

Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education

The refereed journal of the



Volume 6, No. 2
October 2007

Thomas A. Regelski, Editor
Wayne Bowman, Associate Editor

Multiple Vantage Points: Author's Reply

Rhoda Bernard

© Rhoda Bernard 2007 All rights reserved.

ISSN 1545-4517

The content of this article is the sole responsibility of the author. The ACT Journal and the Mayday Group are not liable for any legal actions that may arise involving the article's content, including, but not limited to, copyright infringement.

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

Multiple Vantage Points: Author's Reply

Rhoda Bernard, Ed. D.
The Boston Conservatory

Introduction

“Making Music, Making Selves” was written as “an effort to broaden the academic conversation about music educators and identity, to make room for a wider range of perspectives on identity, and to help us in the field to think deeply about what it means to be a music educator and what it means to become a music educator” (2005, p. 7). In this reply, I continue the conversation that has stemmed from “Making Music, Making Selves” by responding to four of the key points that were raised by the authors in this issue.

1. Some of the authors in this issue feel that I have misstated the pitting of the music making and music teaching of music educators against one another in the existing literature¹



In “Making Music, Making Selves,” I asserted that “writings have traditionally 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” (Bernard, 2005, p. 7). I stand by these claims: first, there is extensive literature about the opposition between the “musician” identity and the “teacher” identity of music educators; and, second, scholars often write about this opposition in terms that suggest the need to resolve it in some way.

The former assertion is supported not only by research in the field of music teacher education; it is also supported in the ways that the other authors in this issue responded to my original article. For example, a recent literature review conducted by the Society for Music Teacher Education (SMTE) Area of Strategic Planning and Action on Music Teacher Socialization in the Pre-service Years (Miksza, 2007) presents two ways that researchers

Bernard R. (2007) “Multiple Vantage Points: Author's Reply” *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 6/2: http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bernard6_2.pdf

differently frame the “conflicts that may arise among pre-service teachers’ identity constructions as musician, teacher, and music teacher”: “attempts to identify sociological models of identity construction” and “focusing on the relative importance of various types or sets of skills in regards to successful music teaching” (p. 44). Regarding the former frame, Miksza discusses two sociological models of identity construction that have been prominent in the research literature in this field: the concept of “role-identity,” and the critical role that social forces play in identity construction (2007, pp. 44-45). Bouij’s research (1998) is cited as an example of a study that explores the conflict between musician/performer and teacher from the perspective of role identity.² Roberts’s study (1991) is noted as an example of an investigation of the conflict between musician/performer and teacher that looks at the ways that identity construction is influenced by social forces that may be in opposition with one another. Much of the conversation in response to “Making Music, Making Selves” derives from the former of these frames, the sociological model.

In studies that look at the skills and characteristics of effective teachers, according to Miksza investigators seek to learn the ways that music educators value musical skills, personal skills and teaching skills, and which types of skills the music educators feel are most important for successful teaching. Jonathan Stephens’s 1995 article (cited in “Making Music, Making Selves”), while not an empirical study, does compare and contrast the different and sometimes conflicting attributes and skills of artists with those of teachers. One such attribute that Stephens discusses is communication skills. Stephens states, “A great composer who is able to communicate at a deeper level than language, may demonstrate gross inadequacies in interacting with people” (1995, p. 5). He goes on to argue that good teaching requires strong interpersonal communication skills: “At the heart of good teaching . . . is the central importance of constructive relationships, the ability of a teacher to relate to pupils or students in a non-threatening way” (1995, p. 5). Underscoring the contrast between the communication skills of artists and those of teachers, Stephens notes, “Unfortunately, the most able, gifted practitioners – or ‘Artists’ – are not always the best at communicating with and inspiring others” (1995, p. 5).

