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Abstract

The purpose of this research was to explore how music student teachers make sense of classroom events during the student teaching internship using a required Video Reflection Assignment. Three questions guided this study: 1) How did student teachers use aspects of three-dimensional narrative space (temporality, sociality, and space) to story classroom events? 2) What aspects of Reflective Practice did student teachers illustrate in their Video Reflection Assignments? 3) How did student teachers reveal their identities as musicians and teachers through their reflections?

Data were Video Reflection Worksheets (VRW), video-recorded teaching episodes (videos), and participant questionnaires. Analysis combined narrative, case study, and grounded theory techniques. Participants’ answers on VRWs revealed aspects of their musician and teacher identities, dilemmas of practice caused by classroom events and conflicting stories with cooperating teachers, and provided insight into the ways participants either rationalized or reflected on classroom events. Results of the study contribute to the profession’s understanding of the interplay of musician and teacher identities, and point to the importance of attending to narratives of identity revealed in student teachers’ reflections through language use, as well as the alignment of student teachers’ and cooperating teachers’ storied identities when assigning internship placements. Additionally, results raise important questions concerning student teachers’ abilities to use reflective assignments like the one in this study to self-reflect, and point to the usefulness of three-dimensional narrative space and MacKinnon’s clues to detecting reflective activity for reframing teacher-educator’s evaluations of student teachers’ reflections.
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PRELUDE

As I have prepared this paper, I realize I have been making sense of the data by negotiating past, present, and future. I am constructing in the present a document for the future; who I am in the present is shaped by understandings I constructed of my life experiences up to now. Thus, I believe readers will understand this paper best if they first understand something about me. Having a picture of my life’s journey as a person and a teacher—illustrated by stories from my childhood, undergraduate years, adult life, and teaching career—will give readers a sense of the foundation of my story to live by and provide insight into how my life’s journey has woven itself into the context of this dissertation.

The social culture of school is my native culture. The rhythms and cycles of my life have revolved around, matched, aligned with, and were ruled by the rhythms and cycles of school. I am a second-generation educator. My father was a band teacher and, though my mother was not a teacher, she was a teacher’s aide and then a school secretary; and in those roles, she was most certainly an educator. School was always my home-away-from-home.

I learned to be a student in what most would consider a traditional school culture. Teachers were authorities, both socially and academically; both teachers and students adhered to traditional social rules. Within this traditional culture, however, ran a current of progressive education. I attended an elementary school without walls that contained both traditional classrooms and a “family group.” From first through third grade, I was a part of that family group: four mixed-grade-level classes with the same teachers every year. We were grouped by developmental level for math and reading, but mixed for
other subjects and activities. We had large group meetings every day, participated in
group decision-making, and used an elaborate behavior modification system—a token
economy. When I took psychology in high school, I learned the elementary school now
included pre-K and Kindergarten, pre-first and first grades, and pre-second grade.
Students were placed in those categories and advanced through them due, in part, to
Piaget-based developmental screenings. These stories illustrate how I was oriented early
in life to the concepts of human development and student agency.

In my undergraduate education, I had many early field experiences and four
internship experiences. I still smile when I remember how much fun it was creating
lessons and piling in the van with my classmates to go teach at local schools. I remember
how scared we all were about classroom management with middle school students, and
how hard we tried to make our lessons engaging for them. My first cooperating teacher
was enthusiastic about teaching and eager to share what he had learned with me. He
explained everything he did, illustrating how he made decisions and why he suggested I
try certain things. He asked me questions about what I did and why. He allowed me to
decide whether to follow his advice, and helped me understand what happened when I
taught.

My second cooperating teacher did not talk about his decisions nor help me
understand how I was doing. My third cooperating teacher got me started, then left me to
my own devices. I had a great time teaching, but was surprised to learn (at the end f the
placement) that she thought I had stagnated. I left my fourth internship placement after a
week because I was appalled at my cooperating teacher’s attitude and behaviors. My
father helped me find a new placement with a friend of his. Like my first cooperating
teacher, he explained his actions and decisions, and he recognized my budding teaching skills by asking me how I knew what to do when I experienced successes.

I have taught in fourteen different schools in seven school districts over my twenty-year career (four student-teaching internships, ten professional positions); thus, my career track has been different, perhaps, from the typical teacher’s. In contrast, many teachers (if they remain in the profession) remain in one position or school district for many years, or hold the same position in the same school for their entire career. Teaching in so many schools no doubt played an important role in the way I learned to teach as well as my assumptions about learning to teach.

I had held my first teaching position only two years when the school district cut my position from full-time to part-time due to budgetary concerns. I decided to leave the district and pursue my master’s degree full time. My second position was with a music teacher service that contracted with parochial schools. During my three years with that service, I taught in five schools. I left that job in pursuit of higher pay. My third position initiated my longest teaching relationship with a single school district: nine years. I spent three years as a long-term substitute (three positions, two schools). During one of those long-term-substitute years, I taught part-time in a neighboring school district. Finally, I received a permanent position at one elementary school, where I remained six years before leaving to pursue a doctoral degree.

Along the way, I discovered that faculty, staff, principals, students, and community members at each school had constructed a unique micro-culture of education. In those ten schools, the community had cultivated, applied, and conducted the general American school culture differently, even when in the same school district. Each school
valued different philosophies of teaching and music teaching. Each held different
expectations and interpretations of cultural components of education such as classroom
management, respect, measurement and evaluation, and musical performance. To
succeed in so many school contexts, I needed to read the culture of each new school
quickly and adapt to it. I learned the importance of flexibility, accurate observation of
self and others, and critical reflection. I became adept at interpersonal skills such as
learning students’ names and figuring out the rules and procedures of a school. I learned
how to discover students’ prior experiences and skills, and how different students might
respond to the same activities and songs.

As I viewed classroom interactions through the lens of each school culture, my
interpretations of classroom interactions in general widened to include perspectives I had
not previously considered. Members of each school culture helped me see classroom
events from different viewpoints. My formal education also cultivated in me a wider
view of teaching. I chose to study multicultural education for my master’s degree rather
than music education. I learned how to teach reading, social studies, math, science, and
English as a second language. I learned about special education and how to work with
students from many cultural backgrounds. I returned to teaching music with a more
holistic understanding of my students.

As I worked in each new school setting, my understanding of how to teach
became more flexible and adaptive, and my ideas about what it means to be a teacher
came to include flexibility and adaptive skill. The “teacher” part of my music teacher
identity grew to equal importance with the “music” part, and I came to label myself
simply “teacher.”
As a result of my formative experiences in multiple contexts, I came to value flexibility, openness to change, and reflective practice as crucial to growth as a teacher. Those values underlie assumptions I bring to the present research: that novice teachers must be disposed to critical reflection and flexibility to become effective professional teachers; and that novice teachers, as a part of their pre-service education, can learn reflective skills that will help them develop the disposition to practice reflection after they graduate.

Finally, the story of my life’s journey would be incomplete without mentioning my orientation toward social justice. While I cannot pinpoint the beginnings of this orientation, I can offer a story or two in example. As a member of an undergraduate music fraternity with a social bent, I once left a “pledge session” because I thought the activity demeaned the pledges, which made me uncomfortable, and I made sure to explain to my sisters why I left. I was also a member of the Anna Crusis Women’s Choir—the oldest extant feminist choir in the United States, whose mission is to sing music by, for, and about women. Often, the repertoire of the choir dealt with social justice themes. The members of the choir taught me to seek awareness of my tacit beliefs, to question assumptions, and to honor diversity. My orientation toward social justice is imbued in my teaching. I continually strive to create a safe, non-judgmental learning environment; and I seek to challenge my students’ tacit beliefs and assumptions as much as I do my own. This orientation toward social justice goes hand-in-hand with my disposition to practice critical reflection.

Readers will bring their own past and present understandings to this paper. It is my hope that, by providing readers stories of my foundational experiences, they will be
better able to understand my interpretations of the data, and better able to judge transferability of my conclusions and implications for practice to their own contexts.
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PART I

INTRODUCTION

Part I contains three chapters: Introduction, Methods, and Analysis. In chapter 1, I introduce the problem, provide background and context for the study, and discuss the assumptions and background of the researcher. I then introduce the purpose and questions guiding the study.

