Learning, Meaning, and Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wolff, Janet. 1984. *The Social Production of Art*. New York: New York University Press.