Furthermore, the authors who have responded to “Making Music, Making Selves” in this issue provide additional support for my argument. In discussing his research, Christer Bouij

Bernard R. (2007) “Multiple Vantage Points: Author’s Reply” *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 6/2: http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bernard6_2.pdf

writes: “Today we know that the *conflict* between a musician identity and a teacher identity during teacher training is quickly reconstructed in working life” (2007, p. 14; italics added). In her response, Lori-Anne Dolloff cites a paper that she presented with Jonathan Stephens in 2002: “Students experience dissonance as their former identity as students and musicians – built from years of practicing music – *conflicts* with that of their identity as ‘teacher’ (2002, p. 4, cited in Dolloff, 2007, p. 9; italics added). Brian Roberts frames his discussion of the musician versus teacher identity conflict in terms of a “never-ending personal war between our musician and our teacher identities” (2007, p. 7). There appears to be a great deal of agreement among scholars in this field that the “musician” identity and the “teacher” identity are indeed in conflict with one another.

Regarding the assertion that the opposition between “musician” identity and “teacher” identity is often portrayed negatively, Brian Roberts notes in his response: “I can only repeat what I have said many times before: that our effectiveness in the classroom depends upon being both strong teachers and strong musicians and that furthermore, the personal war we wage with ourselves to maintain a balance with these two identities is critical to our success in the classroom” (2007, p. 11). Characterizing the opposition between musician identity and teacher identity in terms of a war certainly seems to be a negative portrayal. Reading this passage makes me wonder: Must this opposition be seen as a war? Can this opposition or tension be productive?

I believe that Roberts and I agree that it can. On page nine of my original article, I cited Roberts’s 2004 description of this tension as ongoing and productive in the professional life of a music educator. Referring to the war between the “musician” identity and the “teacher” identity, he states, “we don’t really want a winner. It is in the struggle that we can keep both our musical self and our teacher self alive and both must be strong to produce the kind of great music teacher we want in front of our students” (p. 43). Here we find a portrayal of the tension between “musician” identity and “teacher” identity as productive; and the word “struggle,” though one may not think of it in purely positive terms, is certainly less starkly negative in its connotation than the word “war.” Here, there appears to be a good amount of agreement between Roberts and me: both of us argue for an ongoing relationship between musician identity and teacher identity in the professional lives of music educators. We differ only in the ways that we characterize this

relationship. While Roberts describes it as a war or a struggle – albeit one that does not have a victor – I describe “musician” and “teacher” as “two of the shifting positions and contexts in music educators’ professional identities . . . that exist in relation to one another in various ways” (2005, p. 10). This relationship may be a tense relationship, or it may be quite different: it could be easy, passionate, distant, or intense, among many of the possible qualities. What I aimed to do in my research study was not to accept the nature of this relationship as a “given,” but rather to understand this relationship from the perspectives of several music educators in specific contexts. Studies such as mine can make an important contribution to the field by providing insight into the particular nature of this relationship for individual music educators.

When Jonathan Stephens writes about the relationship between artist and teacher in the professional identity of music educators, he focuses less on the tension between them and more on their resolution, and discusses the need for balance between artist and teacher. The portion of Stephens’s article originally cited in “Making Music, Making Selves” (p. 8) is again relevant here: “In teacher education there is a need to balance personal, musical or subject-based development (the skills of the Artist) with professional orientation, which is concerned with the development of others (the tools of the Teacher). Essentially these two aspects are like two sides of a coin, or two partners in a marriage relationship – separate, yet complementary and united” (Stephens, 1995, p. 10). To me, the images that Stephens presents here communicate a sense of harmony and cooperation between artist and teacher, rather than a sense that the tension between these two might be desirable and productive. In his response to “Making Music, Making Selves,” Stephens notes that “the two areas of musicianship and teaching are considered to be complementary, and my conclusion is that there can and should be a synthesis between the identities of ‘artist’ and ‘teacher’” (2007, p. 5). He goes on to cite from his 1995 article: “We are all ‘Teachers’ from whom others learn – the effectiveness of our message will depend on whether or not we are also ‘Artists’” (1995, p. 13, cited in 2007, p. 5). He concludes: “The resolution, in effect, holds the different identities in necessary tension” (2007, p. 6).

As I review these passages, I do not come to the same conclusion that Stephens does. Instead of holding the different identities in necessary tension, Stephens presents a situation where each contains aspects of the other – where artists are also teachers, and teachers are also

artists. He uses the words “complementary” and “synthesis” to describe the relationship between the “artist” and “teacher” identities. This sounds to me much more like a scenario of resolution than a depiction of maintaining a productive tension between the two identities.