In chapter 2, I describe the theoretical framework of the study, and how the framework influenced decisions about design. I also describe the context of the setting of the study, describe gaining approval for the study and access to potential participants, and the process of inviting participants and obtaining consent to participate. In chapter 3, I detail the process of data analysis, including techniques for coding and decisions I made during analysis; I also detail procedures I undertook to check dependability and credibility of my findings.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

The student teaching internship is the culminating experience of teacher education. It is an important step to becoming a teacher—a transition or rite of passage (Britzman, 1986). The student teaching internship is different from pre-student-teaching field experiences because it is most like what is to come when preservice teachers become in-service teachers; student teachers work full-time alongside practicing teachers for an extended period of time—usually a full semester. The student teaching internship may be the first opportunity novice teachers have to gather in-depth experiences with authentic students and “try on” their teacher identities in the midst of a complex, multifaceted, socially-situated context. In the classroom, student teachers begin to apply the knowledge and skills they have acquired in college classes; reflective practice is an important factor in this process (Conway & Hodgman, 2006; Reynolds, 1992, 1995; Webster, 1999). Reflective practice is a way student teachers adapt and grow during the internship, which can help set them up for success in their first years of teaching.

Reflective practice has become a widely accepted component of teacher education and music teacher education (Bromme, 2004; Latham et al., 2006; Loughran, 2002; Marcos, Sanchez, & Tillema, 2011; Pultorak, 2010). The need for the disposition and skills to reflect is echoed by teacher education and music education alike (Jay, 2003; Latham et al., 2006; Mewborn, 1999; Webster, 1999). Preservice teachers need to develop “the disposition to reflect on their own actions and students’ responses in order to improve their teaching, and the strategies and tools for doing so” (Reynolds, 1992, p. 26). The most important element of student teaching may well be “learning how to think

**Reflective Practice**

Dewey refers to reflective thinking as “turning a subject over in the mind and giving it serious and consecutive consideration” (1933, p. 113). He writes that reflection on any belief or knowledge must be grounded in and justified by evidence in practice. In other words, one must consider concrete experience as the evidence of a belief, reflect on the evidence gathered from the experience, question the evidence, and form hypotheses about the experience. The hypotheses formed must then be re-considered, or tested in further experience, to be sure they are reliable. Dewey (1938) suggested three type of learning experiences, all of which require reflective thinking: educative, miseducative, and noneducative. Educative experiences make further learning and growth possible; miseducative experiences interfere with continued learning; and noneducative learning experiences have no particular effect on continued learning.

Schön (1983) built on Dewey’s idea of reflective thinking; he defines two types of reflection: *reflection-in-action* and *reflection-on-action*. Reflection-in-action is the application of professional knowledge. It involves the partner processes of *problem setting* and *problem solving*. Problem setting is examining the many variables of a practice situation and choosing on what to focus and toward what end (goal) to strive (p. 40). Reflection-on-action is examining something that has occurred, either during practice or outside of the practice situation while looking back and considering events and actions. Schön described two phases of reflection, framing and reframing.
Professionals initially perceive problems in practice from their own perspective, and understand the implications problems hold for practice (framing). They call upon prior knowledge and experiences to consider problems from alternative perspectives, further define them, and form possible solutions (reframing). By reframing problems, professionals form better or alternative understandings of and choose corrective actions for problems. They then prove or disprove their understanding of problems and solutions by testing them in action.

**The Reflective Cycle**

MacKinnon (1987) based his *reflective cycle* on Schön’s notions of reflection. He found evidence of framing and reframing in the dialogue between science student teachers and college supervisors. To the ideas of framing and reframing, MacKinnon added *resolving*, or taking action, as an important third phase of reflection. In MacKinnon’s reflective cycle, the *initial problem setting* phase has three elements: the *initial problem*, the *initial conclusion*, and the *initial implication* for teaching (e.g., students didn’t do what I expected, this is why, and this is what I should do or should have done about it).

Fuller and Brown (1975) developed a model of teacher development in which novice teachers first focus their concerns on themselves, then on teaching, and finally on student learning. The process of shifting concerns in teacher development may take three or more years of professional experience after graduating with an undergraduate degree (Steffy, Wolfe, Pasch & Enz, 2000). MacKinnon drew on Fuller and Brown’s model in his own reflective cycle. He demonstrated that acts of reflection cause a shift of perspective from teacher-centered (self) thinking while framing problems, to student-
centered thinking, in the reframing and resolving phases. Student teachers’ initial interpretations of events reveal their self-concerns (i.e., they focus on themselves). During the reframing phase of the cycle, all three initial interpretations (problem, conclusion, and implication) are reconsidered by student teachers. They try to see their students’ perspectives, and often use their personal experiences as students to imagine their students’ points of view; they may also search for counterexamples in their repository of experiences.

Not all student teachers reflect, however. MacKinnon (1987) found that student teachers took one of two approaches when examining their teaching: acts of reflection and acts of rationalization. Student teachers used acts of reflection to critically examine their teaching behaviors and change them. MacKinnon noted that acts of reflection require “a willingness to examine and reexamine teaching experience from a variety of perspectives and theoretical platforms” (p. 144). Student teachers used acts of rationalization “to justify, or defend, a particular teaching behavior” (p. 139).

MacKinnon developed four clue questions for detecting reflective practice in student teachers’ reflections: 1) “Can the phases of the reflective cycle be ‘seen’ in the dialogue,” 2) “Is there evidence of a change in the perspective from which a classroom phenomenon is viewed,” 3) “Does reframing result in a change in the conclusions about the problematic phenomenon or in the implications that are derived for practice,” and 4) “Does the teacher draw from his or her personal experience as a student to make sense of the pupil’s position?” (p. 140). MacKinnon determined that Schön’s ideas about reflection-in-action “provide a useful way to interpret how preservice teachers make sense of their early teaching performances” (p. 144).
The reflective cycle—framing, reframing, and resolving problems of practice—is an important factor in learning to teach. Prior knowledge and experience are key factors in the reframing phase of the cycle; they influence how student teachers make sense of experiences and whether they reflect or rationalize. Identity is tied to the reflective cycle as MacKinnon (1987) describes it because student teachers frame events through the lens of their beliefs about teaching and learning, and their understandings of the nature of knowledge, which are formed by their prior experiences.

**Teacher Identity**

For student teachers, learning to reflect and make sense of their teaching occurs alongside the early experiences that can guide their socialization, and perhaps help them make sense of their teacher identities. Identity, in turn, can be seen as a “frame or an analytic lens” with which to examine aspects of teaching (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009, p. 175). It is an organizing element teachers use as a resource to make sense of themselves. The origins of teachers’ identities are grounded in their preconceived ideas of what it means to be a “teacher” (Danielewicz, 2001; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Schmidt, 1994, 1998; Steffy, Wolfe, Pasch, & Enz, 2000; Thompson, 2004; Thompson & Campbell, 2003), forged during their *apprenticeship of observation* (experiences as students) in elementary and secondary school (Lortie, 1975).

Student teachers’ understandings of the nature and purpose of school, students, and teachers (the cultural institution of school) influence their identity formation (Finders, 1998). Student teachers, like their more experienced counterparts, express their cultural understandings as narratives (Britzman, 1986; Watson, 2006). Also called
cultural narratives, master narratives, dominant cultural narratives, or hidden curriculum (Cornbleth, 2003), such narratives form the backdrop for personal narratives.

Dominant cultural narratives often illustrate stereotypes (ideas), but are distinct from stereotypes because people enact them as they live their lives and create meaning from experiences (Rappaport, 1995). They are portrayed in literature, movies, television shows, and other popular culture media (Muchmore & Sayre, 2008), which both reflect and perpetuate the stereotypes. Dominant cultural narratives and opposing counter-narratives of teaching are part of student teachers’ preconceived ideas of what it means to be a teacher (Watson, 2006, 2009).

The language people use to describe their experiences reveals how their pre-established identities and dominant cultural narratives influence their understanding of those experiences (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988; Peräkylä, 2010). Metaphors, images, and narrative strategies student teachers use when describing problematic events reveal their prior understandings and the ways in which they make sense of new experiences (Bernard, 2009; Bullough & Stokes, 1994; Thompson & Campbell, 2003). Reflective practice is one way to make the lived act of creating meaning from new experiences transparent and purposeful for the reflector (Burrack, 2001; Conkling, 2003; Killian & Dye, 2009; Loughran, 2002). When student teachers (and in-service teachers) reflect-in-action and reflect-on-action, they increase their awareness of themselves, their students, and their interactions. Problem solving becomes more purposeful.

Constructing identity is an “ongoing and performative process” (Watson, 2006, p. 500), which emerges in and through narratives of practice, or stories to live by (Clandinin & Connelly, 1999). The term, story to live by is equivalent to identity. It is a way to
“conceptualize the link between knowledge, context, and identity” (Clandinin & Connelly, 1999, p. 4). Narrative, or storytelling, is a mode of knowing (Clandinin, 2006)—a way of understanding experience. People both live and tell their stories, and each shapes and defines the other; lived experience becomes story, and story creates meaning of lived experience (Bruner, 2002; Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Connelly & Clandinin, 1988, 1999). Teachers’ stories to live by contain and reveal the origins of their present teacher identities (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988, 1999).

Teachers may hold to their stories to live by “with conviction and tenacity” (Connelly & Clandinin, 1999, p. 94), even when confronted by problems of practice or dilemmas of identity. The process of change in stories to live by is initiated by events, interactions, and ideas encountered in practice. Classroom experiences may sustain or conflict with teachers’ stories to live by. Sustaining experiences verify and support stories to live by, and conflicting experiences create dilemmas in stories to live by as teachers redefine their identity to reconcile experiences with identity. Connelly & Clandinin (1999) suggest that evidence of change in teachers’ stories can be found in their explanations of stories and the status of memories.

Beliefs

Steffy, Wolfe, Pasch, and Enz (2000) state that “novice teacher use their prior beliefs as a lens through which they process or ‘read’ new information about teaching” (p. 36). Bernard (2009) studied preservice music teachers’ stories used as course assignments as a way to elicit preconceptions of self and teaching. She uncovered several beliefs about music learning and what constitutes “good” teaching in participants’ stories, including the following: music learning has to do with achieving perfection, it
takes persistence, and happens when one steps outside one’s prior thinking; good music teachers are passionate about what they teach, they ignite a passion for their subject in their students, and are open to student’s ideas.

Connelly and Clandinin (1988) describe personal philosophies and metaphors as elements of identity in teachers’ written stories of classroom experiences. Statements of personal philosophy explain the way teachers think about themselves in teaching situations. They reveal the experiential, narrative origins of teachers’ beliefs and values, and their action preferences in the context of teaching (p. 67). Metaphors, such as “teaching is like gardening” or “students are like players on a team,” illustrate the ways teachers conceptualize teaching. Metaphorical statements are most direct in speech or writing, but can also be present in how teachers live out ideas in practice.

Thompson and Campbell (2003) identified root metaphors for music teacher archetypes, which are built upon assumptions about the nature of knowledge and functioning of the mind. They specify three root metaphors: production, growth, and travel. Production metaphors portray the teacher as an authority, a “transmitter of knowledge” (p. 51), and a skilled expert who specifies the ends of learning and specifies the means to achieve them. In this metaphor, teacher efficiency and control are necessary. Knowledge is “fixed, universal, objective, and often hierarchical . . . as well as independent of the learner” (p. 52). Thompson and Campbell assert production metaphors “privilege the teacher and subject matter over the student” (p. 52).

Growth metaphors portray the teacher as a tireless, selfless change-agent (facilitator, collaborator, mentor, manager). In this metaphor, teachers challenge learners’ preconceived ideas and promote reflective thinking. Teaching brings about
change (personal growth) in learners through student-teacher relationships, and through controlling, administering, or providing experiences that create a context for learning. Knowledge is “constructed, discovered, and/or experienced” (Thompson & Campbell, 2003, p. 52) by the individual learner. Thompson and Campbell (2003) assert growth metaphors “privilege the student over the subject matter” (p. 52).

*Travel* metaphors portray the teacher as a knowledgeable guide, leading students on a learning journey or adventure, directing their attention to interesting or important things on the way, and suggesting ways to approach or engage them. In this metaphor, learning is collaborative and socially constructed. The encounters and the destination may be predetermined by the teacher or may emerge along the way, but learners’ interests are important in determining the path. Knowledge is subjective. Thompson and Campbell (2003) assert travel metaphors imply “a mutuality between student and teacher” (p. 53); subject matter and knowledge are dependent on that mutuality.

**Narrative Inquiry**

Teachers tell stories of teaching and live their stories of what it means to teach and be a teacher. Researchers in teacher education have applied narrative inquiry to study teachers’ and student teachers’ narratives to better understand teacher identity.

The roots of narrative inquiry reach into several disciplines historically, including sociology, anthropology, socio-linguistics, and feminist studies (Chase, 2010). Contemporary narrative inquiry encompasses five analytic lenses (Chase, 2010). Narrative can be 1) a distinct form of discourse, in which stories are considered a way of making meaning of past experiences (even if the immediate past); 2) a verbal action used to do or accomplish something (e.g., explain, entertain, inform, defend, complain); 3)
stories told within a range of social resources and circumstances that outline possibilities for self in those circumstances and with the resources available to the narrator; 4) socially situated interactive performances, told to a specific audience and purpose; and narrative can represent 5) the researcher’s view of him- or herself when developing meaning, sense, or order out of data.

“The selves we live by” (Chase, 2010, p. 67) are shaped by the settings in which we live and those we move across and among. In a teaching context, stories to live by frame teacher identity (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988, 1999). Watson (2006) describes how “people construct narratives, and narratives construct people” (p. 510). People “spin” stories as they tell them to suit the audience and purpose of the telling, giving them a quality of “made-upness” (p. 511). She maintains the inherent value of the made-upness: the way an individual interprets experiences and molds them into a plot can reveal hidden truths about the individuals’ self-identity.

**Need for Study**

Researchers have noted a need for examining established practices in music teacher education and documenting the process of learning to teach (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Conkling, 2003; Dunn & Shriner, 1999; Nierman, Zeichner, & Hobbel, 2002; Reynolds, 1992; Standley & Madsen, 1991; Welsch & Devlin, 2006). A report from the American Educational Research Association (AERA) suggests research is needed to demonstrate the impact of common practices in teacher education, including “using journaling as a way for teacher candidates to track and reflect on their developing practices” (p. 304).
Larrivee (2010) suggests teachers need to engage in reflective “processes that explicitly prompt them to think, respond, and act in new ways” (p. 145). She suggests several *task structures* useful for promoting reflection in teacher education, including journal writing, personal histories, critical incidents, and peer coaching. Other researchers have found video recording a useful tool for promoting reflection, allowing a relatively objective view of one’s teaching and providing teachers opportunities to notice and recall events not easily observed during the act of teaching (Husu, Toom, & Patrikainen, 2008; Kukanauza de Mazeika, 2001; Lundeberg et al., 2008; Phillips, 1997; Struyk & McCoy, 1993; Wang & Sogin, 1997; Welsch & Devlin, 2006).

Viewing videos of oneself teaching for the purpose of reflecting has become an established and recommended practice for novice teachers (Borich, 2007; Conway & Hodgman, 2006; Danielson, 1996). However, merely viewing videos may not actively promote reflection (Lundeberg et al., 2008) unless a more experienced teacher offers the novice teacher some form of guidance (e.g., written prompts or questions, peer or mentor feedback or dialogue, journal writing).

School music education programs in which student teachers intern seem well suited for documenting the process of learning to teach. Their structure offers opportunities to examine the reflective cycle in planning, teaching, and evaluating lessons. Typically, teachers plan one lesson for each grade or elective, and teach it to all groups or sections, resulting in repeated opportunities to refine the teaching of the lesson. Secondary music teachers typically plan many lessons around performance literature: a few selections are revisited many times in preparation for a concert. This recursive cycle of planning, teaching, and evaluating the same lesson repeatedly within a short span of
time (usually one or two weeks) is a characteristic of music education (and other arts education), particularly in elementary school settings. In contrast, elementary classroom teachers may teach a single lesson one time during a school year (when they teach most subjects to their own class); or they may teach a single concept to a few classes using different lesson plans differentiated by ability-level (when they specialize in a particular subject such as math or science).

Thus, music teachers are rapidly afforded many opportunities to identify teaching and learning problems, attempt to understand them, and formulate and test hypotheses for resolving them. Because of this structure, learning to teach through reflective practice may be qualitatively different for music teachers and general education teachers. Perhaps music student teachers attend to different aspects of teaching and learning than general education student teachers. Much of the research literature about reflective practice in learning to teach comes from the field of general education.

**Overview of the Study**

This research represents a narrative study using qualitative techniques from narrative inquiry, grounded theory, and case-study traditions to explore how student teachers learn to teach music during the student teaching internship. Participants completed Video Reflection Assignments (VRA) during two internship placements (elementary and secondary). The information I obtained through VRA materials formed the basis for the overall findings of this study.

The study’s conceptual framework guided data analysis. To strengthen credibility of findings and trustworthiness of process, I checked with colleagues during various stages of analysis, worked with an auditor, searched for discrepant evidence, and logged
all moves and decisions I made over all phases of the study in a research journal, which included a log of reflective memos.

**Assumptions**

I bring the following three assumptions to the present research. One, that novice teachers must be disposed to critical reflection and flexibility to grow into effective professional teachers; two, that novice teachers, as a part of their pre-service education, can learn reflective skills that will help them develop the disposition to practice reflection after they graduate; and three, that student teachers learn to teach by testing and modifying their understanding of teaching through interactions with authentic students in authentic contexts.