2. Some of the authors in this issue feel that I have unfairly characterized the values of the field of music teacher education based on my discussion of the literature that presents music teacher education as the socialization of musicians into teachers.

In “Making Music, Making Selves,” I put forth a provocative interpretation of the literature about music teacher education: I asserted that “the presentation of teacher education in terms of the socialization of musicians into teachers ... and the characterization of music teacher education as ‘teach[ing] musicians to be teachers’ [citing Roberts, 2004, p. 43] underscore the underlying values of the field of music teacher education when it comes to the teaching and performing of music education students” (Bernard, 2005, pp. 9-10). I went on to argue that “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” and that music teacher educators “aim for their programs to take individuals who come to them as musicians, and to transform them into teachers” (2005, p. 10). These are strong assertions, indeed. It is not surprising that three of the other authors in this issue take issue with this line of argument.

Reading these words that I wrote more than two years ago, I can see that the tone of my claim is stronger than I intended at the time. If, with the wisdom and hindsight that I have today, I were to write what I meant to convey, I would rephrase those sentences as follows:

Those of us who work and write in the field of music teacher education should be mindful of the underlying values that might be communicated by certain ways of characterizing music teacher education. For example, by referring to our work as “teach[ing] musicians to be teachers” (Roberts, 2004), or by writing about the “musician-to-teacher identity shift” (Roberts, 2007, p. 11), we may run the risk of neglecting to validate our students’ identities as musicians. It is not obvious from such language that we believe that both the “musician” and the “teacher” identities (as well as other identities) are essential for our students to develop as they craft their professional identities as music educators.

Perhaps these characterizations of music teacher education stem from the fact that some research has shown that music educators appear to be better prepared for the musical aspects of their work than for the teaching aspects. As Bouij notes, “the music education program seems to prepare students rather well for the ‘musician’ profession but not so well for the ‘teacher’ profession” (2007, p. 14). This statement is similar to those made in the writings of other researchers in music teacher education about whom I made the following assertion in “Making Music, Making Selves”: “Several of these authors lament that music teacher preparation programs are failing their students because music education majors appear to be socialized in school as performers or general musicians and not as future music teachers (Woodford, 2002, p. 678; see similar assertions in Cox, 1994; 1997; L’Roy, 1983; Roberts, 1991a; 1991b; 1991c)” (Bernard, 2005, p. 9). Scholars in music teacher education have responded to findings like these by advocating that music teacher education programs should emphasize the development of their students’ “teacher” identities. This is certainly a reasonable and sound response to these findings. Perhaps music teacher educators, in their enthusiasm for increasing the field’s focus on providing pedagogical knowledge, skills, and support to their students, have oversimplified the music teacher education process in their portrayals by downplaying the “musician” identity of pre-service music educators.

Another possible explanation for the ways that music teacher education is characterized in the literature might be that there is consensus among scholars in music teacher education that the continual development of a “musician” identity throughout music teacher education is ‘understood’ and taken for granted. After all, we know, thanks to the contributions of Bouij (1998), Roberts (1991, 1991a, 1991b, 1991c), and others, that students come to us with well-developed “musician” identities. We also know that these individuals will maintain their “musician” identities in various ways throughout their studies. Since the field has already established these two propositions, perhaps scholars place more emphasis on the development of the “teacher” identity when they describe music teacher education. This seems to be a reasonable approach, if it is truly grounded in the work of researchers in the field.

However, as I encountered this literature, I did not have the benefit of having been involved in the scholarly conversations about music teacher education that preceded my work.