**The Researcher**

At the time of conducting this study, I was employed as a graduate assistant in the doctoral program in Music Education. My assistantship duties included supervising student teachers, mentoring and evaluating groups of teachers in field experiences, teaching lessons about music education teaching methods and approaches (e.g., Suzuki Talent Education, Education Through Movement, Orff-Schulwerk), assisting faculty by completing administrative duties associated with courses, and teaching required courses in the major. Thus, I bring to the inquiry process practical experience as a nascent teacher educator. My experiences as a teaching assistant have continued to develop my knowledge and understanding of the environmental context of the setting.

I acknowledge that the same experiences that are so valuable in providing insight also serve as a liability, influencing my judgment regarding research design and the coloring my interpretations of findings. Therefore, in addition to making my assumptions
and theoretical orientation explicit at the outset of the study, I remained committed to engage in ongoing critical self-reflection by writing reflective memos (in the research journal) and engaging in dialogue with professional colleagues and advisors. Moreover, to address my subjectivity and strengthen the credibility of the research, I incorporated procedural safeguards into the design of the study, such as triangulation of data types, peer review, and detailed record-keeping of the process of the study and content of analysis.

**Purpose and Questions**

The purpose of this research was to explore how music student teachers make sense of classroom events during the student teaching internship using a required Video Reflection Assignment. Three questions guided this study.

1. How did student teachers’ use aspects of three-dimensional narrative space (temporality, sociality, and space) to story classroom events?

2. What aspects of Reflective Practice, if any, did student teachers’ illustrate in their Video Reflection Assignments?

3. How did student teachers reveal their identities as musicians and teachers through their reflections?

Teacher identity is represented in many facets, and while researchers hone their understandings of single facets, all are interrelated and inseparable in the larger notion of identity (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; McClean, 1999). Issues of identity among teachers are sometimes nebulous and may involve teacher beliefs (Pajares, 1992; Thompson, 2004), teacher metaphors (Bullough & Stokes, 1994; Thompson & Campbell, 2003), cultural narratives (Finders, 1999), discourses (Danielewicz, 2001; Marsch, 2002), images (Calderhead & Robson, 1991), and preconceptions of teaching. In music teacher
education, musician identity (Bernard, 2009; Butke, 2003; Regelski, 2007; Roberts, 2007) also plays a key role.
In this chapter, I will provide a rationale for using a qualitative research paradigm based on a social constructivist framework to examine the questions of the present study. I will describe how I chose the setting and context for the study, selected participants, and gathered and prepared data.

**Theoretical Framework**

Social Constructivism, a philosophical perspective in which “the truth” is socially defined, formed the framework of this qualitative study; the framework is grounded in the ideas of John Dewey. Dewey (1933, 1938) espoused a constructivist view of knowing: individuals actively construct, test, and modify knowledge through their experiences with phenomena, and by reflecting on their experiences of phenomena. He saw experience as being carried out through the influence of the natural and social environment, including interaction with other people (Dewey, 1938, p. 24). He recognized how our understandings of past experiences shape the way we experience phenomena and make sense of them in the present; he referred to this connection between past and present experience as *continuity* (p. 17). The people with whom we interact influence and shape what we learn from experiences.

While multiple realities exist (due to individualistic construction of knowledge) they exist in relation to social worldviews—or discourses—within which individuals situate their understandings and are situated by those with whom they interact. In the present study, I assumed student teachers create their own understandings of their classroom experiences, through social interactions with students and other teachers. I
also acknowledged that some classroom experiences, shaped by many social and
contextual variables, can be educative, some miseducative, and some noneducative. The
discourses in which student teachers participated are revealed in language. Language, in
Dewey’s view, is important because it is the social medium through which concepts
develop (Phillips, 2000).

Dewey’s (1938) criteria for experience (interaction and continuity) form the basis
of Clandinin and Connelly’s (2000) notions of narrative inquiry and three-dimensional
narrative space. Dewey’s (1933) concept of reflective thinking, or “turning a subject
over in the mind and giving it serious and consecutive consideration” (p. 113), and the
attitudes required for reflective thinking (open-mindedness, whole-heartedness, and
responsibility) form the basis of Schön’s (1983) concepts of reflection-in-action, and
reflection-on-action, or reflective practice (Bauer, 1992). Narrative three-dimensional
space and reflective practice are integral to the framework of the present study.

According to Patton (2002), “constructivist researchers study the multiple realities
constructed by people and the implications of those constructions for their lives and
interactions with others” (p. 96). In the present study, I examine the multiple realities of
student teachers. Participants’ realities are multiple in at least two senses. First, each
constructs his or her own reality separate from other participants based on his or her
unique combination of internship experiences; second, the reality of each can change
from lesson to lesson and placement to placement as he or she makes sense of new
experiences. Those two realities of each participant are rooted in his or her notions of
teaching and learning music, formed from earlier life experiences as students and
preservice teachers (Lortie, 1975; Munby, Russell, & Martin, 2001; Richardson &
As data analysis in the present study progressed, a multidimensional framework rooted in Symbolic Interactionism, Discourse Analysis, and Critical Discourse Analysis emerges. Researchers using these three paradigms examine language as evidence of the ways people make meaning of interactions and symbols, and how they identify themselves and others. Symbolic Interactionism is rooted in three premises: “human beings act toward things on the basis of the meanings that the things have for them” (p. 2), the meaning of a thing is derived from social interactions between people, and people handle and modify meanings through an interpretive process (Blumer, 1969). Blumer (1969) described things as

... everything that the human being may note in his world—physical objects ... other human beings ... categories of human beings, such as friends or enemies; institutions, as a school or a government; guiding ideals ... activities of others ... and such situations as an individual encounters in his daily life. (p. 2)

Social Interactionists believe social interaction is a process between or among people that forms the way they conduct themselves, and informs society and culture (Blumer, 1969). When a person creates meaning for a thing using the interpretive process, he or she first chooses to what thing to relate; the person communicates with him- or herself about the choice. Second, the person “selects, checks, suspends, regroups, and transforms” the meanings he or she holds for the thing, considering the context of the situation and intentions for action (Blumer, 1969).

Discourse analysts study text and talk in the context of social practices. They view language “as social practice, as a way of doing things” (Wood & Kroger, 2000, p. 4). Critical discourse analysts examine the ways language reveals power relationships
between people, and the underlying assumptions influencing interactions and the interpretation of them (Wood & Kroger, 2000).

Discourse can also be considered a socially constructed and accepted way of using language when interacting within an identity group (Danielewicz, 2001). Learning the discourse of an identity and using it indicates acceptance of the discourse of the group, and declaration of that identity. In the present study, the identity group is music teachers, and the social practice is twofold: teaching music and making meaning of classroom events and interactions.

**Qualitative Design Decisions**

I chose a qualitative research paradigm because it is useful for exploring a complex, detailed phenomenon, in this study, learning to teach (Patton, 1987). Qualitative research is also useful when capturing and communicating stories (Patton, 2002). In the present study, participants wrote reflective accounts of classroom events or interactions. In other words, though they may not have thought of themselves as storytellers, their written accounts hold stories about themselves in the classroom; and those stories illustrated ways they made meaning of events and interactions (what they learned).

**Issues Regarding Design**

The research strategy in the present study differs from typical qualitative research practice in the level of interaction between participants and me (the researcher) during data collection. Qualitative researchers typically interact with participants a great deal while collecting data. They conduct in-person interviews with participants, observe participants (they are physically present in the setting), and begin to analyze data while it
is still being collected (Bernard & Ryan, 2010; Patton, 2002). In the present study, interactions between participants and me were limited to the beginning of the semester when I explained the study and invited student teachers to participate; during the semester when participants asked procedural questions about the study; and at the end of the semester when I invited them to complete a Participant Questionnaire and thanked them for participating. Data analysis began after data were gathered, and after the seminar instructor had turned in semester grades. The decision to depart from typical qualitative research practice was due to considerations regarding ethics, rapport, and purpose.¹

**Ethics.** As a graduate teaching assistant, I was assigned to observe and grade four student teachers (potential participants) in one of their placement. As their supervisor, I determined their grades for the placement I supervised. If I had interacted with participants as a typical qualitative researcher might, and data analysis had occurred during the semester, I might have functioned in a dual role during grading (researcher and supervisor), which blurs the distinction for clarity of roles (American Psychological Association, 2010). Therefore, student-teacher participants and the seminar instructor created and gathered data for the present study in order to maintain role clarity.

**Rapport.** Prior to conducting the study, I had taught and assisted required undergraduate courses as a graduate teaching assistant (TA) and instructor. I knew 13 of the 23 student teachers (potential participants) as students in my classes or through

---

¹ The only exception regarding interaction with participants is that I supervised one participant during her elementary placement. I purposefully refrained from initiating discussion with her regarding the VRA or her participation in the study. She did not initiate discussion of the assignment or the study with me while I supervised her.
student music education organizations. I had taught two of the student teachers (included in the 13 I knew) when they were in middle school. Therefore, I had established rapport with approximately half of the potential participants. Rapport has potential to be both beneficial and detrimental to a study. It is an important factor in establishing the trustworthiness of a study, as rapport is an indication of trust between researcher and participant, and is believed to facilitate truthful responses from participants.

Rapport could have detracted from the study, however, by influencing participants’ assignments, had I interacted with participants as a typical qualitative researcher might, collecting and analyzing data during the semester. Davies, Hogan, and Dalton (1993) noted that some student teachers struggle with finding self-purpose and direction for reflecting (journal writing); they become stuck in the “institutional story of what it [is] the university want[s]” (p. 54). Participants in the present study might have struggled with what they believed I wanted to read in their assignments (the institutional story of research—my research). By delaying data analysis until the semester was over, I hoped to reduce any influence I might have had on how participants completed the assignment due to established rapport.

**Purpose.** The purpose of the present study was to explore how music student teachers make sense of classroom events during the student teaching internship using a required Video Reflection Assignment. In this context, student teachers are required to follow assignment guidelines and complete the VRA on their own, with or without the help of their supervisor or cooperating teacher. Typical qualitative practices of collecting and analyzing data, then collecting more data based on the analysis would likely have influenced the context of the assignment, as my influence would become a factor in the
context. Delaying analysis until the end of the semester was intended to keep as true to the context as possible.

**Characteristic Features**

The design for this study contains three characteristic features of qualitative research (Creswell, 2007; Denzin & Lincoln, 2010; Patton, 2002): data collected in natural settings; multiple sources of data; and data analysis focused inductively and interpretively on participants’ meanings (as related in their own stories of teaching).

Collecting data in natural settings allowed me to focus on student teachers’ realities. Natural settings in this study—the places where participants experienced the phenomenon of interest (the field)—were the classrooms where student teachers were placed and any setting in which they reflected on their practice by completing the Video Reflection Assignment. The context of teaching and learning in music abounds with human interactions, and the process of learning to teach is highly individual (Lampert, 2001; McDonald, 1992; Steffy, Wolf, Pasch, & Enz, 2000). Each novice teacher experiences classroom interactions constructed by contextual factors at once common and unique.

The general structure of public education in the United States provides common contextual factors for the participants in this study, for example, neighborhood schools, age groupings, discipline specialties, hierarchical power structures, and physical locations and features (e.g., classrooms, chairs, chalk or white boards). Likewise, the general structure of music teacher education at the University provides common contextual factors: pre-internship coursework, temporal cycles (e.g., internship length, two-placement structure, placement length, weekly seminar class), and internship
requirements. Within the common contexts of public education and the University program, however, contextual factors vary (e.g., specific student populations, school and class sizes, individual school cultures, and student teacher-cooperating teacher relationships). Because of these variations, participants notice, emphasize, and consider important differing contextual factors; they achieve differing ends as a result of classroom interactions. Thus, each novice teacher’s understanding of classroom interactions differs. In other words, what novice teachers learn is affected by the setting in which they student teach. Collecting data in natural settings helped reveal both common and unique aspects of learning to teach.

Using multiple sources of data serves two purposes in qualitative research. It provides (a) a deeper picture of the complexity of natural settings and the phenomena of interest, and (b) a means of confirming or disconfirming findings by comparing codes and categories across data sources. Qualitative researchers commonly use observations, interviews, and source documents as data (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Patton, 2002). In the present study, there were four data sources: student teacher-collected video recordings (observations), lesson plans for the recorded teaching episodes (source documents), written guided reflections on the recorded lessons (VRWs; a form of interview), and participant questionnaires (Questionnaires; a form of interview).

Video recordings provided sources of observation for participants and me. VRWs and Questionnaires served as forms of structured and semi-structured interviews in lieu of in-person interviews. Researchers typically collect demographic and background information during in-person interviews; participant questionnaires were designed to solicit that type of information. Qualitative researchers typically begin interviews with a set of
initial questions, and develop subsequent questions based on participants’ responses to initial questions. VRWs, as a form of written, everyday texts (Stillar, 1998), exhibit linguistic complexity in both making and understanding them. They “perform critical rhetorical functions for the participants involved” in making and understanding them, and “powerfully summon and propagate the social orders” in which student teachers live (Stillar, 1998, p. 1).

Therefore, while Questions on VRWs and Questionnaires were not the same as in-person interview questions, they nonetheless provided rich, rhetorical, linguistic information, as would in-person interviews. While I considered VRW questions and participant questionnaires similar in function to initial interview questions, they provided no possibility for impromptu follow-up. Because of the purpose of capturing the naturalistic practice of using of the VRA (inasmuch as possible), the additional insight that follow-up questions might have provided was sacrificed.

Qualitative data analysis is largely inductive and interpretive. The knowledge and experience of the researcher is crucial in constructing meaning from the data, beginning with detailed analyses and moving toward broader conclusions (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). I relied on my experiences as a music teacher and teacher-educator when making decisions about how to examine data and how to interpret findings. In the present study, I sought strategies to fit the data and sharpen my analytic focus on another characteristic feature of qualitative research: emphasizing participants’ perceptions of the phenomenon of interest. Ultimately, I incorporated data analysis strategies from grounded theory, case study, narrative, and discourse analysis research approaches. As I examined the data, I continually shifted among strategies as a way of checking results and directing further
analyses.

**Data Analysis Strategies**

I used *constant comparison*, a strategy from grounded theory, as one way to code data. Constant comparison is a process of segmenting data into meaning units, generating codes and grouping them into categories, and recursively comparing categories with data (Strauss & Corbin, 1998). I began coding the data with some *a priori* codes, loosely organized around VRW questions; however, I remained open to the emergence of additional codes and variants on *a priori* codes (specific codes, and ways they changed during analysis, are listed in chapter 3). As codes and themes emerged from the data, I compared them to participants’ perceptions of their teaching experiences as revealed in the data. I used *cross-case analysis*, a strategy from case study, to compare codes, themes, and categories among participants, and search for common perceptions or meanings of teaching experiences (Stake, 2000). I used narrative analytical techniques to examine the three-dimensional narrative space (temporality, sociality, place) of participants’ storied teaching experiences, and search for clues to tacit or hidden perceptions and meaning (Connelly & Clandinin, 1988, 1999).

Finally, I used discourse analysis to examine how participants chose to describe and interpret classroom events. I examined participants’ word choices, metaphors, and voice (tone, positioning of self and students) to identify hidden assumptions about teacher and student identities, the ways those assumptions might have influenced classroom interactions and participants’ interpretations of them, and the ways participants accepted the discourse of music teaching (Wood & Kroger, 2000).
Setting

I selected one university for the present study for two reasons. First, the pool of potential participants at one university was already large for a qualitative study; twenty-three student teachers completed their internships in the semester in which the study took place. Second, the data used in the study came from an established diagnostic assignment that was part of the student teaching seminar course at one university. Other institutions may not have had similar assignments, which likely would have prohibited comparison between institutions.

The setting for this study was a College of Music at a large urban university located in the northeastern United States. I chose this setting because it is a well-respected music education program with which I was familiar (I had established rapport with potential participants), to minimize differences among participants, and facilitate access to potential participants. The university is classified as a large university by the Carnegie Foundation, meaning at least 10,000 undergraduate students are enrolled. The College of Music is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Music, Middle States Association, National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, and the State’s Department of Education.

Students in the College of Music

Demographic statistics for the University are collected by its Office of Institutional Research, and are reported in the Factbook of Student Profiles (2009). Demographics are reported for the University as a whole, each College within the university, and for degree programs within each college (enrollment by degree only).

According to the 2009 Factbook of Student Profiles, which included student teachers in
this study, 139 undergraduate music education majors were enrolled in the college; the following ethnic groups were represented in the population of the College of Music (undergraduate and graduate): American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black or African American, Hispanic, white, unknown or other, and non-resident aliens (international students). The ethnic diversity of the Music Education program may not reflect the same diversity, however. Anecdotal evidence suggests the majority of music education majors are white, with very few people of other ethnicities represented.