With that literature as my only guide, I found portrayals of music teacher education in phrases and clauses like those that cited above – language that can be seen as suggesting that some authors might place a higher value on the “teacher” identity than on the “musician” identity. I would have benefitted from being introduced to more of the context for this language in the literature, or from more nuanced discussions of both the “musician” and the “teacher” identities. Some careful rewording of some of the language that appears in the literature would add some much-needed richness, as well. For example, Stephens refers to “the transition from ‘Artist’ to ‘Teacher’ in teacher preparation” (1995, p. 12). Rephrasing this description to refer to “the transition in teacher preparation from ‘Artist’ to ‘Artist-Teacher’” would capture the continuation and expansion of the “musician” identity into one of “musician-teacher.” Instead of writing, “I teach musicians to be teachers” (Roberts, 2004, p. 43), or “my responsibilities are to teach these self-identified musicians to become teachers” (Roberts, 2007, p. 7), one could state, “I teach musicians to be teachers, as well as musicians,” or “my responsibilities are to teach these self-identified musicians to become teachers, as well.” Modifying the language in this way allows for more clarity about exactly what is meant in these portrayals of music teacher education.

I am pleased to see that Roberts provides a greater degree of nuance to this picture in his response in this issue: “The evidence supporting the need to convert ‘musicians’ into ‘music teachers’ (or ‘educators’) is overwhelming and cannot be dismissed.... It is also important to mention here that this ‘conversion’ is not simply a different word for ‘replacement’” (2007, pp. 11-12). Similarly, in his response, Bouij paints a more detailed portrait of music teacher education than what I have gleaned from much of the previous literature: “As music teacher educators, we must therefore give the students support for their pedagogical development just as the institution traditionally does for their musical development” (2007, p. 13). I support the more nuanced portrayals of music teacher education that Roberts and Bouij provide in their responses.

3. Some of the authors in this issue feel that I intended to suggest that the field of music teacher education should take only one perspective on these issues – more specifically, the perspective that I put forth.

I was surprised to discover that some of the authors who responded to “Making Music, Making Selves” interpreted my article as a mandate that the field of music teacher education adopt my perspective as the one and only framing of these issues. In fact, nothing could be farther from the truth. As I cited above, “Making Music, Making Selves” was written to broaden the scholarly conversation in the field by making room at the table for the perspective that I raised.

Some of my critics in this issue appear to deny me a space at that table because the perspective that I take on identity differs from theirs. As an example, in his response, Brian Roberts repeats and italicizes one perspective on identity, suggesting by doing so that it is the only acceptable way of thinking and writing about identity: “*Identity comes from an actor’s assertion which is subsequently supported by Other*” (2007, p. 6, italics in original). However, this is just one conception of identity. Many others have been put forth in the scholarly literature and have long, rich histories. I am reminded of the response written by the editors of the book, *Musical Identities* (2002), Raymond MacDonald, David Hargreaves, and Dorothy Miell, to the authors, including Brian Roberts, in the special issue of ACT that was devoted to reviews of their book. MacDonald, Hargreaves, and Miell discuss the importance of “positioning identity research within the academic spectrum” (2004, p. 3) and note that, “We find identity research not only in all branches of the arts and humanities, but also within the much more positivist world of medicine and science” (p. 3).

My aim with “Making Music, Making Selves” was to open up the conversation about music educators and identity so that other perspectives on identity could be included in that conversation. In order to do so, I used strong language in the piece. The title included the words, “A Call for Reframing Music Teacher Education.” I noted in the concluding pages that the framework that I described in the article “can dramatically alter the landscape of theory and practice in music teacher education” (2005, p. 27). This language was put forth in the face of what I perceived to be a non-welcoming, oppositional climate for these ideas. It was not intended to suggest that any particular perspective is superior to any other. Just as I wrote above that there

are various ways that the positions of “musician” and “teacher” can exist in relation to one another in a music educator’s professional identity, so do I believe that numerous perspectives in the field about the professional identities of music educators can and should exist in relation to one another. It is by highlighting and discussing these multiple perspectives that we can move our conversation forward in powerful ways, generating and stimulating new thinking and research. As Jonathan Stephens writes in his response: “We should welcome different perspectives on the identity of the ‘musician-teacher’ as opportunities to enlarge and enrich our understanding. Some perspectives may be more helpful than others – just as certain vantage points provide a more satisfying view of a landscape. To view an object in one way only, or to assume, on the basis of limited evidence, that one vantage point is superior to another, is potentially to deny the observer a proper understanding of the nature of the object.” (2007, p. 10). I agree with those conclusions.