The Music Education Program

According to the University’s Undergraduate Bulletin (found on the University website), the goal of the Department of Music Education is to “develop music educators at the undergraduate level who will be ready for successful entry into the teaching profession.” Music education students may choose the traditional 4-year program in which students choose an instrumental, choral, or general music emphasis or the 5-year program with a Jazz Studies component. All music education students take thirty-two semester hours of general education coursework, four hours of conducting, twenty-six hours of professional studies (music teaching methods), and nine hours of internship (student teaching). They also complete varying hours of coursework in music theory, music history, applied music, pedagogy, piano, and music electives. Music education students must maintain a minimum grade point average of 3.0 overall, and passing scores on all state-required Praxis Exams to register for the student teaching internship, and to be eligible for state teacher certification. Upon successful completion of all university requirements and those of the state department of education, graduates qualify for state certification for public school music teaching (K-12).
Student Teaching in Music Education

University Music Education students complete the student teaching internship in one semester, usually the final semester of study before graduating [seniors or high seniors (>120 credit hours)]. Students enroll in three courses during the internship semester Student Teaching-Elementary (elementary placement); Student Teaching-Secondary (secondary placement); and Senior Student Teaching Seminar (seminar). The semester is divided into approximately equal halves (6-7 weeks), which delineate the elementary and secondary placements.

Internship contexts. Placement schools were located in a major metropolitan area, including both urban (city) and suburban settings. Every participant completed one elementary and one secondary placement. In all elementary placements, participants taught general music. Some elementary schools comprised grades K-8; one secondary placement comprised grades 5-12. In secondary placements, participants usually taught vocal or instrumental ensembles, and may have taught small ensembles, small group lessons, music theory, or general music. Seven participants completed their elementary placement first, followed by their secondary placement; six completed secondary then elementary. Table 1 summarizes the number of placements by type of school for participants in this study.

Senior Student Teaching Seminar. The Senior Student Teaching Seminar class (seminar) meets one evening a week throughout the semester. The purpose of the seminar is to enable student teachers to develop their teaching skills and employability (Appendix A). In the seminar, student teachers learned from each other and a veteran teacher (the instructor) via informal discussions about teaching experiences and formal
assignments. Formal assignments included creating lesson plans, and writing daily and weekly journal entries (Appendix A). The seminar instructor encouraged student teachers to video record themselves teaching routinely throughout the semester. The Music Education Department provides digital video cameras, tripods, and DV tapes to student teachers for this purpose. For one formal assignment, the Video Reflection Assignment (VRA), student teachers video recorded themselves teaching and completed Table 1

**Number of placements by type of school**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of School</th>
<th>Elementary Placements</th>
<th>Secondary Placements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 (Grades 5-12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Schools</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Regular schools are traditional public schools run by the school district.

<sup>b</sup> Charter schools are non-religious, independently run schools; they are licensed by the school district.

<sup>c</sup> Magnet schools are public schools to which students residing anywhere in the school district may apply.

reflection worksheets while viewing their own video recordings. The VRA is the focus of the current study. A detailed description of the assignment follows.

**The video reflection assignment (VRA).** To complete the VRA, student teachers video record themselves teaching several times and answer questions about each video in writing (see Appendix A). VRA components are video recordings (videos), Video Reflection Worksheets (VRWs) and lesson plans. VRWs are intended to focus student teachers’ reflection on critical incidents on the video and promote deep and
meaningful reflection. While student teachers have to use VRWs for each VRA, they receive a copy of the VRW at the beginning of the semester and are free to use it at any time. Student teachers complete one VRA during each placement. The seminar instructor graded the VRA as pass or fail.

**Video reflection worksheets (VRWs).** In the present study, VRWs comprised the most important type of data as well as the largest amount of data. VRWs guided participants’ reflections on classroom events. (The complete VRW can be found in Appendix B). The wording and order of questions on the VRW mirrors MacKinnon’s (1987) reflective cycle: framing, reframing, and resolving. The first two questions on the VRW asked participants to choose and describe a classroom event or “moment” on the video and tell why they chose it (framing). The next two questions asked participants to explain what they learned from the event (reframing). The final question on the VRW asked participants to describe what they would change when teaching the lesson again, if anything, or to formulate possible solutions to problems (resolving). Completing a VRW, then teaching the lesson again and completing another VRW might facilitate further change in practice (ideally, *improved* practice) by engaging participants in recursive reflection.

**Participants**

**Sampling**

I employed what might be called typical case sampling or criterion case sampling (Patton, 1987). Typical case sampling in this study implies that the cohort of student teachers in spring 2010 represented typical music student teachers at the University. That is, the group likely had members with varying teaching and reflecting skills, as would a
typical cohort of student teachers. Criterion case sampling in this study is such that all cases that met a predetermined criterion—student teaching in music at the University during spring 2010—were eligible to participate in the study.

All potential participants had undertaken the same course of study (music education) in the same institution, and were student teaching in the same semester (spring 2010). This is important because many other contextual components of the student teaching internship differed between participants, including the age and prior experiences of student teachers. All potential participants had a single seminar instructor, but were placed in two settings, elementary and secondary. University supervisors are usually assigned by placement; in other words, participants had a different supervisor for each placement. Therefore, participants learned from two cooperating teachers and two university supervisors, in two different contexts. Even though participants had different experiences prior to attending college, different professors, and different concentrations within the music education curriculum, the curriculum itself lent a measure of unity to the participant group and the study procedure.

**Gaining Access to Potential Participants**

All potential participants (n=22) were students enrolled in the Senior Student Teaching Seminar course during spring 2010 (student teachers). In December 2009, I wrote letters to the Music Education Department Chair and the seminar class instructor (via e-mail) to ask permission to visit the seminar class, explain my study to student teachers, and invite them to participate. Both the department chair and seminar class instructor granted me access to the seminar class students (see Appendix C), pending approval of my research protocol by the Temple University Institutional Review Board.
Committee B (IRB). I submitted my protocol (see Appendix D) to the IRB and received approval to proceed with the study in January 2010. After receiving all required permissions and approvals, I contacted the seminar instructor and arranged a visit to the seminar class early in the semester. Upon visiting the seminar class, I described the project and invited student teachers to participate in the study (see Appendix E).

Eighteen student teachers agreed to participate. Consent forms were collected by mid-February, prior to the first Video Reflection Assignment due date (see Appendix E). One participant withdrew from the study a few weeks into the semester; I collected no data for that participant. An additional student teacher consented to participate at the end of the semester.

**Participant Questionnaires (Questionnaires)**

During the semester of the study, as I thought about describing participants, I realized I knew a lot about a few of them, knew something about several of them, and knew almost nothing about others. I realized what I knew would influence my analysis. Thinking I might need to disclose some of this information to provide a context for my interpretation of the data, I realized I needed participants’ permission to include personal demographic information as data in the study. Therefore, I submitted a Participant Questionnaire and an addendum to the IRB protocol (see Appendix F), which was approved. I visited the final meeting of the seminar class for the semester, at which time I explained the questionnaire and invited participants to complete it. Several participants were absent from the meeting; I sent those who were absent an e-mail request that they complete the questionnaire. Eleven of the then 17 participants, including those who were present at the final course meeting and those who responded to my e-mail, completed the
questionnaire. The last participant to join the study did not complete a questionnaire.

Fifteen of the eighteen questions on the questionnaire (1-7, 10-12, and 14-18) were designed to collect participants’ prior knowledge and experiences and how these factors might have interacted with or influenced their reflections on classroom events. Several of these questions asked about demographic information such as age, marital status, race or ethnicity, previously held degrees, and primary and secondary instruments. Three questions (8, 9, and 13) elicited information about the influence of the researcher and participation in the study on participants’ reflections on classroom events. Table 2 lists those 15 questionnaire items by the type of response required, open-ended or multiple choice. For the complete Questionnaire, see Appendix F.

Participants’ answers on the Questionnaire allowed me to provide readers and reviewers of this study a “face” for each participant, and to account for potential influences demographic characteristics might have exerted on the ways participants completed VRAs, and the ways I interpreted their reflections.

Eleven of the participants completed Participant Questionnaires. After gathering materials at the end of the semester, I compiled Questionnaire data. Several participants provided information on the questionnaire that could be used to identify them. Therefore, to conceal participants’ identities, I report demographic data (age, marital status, race/ethnicity), and background data (primary instrument, music education concentration, mentor for teaching) in the aggregate (see Appendix G).

Two participants indicated that participating in this study may have influenced they way they completed the VRA. One simply stated participation might have been an influence; the other (whom I did not supervise) said he might have been more detailed in
Table 2

*Items included on Participant Questionnaire by type of response*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open-ended Response Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. What is your primary instrument?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What other instruments do you play, if any?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. If your primary instrument is not voice, do you sing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Is/are your answer(s) to Question 5 the same now as before student teaching?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did your participation in this study influence the way you completed the Video Reflection Assignment? If so, please briefly describe how.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Before entering the music education degree program, did you hold any other degree(s) and/or work in a field outside of music education? If so, what degree(s) and/or what field?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. How many children do you have?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. What is your age?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. What is your gender?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple-choice Response Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. What is your concentration within the music education degree?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. In what level or type of education do you hope to teach? a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Who would you consider your mentor(s) for teaching? a, b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Before participating in this study, to what degree were you acquainted with the researcher, Heather Russell? a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. How would you classify your participation in the music education degree program? (choices: traditional undergrad, post-baccalaureate certification, transfer student) a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. In what year did you start or enter the music education program at TU?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. When did you typically complete the VRWs after video recording?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. What is your marital status?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. What is your race and ethnicity?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Numbers indicate the order of items on the questionnaire.

a Items indicated, “Circle all that apply.”
b Item indicated, “Circle all that apply,” and included the open-ended choice of “other.”

completing the VRWs because of participating. Eight participants knew the researcher prior to participating in the study as a teaching assistant, K-12 teacher, and/or classmate. One participant only knew who the researcher was; and one participant, Deena, only knew the researcher would be her elementary supervisor.
Data Collection and Preparation for Analysis

The week after final exams, I received VRA materials from the seminar instructor (VRWs, videos, and lesson plans). The seminar teacher gave me the videos and VRWs in the form in which students turned them in to him. Students had turned in VRWs via e-mail or on storage media (DV tapes, compact discs, DVDs); they turned in videos in person on storage media such as DV tapes, compact discs, or DVDs. The seminar teacher was unaware of which student teachers were participating, so he gave me all student teachers’ materials that he received. I only downloaded (or uploaded) and used materials from those who had consented to participate. I was already in possession of questionnaires (hard copies), which participants had completed during the final seminar class meeting of the semester. I had stored the questionnaires in an envelope in my office until after the seminar teacher turned in course grades.

I logged materials I received in a spreadsheet (Microsoft Excel) by participant and type. The spreadsheet included a column for pseudonyms, which I filled in as I assigned one to each participant. Missing data is common in qualitative research (Bernard & Ryan, 2010, p. 47), especially in instances in which researchers use pre-existing data (such as the Video Reflection Assignment materials). Such is the case in the present study; no participant turned in all parts of the assignment. The seminar instructor informed me that several student teachers were confused about how to complete the assignment, thinking they had only to hand in one video-VRW-lesson plan combination per placement. The student teachers’ confusion did not come to the seminar instructor’s attention until the end of the first placement, when there was not enough time to re-do the VRA. I am unaware why most participants did not hand in lesson plans, or why a few
handed in either videos or VRWs, but not both. I contacted participants with incomplete materials via e-mail to inquire whether or not they had the missing materials and would be willing to send them to me. Six participants responded in the affirmative, and five sent or delivered missing materials. However, even with the new materials, I still did not receive every part of the assignment for any participant.

A student teacher, Randy,\textsuperscript{2} who had not previously consented to participate, brought me his video recordings directly. After he left, and I saw that he had not consented to participate, I emailed him to invite his participation (using the IRB approved Invitation to Participate and Consent forms). He responded via e-mail in the affirmative, and I downloaded his VRWs. Table 3 represents the final tally of materials received from each participant by pseudonym.

Of the 18 participants, all except five (Barb, Emily, Francis, Neeta, and Rhonda) turned in at least two Video Reflection Worksheets. The VRWs (46 in total) were the first type of data I examined. They contained what I considered to be the most important data—participants’ written thoughts about teaching (their stories). I considered videos (35 in total) secondary to VRWs. I intended to incorporate a quantitative analysis of videos by using a point system and rating scheme devised by Standley and Madsen (1991). I planned to enlist two experienced music educators, in addition to me, as raters to confirm or disconfirm participants’ reporting of events (i.e., determine accuracy or inaccuracy of participants’ statements). Raters would compare participants’ written statements with events contained in videos. I also intended to use videos as illustrations of participants’ viewpoints while making meaning from events, and evidence of change

\textsuperscript{2} pseudonym
Table 3

Materials Received (by Participant)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>PQ</th>
<th>VRWs</th>
<th>Videos</th>
<th>Lesson Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>E.2</td>
<td>S.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deena</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neeta</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeb</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Y = received; - = not received; empty cell = not applicable; PQ = Participant Questionnaire; E = elementary placement; S = secondary placement.

*a* Pseudonyms.

in participants’ practices. I considered lesson plans (10 in total) tertiary data that might indicate participants’ intentions for their lessons, shed light on their interpretations of events, and show how participants’ plans to change evolved from their reflections on classroom events. I thought lesson plans might connect to VRWs cyclically, and illustrate the connection between the beginning and ending of the reflective cycle—planning and action.

Because of the prominence of VRWs in the analysis I had planned, I decided to exclude data from Emily and Francis from analysis (2 videos each), as they turned in no
VRWs. I made no decision to exclude data from Barb, Neeta or Rhonda at this time. Instead, I planned to periodically reconsider whether or not to include their data.

**Preparing Videos**

I prepared videos on an iMac computer. I used iMovie ’09 (version 8.0.6) to transferred digital video recordings from DV tapes to the computer and adjust the quality and format of files. Videos participants had already transferred to digital storage media (compact discs or DVDs) were of several file types (.m4v, .mp4, .avi, .mov) and of varying quality. I converted all videos in other formats to Quicktime format, with the exception of Zeb’s videos. Zeb’s videos were in AVI\(^3\) format, which is native to the PC\(^4\) operating system and does not work well on the Mac operating system.\(^5\) Therefore, I converted Zeb’s videos to MPEG format, which works well with the Mac operating system. I used the video conversion application, MPEG Streamclip (version 1.9.2), to convert the files.

When participants submitted MPEG\(^6\) videos, the recordings were consistently of good quality. Both picture and audio were clear and free from skips and jumps.

Quicktime movies were generally of good quality with one exception; the color and clarity was distorted on Jenny’s video recordings, which she had turned in on DV tapes. I did convert Jenny’s videos to Quicktime format; however, the quality remained poor because the original recordings were of such poor quality. Zeb’s original AVI files were

---

\(^3\) AVI stands for Audio Video Interleave. The file extension is .avi.

\(^4\) “PC” is a generic term for personal computer, and also for the Microsoft operating system (Windows). Windows is a registered trademark of Microsoft Corporation in the United States and other countries.

\(^5\) Audio and video are treated differently in the Mac and PC operating systems.

\(^6\) MPEG is an acronym for Moving Picture Experts Group. Several file extensions indicate MPEG format, including .mp4 and .m4v.

also of poor quality. The picture was extremely blurry, and the audio was somewhat unclear, though understandable; converting them to MPEG format improved the quality a little. Even though I was able to improve the quality of the videos somewhat, they still left much to be desired.

After converting video formats, I named each video file with the pseudonym of the participant, the placement (elementary = E, and secondary = S), and the number order (1 or 2). For example, a participants’ first elementary video would be labeled: pseudonym_E1.mov. I stored all full-length video recordings on a FreeAgent Go portable external hard drive, which was kept on my person or in my home. Files containing video recordings were password protected. While preparing videos, I noted ideas for later analysis.

Preparing to Code Video Reflection Worksheets and Lesson Plans

All participants submitted their VRWs and lesson plans\(^7\) in electronic form (.doc or .docx). Preserving original documents as a basic reference is important in qualitative research (Patton, 1987), so I first made copies (electronically) of the original documents and stored the originals and copies in separate, password-protected files. (From this point forward, any reference to documents, VRWs, or lesson plans indicates the copies.) I then removed any identifying information from the documents.

Most obvious were the names of participants, which I replaced with pseudonyms. I also replaced the names of other people (students, cooperating teachers, and a university supervisor) with pseudonyms. Other identifying information included placement schools

\(^7\) Only five participants turned in some number of lesson plans. Which such a small amount of this type of data, I determined I would not include lesson plans in my analysis, though I did replace identifying information in lesson plans.
or districts, and a local university. In place of school and district names, I simply wrote, “my school;” in place of the local university, “a local university.” From this point forward, any reference to documents, VRWs or lesson plans, indicates the edited versions unless otherwise stated; any reference to names indicates pseudonyms.

Finally, I changed the name of the file from whatever it was when I received it to the participant’s name, document type (VRW or LP), and the same placement and order conventions I used for the videos. For example, I might name a participants’ first VRW from his or her secondary placement “name_VRW_S.1.” I saved the files as Microsoft Word documents. I coded all Video Reflection Worksheets (VRW) in HyperResearch (version 2.8.3), so I then converted the word documents to (saved them as) plain text format (.txt), which was the format required by HyperResearch.