In my study, I attended to the personal meanings about music making that were offered by the six music educators I studied – including agency, expressing emotions, and vulnerability in public, as just a few examples. From their discussions of these personal meanings I drew some conclusions about the professional identities of those six music educators and the ways they understood the relationship between their “musician” and “teacher” identities. The account that I offer in “Making Music, Making Selves” focuses attention on a conception of professional identity as the personal meaning that an individual makes of who she is and what she does for a living.

In her response, Lori-Anne Dolloff presents a perspective on identity-formation that is different from the one that I discuss in “Making Music, Making Selves.” She highlights the role of emotions: “What is missing from most discussions of teacher identity in music is the role that emotion plays in the initial constructing, as well as reconstruction and restoration of our teacher identities” (2007, p. 11). This perspective could provide an explanation for the intensive focus of the music educators in my study on the personal meanings that result from their music making experiences. Perhaps their music making experiences are particularly meaningful because these experiences have certain emotional qualities. As Dolloff notes later in her article: “Yet it is hard to deny the powerful emotional affects that we experience when we participate in intense,

moving musical experiences.... This emotional connection to music ... is often an important factor in why we came to music teaching in the first place” (2007, p. 12). It may very well be, as Dolloff suggests, that some individuals choose to become music teachers because of the emotional effects that musical experiences of some kind have had on them. Perhaps they wish to help others have similar kinds of experiences in their lives, and they feel moved to become music educators so that they can provide such meaningful musical experiences to children. Perhaps they wish to re-live their musical experiences by witnessing the emotions that musical experiences might occasion for their students. More research is needed to investigate the role that emotional rewards of music making might play in the personal and professional lives and identities of music educators.

4. Some of the authors in this issue express doubts about certain aspects of my original study; for example, sample size, sample selection, and data analysis strategies, as well as the relatively limited presentation of the study in the article.

Some of the authors in this issue have questions about my study, about which I wrote only briefly in “Making Music, Making Selves.” Rather than respond to those questions here, I would like to direct them (and the readers of this issue) to the study itself (Bernard, 2004). There, I discuss the research design, data collection procedures, and data analysis strategies, and I also describe in great detail all six of the music educators who participated in the study, and present extended data from their interviews.

“Making Music, Making Selves” was not intended to be a presentation of my original research study. Rather, the brief references to the study that were included in the article were used to provide examples in support of the framework about the “musician” identity and the “teacher” identity that I described in the article. I suggest that, before raising doubts or asking questions about aspects of the study based solely on the information that is provided in “Making Music, Making Selves,” readers review the study in its entirety.

Conclusion

The various perspectives exchanged in this issue of ACT about “musician” and “teacher” aspects of the professional identities of music educators provide multiple entry points into a complex array of ideas, questions, and deliberations. As researchers in the field of music teacher identity engage these and other vantage points in thoughtful, meaningful, and productive interactions, the conversation about the professional identities of music educators can be moved into new dimensions by seeing how these different perspectives may interact in various ways; how they may resonate with one another, bump up against one another, overlap with one another, inform one another, conflict with one another, and enhance one another, among many other possibilities. I look forward to the continued interaction among a wide range of vantage points on these issues as more research – by these and other scholars – becomes available. Informed by these conversations, music teacher educators will be better equipped to support and strengthen the identity construction of musicians engaged in the profession of music education.

Notes

¹ For example, in his response, Brian Roberts asserts that my “argument again goes off the rails” when I describe that “the literature has generally ‘pitted against one another music making and music teaching’ or described the conflict between musician and teacher ‘as disabling, as in need of some sort of resolution’” (2007, pp. 5-6, citing Bernard, 2005, p. 7).

² Miksza praises Bouij’s 1998 study and recommends that a similar line of research be conducted in the U.S. so that international comparisons can be executed. Miksza sees this as one possible way to bring together the two streams of research in this area.

References

- Bernard, R. (2004). Striking a chord: Elementary general music teachers’ identities as musician-teachers. Unpublished doctoral dissertation at the Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Bernard, R. (2005). Making music, making selves: A call for reframing music teacher education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*. 4 (2) (September 2005). Retrieved July 27, 2007, from http://mas.siue.edu/ACT/v4/Bernard4_2.pdf.
- Bernard R. (2007) “Multiple Vantage Points: Author’s Reply” *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 6/2: http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bernard6_2.pdf

-
- Bouij, C. (1998). Swedish music teachers in training and professional life. *International Journal of Music Education*, 32, 23-30.
- Bouij, C. (2007). A comment to Rhoda Bernard: Reframing or oversimplification? *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 6(2).
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bouij6_2.pdf.
- Cox, P. (1994). The professional socialization of Arkansas music teachers as musicians and educators: The role of influential persons from childhood to post-college years. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas, Denton.
- Cox, P. (1997). The professional socialization of music teachers as musicians and educators. In R. Rideout (Ed.), *On the sociology of music education* (pp. 112-120). Norman: University of Oklahoma.
- Dolloff, L. & Stephens, J. (2002). Serving two masters: The tensions of music education in the academy. Paper presented at the Canadian University Music Society Congress, May 26, 2002, Toronto, Canada.
- Dolloff, L. (2007). 'All the things we are': Balancing our multiple identities in music teaching. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 6 (2).
http://www.maydaygroup.org/articles/Dolloff6_2.pdf.
- L'Roy, D. (1983). The development of occupational identity in undergraduate music education majors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, North Texas State University, Denton.
- MacDonald, R, Hargreaves, D. & Miell, D. (2004). Editors' response: The sound of ideologies clashing. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*. 3 (1) (May 2004). Retrieved July 10, 2007, from <http://mas.siu.edu/ACT/v3/EditorResponse04.pdf>
- MacDonald, R., Hargreaves, D., & Miell, D. (Eds.) (2002). *Musical Identities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bernard R. (2007) "Multiple Vantage Points: Author's Reply" *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 6/2: http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bernard6_2.pdf

-
- Miksza, P. (2007). Musician/performer role conflict. In J. Scheib (Ed.), *Society for Music Teacher Education (SMTE): Roles, identity, socialization, and conflict: The transition from music student to music teacher (a literature review)*; 2007. Retrieved July 27, 2007, from <http://smte.us/wpcontent/uploads/2007/02/rolesidentitysocializationconflict.pdf>.
- Roberts, B. (1991). Music teacher education as identity construction. *International Journal of Music Education*, 18, 30-39.
- Roberts, B. (1991a). *Musician: A process of labeling*. St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Roberts, B. (1991b). *A place to play: The social world of university schools of music*. St. John's: Memorial University of Newfoundland.
- Roberts, B. (1991c). School music teachers as musicians: Professionals with an alternate relationship to traditional school knowledge. Paper presented at Commission for Continuing Professional Education of the AAACE, Pre-Conference, Montreal, Canada, 13-15 October, 1991.
- Roberts, B. (2004). Who's in the mirror? Issues surrounding the identity construction of music educators. *Action, Criticism and Theory for Music Education* 3 (2), 1-47. Retrieved July 27, 2007, from http://www.maydaygroup.org/ACT/v3n2/Roberts3_2.pdf.
- Roberts, B. (2007). Making music, making selves, making it right: A counterpoint to Rhoda Bernard. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 6 (2). http://www.maydaygroup.org/articles/Roberts6_2.pdf.
- Stephens, J. (1995). Artist or teacher? *International Journal of Music Education* 25, 3-15.
- Stephens, J. (2007). Different weather. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 6(3). http://www.maydaygroup.org/articles/Stephens_3.pdf.
- Woodford, P. G. (2002). The social construction of music teacher identity in undergraduate music education majors. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 675-694). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bernard R. (2007) "Multiple Vantage Points: Author's Reply" *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 6/2: http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bernard6_2.pdf

About the author

Rhoda Bernard (Ed.D., Harvard Graduate School of Education, 2004; Ed.M., Harvard Graduate School of Education, 2000; B.M., New England Conservatory of Music, 1994; B.A., Harvard University, 1988) is Chair of the Music Education Department at The Boston Conservatory, where she leads and teaches in a Master's Degree program that provides licensure to teach music in grades K-12. Her research interests include the professional identities of music educators, teacher reflective practice, and music teacher education.