A benefit of the process of preparing the videos and documents for analysis was that I became familiar with all of the data and recorded a few initial ideas for analysis (recorded in field notes). By the time I was ready to begin coding, I had read all VRWs and lesson plans and watched all videos at least once. I was able to get a “sense of the data” (Patton, 1987, p. 146; Richards, 2005, p. 69), which is the important first step in analyzing qualitative data.

Before beginning the analysis, I created a study in HyperResearch (first-pass Coding). HyperResearch allows one to use the same data for more than one study. In later coding steps, I created new studies (second-pass coding, and coding for inference and discrimination statements). The new studies allowed me to use the same data files without seeing previously assigned codes, which moderated the effect of previous coding

---

8 *Study* is the name for a HyperResearch coding file.
on the new analysis. I entered all participants’ names into the first-pass coding study and reviewed my original research questions. I also reviewed ideas I had noted when preparing the data for analysis.

Summary

In this chapter, I set forth a rationale for using a qualitative research paradigm based on a constructivist and pragmatic framework to examine the questions of the study. I described how I chose the setting and context of the study, selected participants, and gathered and prepared data.
CHAPTER 3

ANALYSIS

Coding the Data

First-Pass Coding

Having prepared materials and reviewed my purpose, questions, and ideas, I began to code VRWs using HyperResearch software (version 2.8.3). That is, I read each VRW carefully and marked segments of text that conveyed an important idea to me (data segments) with a label that represented the idea (code). Though I considered all text as potentially important, I did not force myself to code every word. Rather, I tried to include in each data segment just enough words to represent the idea—to neither hamper nor hinder clarity. The size of each data segment ranged from one two-word sentence (“BIG MISTAKE.” James, S2) to paragraphs of forty to fifty words. As I coded data segments, I defined each code in HyperResearch. I coded elementary placement VRWs, one participant at a time, until all were coded; then I repeated the process with secondary placement VRWs.

Throughout the first-pass coding, I edited code definitions, as it seemed appropriate, to accommodate new ideas or variations of ideas. For example, if a data segment in a VRW seemed related to, but not exactly the same as, an existing code, I marked it with the same code, but noted the difference in the definition and in an annotation linked to the new data segment. Thus, codes became refined over the course of coding. I sometimes coded data segments with more than one code because of changing ideas or tentative connections between codes, again noting the reasons. New
codes emerged throughout first-pass coding; therefore, to conclude this process I reviewed all VRWs once more using the final list of 30 first-pass codes (listed in Table 4).

Table 4

First-Pass codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan to change</th>
<th>Reason to change</th>
<th>The Moment</th>
<th>Source of change</th>
<th>Why Chose the moment</th>
<th>Conflict</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Feelings</th>
<th>Gap before reflecting</th>
<th>Read the class</th>
<th>Should have</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Wasting time</th>
<th>I can do this</th>
<th>I’ve learned</th>
<th>Judgments of students</th>
<th>Justification</th>
<th>Not evidence</th>
<th>Options</th>
<th>No change needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learned about students or teaching</td>
<td>Passive language about students</td>
<td>Teaching reaction to moment</td>
<td>Trying to figure out why</td>
<td>VRA procedures broken</td>
<td>Goal or philosophy statement</td>
<td>Hard to choose the moment</td>
<td>Assumptions about students</td>
<td>Connection between VRWs</td>
<td>Missed opportunity</td>
<td>Read the class</td>
<td>Should have</td>
<td>Strategy</td>
<td>Wasting time</td>
<td>I can do this</td>
<td>I’ve learned</td>
<td>Judgments of students</td>
<td>Justification</td>
<td>Not evidence</td>
<td>Options</td>
<td>No change needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Codes are in no particular order or grouping.*

**Considering and Comparing First-Pass Codes**

I printed the list of codes, corresponding source material (data segments from the VRWs), and annotations for each code, and examined each code across participants and placements. Isolating source material to examine codes is useful to “generate new insights” and “look for patterns that may not have been immediately obvious in the initial, inductive analysis” (Patton, 1987, p. 155). I devised questions to guide this step of analysis: Do code names accurately convey the source material? Do they need to be revised or renamed? Are they applied consistently among data segments? Are there further subdivisions of codes? Should some codes be combined, or do they overlap, to form possible categories?”
I made notes on the hard copy of source material regarding the questions above, and wrote (by hand) ideas for revising codes and possible themes. It was during this step of analysis that I began noticing specific words and phrases participants used when talking about themselves, students, and their cooperating teachers. I began seeking definitions of words, thinking about their common usage, and considering how participants’ word choices might reveal the origins of their understandings. This step marked the infusion of discourse analysis (sometimes critical discourse analysis) into the analytic mix.

**Second-Pass Coding**

The product of considering and comparing first-pass codes was a list of revised or refined codes and categories (listed in Table 5), which became *a priori* codes that I used to re-examine the source material in a second-pass Coding. Recursive analysis—returning to the source material and comparing it to emerging ideas (codes, categories)—is characteristic of qualitative data analysis (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000; Cousin, 2009; Creswell, 2007). Patton (1987) states, “the naturalistic evaluator then works back and forth between the data and the classification system to verify the meaningfulness and accuracy of the categories and the placement of the data in categories” (p. 154).

In the first-pass, I coded elementary VRWs for all participants, then secondary VRWs for all participants. For this second-pass, to temper the influence of order on coding, I analyzed VRWs alphabetically by participant name, coding all VRWs for one participant (elementary and secondary) before moving on to the next participant. As I coded, the meaningfulness and accuracy of the revised codes became clearer. I rejected some of the newer codes for the older ones, and continued to refine all codes. When
Table 5

Revised/Refined Codes and Categories Used in Second-Pass Coding

| • Aside                  | • Justification                  |
| • Becoming confident    | • Music learning should be       |
| • Change                | • New understanding              |
|   o non-specific ideas  |   o interpersonal                |
|   o specific strategies |   o learning                    |
| • Evidence              |   o teaching                    |
|   o descriptive         | • No change needed              |
|   o nebulous            | • Options                       |
|   o types               | • Passive language about students|
| • Frustrated/helpless   | • Perception versus reality      |
| • Good teachers should  | • Proof of success               |
| • Good teaching should  | • Reason to change               |
| • Hard to choose moment | • Relief                        |
| • I should have         | • Source of change               |
| • I still need to learn | • Students                      |
| • I’ve learned…         | • Teaching is contextual         |
|   o teaching strategies | • Teaching is separate from musical content |
|   o to value            | • Teaching reaction to moment    |
|   o what works with students | • The moment |
| • Judgments of students | • Questioning established identity|

Note: Codes and categories are in no particular order.

finished, I printed out the source material by code, and examined the second-pass codes and categories using the same questions I asked when considering and comparing first-pass codes (Patton, 1987). The second-pass coding resulted in 22 codes grouped into 7 categories, which are listed in Table 6.

Coding for Inference and Discrimination Statements

I coded the VRWs a third time using two a priori codes: inference statement and discrimination statement. The reason for coding inference and discrimination statements was to examine participants’ abilities to use inference and discrimination thinking when reflecting on teaching. I intended to further code the statements as accurate or inaccurate using a point system devised by Standley and Madsen (1991). However, after coding the
VRWs for inference and discrimination statements, it became clear that attempting to determine accuracy seemed inappropriate for many participants’ statements (see Analytic Monologue 1, Appendix H).

The statements in question were generalizations, statements of prior knowledge, or were otherwise internal. Internal statements were about thoughts or feelings, choices or decisions that may have been covert. Generalizations were statements about learning that were broadened to teaching in general, or statements about “these kids” in general. Sometimes they were philosophical in nature; other times they emerged from ongoing
interactions between participants and their students to which observers would not be privy. Statements of prior knowledge gave information about the class, grade, or student that was obtained prior to the video recorded lesson and expressed as a memory. While I believed all three types of statements were potentially observable, I also believed one could not rule out accuracy for lack of observable evidence. Though questions remained about determining accuracy or inaccuracy of statements, I decided to proceed as if I was confident in the analysis by creating clips of “the moment” for each VRW with a corresponding video recording (listed in Table 3).

Editing Video Recordings for “The Moment”

Question one on the VRW asked participants to “Choose a specific moment or event in the video that sticks in your mind,” and “Describe what happened.” Typically, participants described an event by identifying both the time at which it happened and the general activity that took place during the event. “When I introduced the group diagram activity” is an example of time identification relative to the lesson activity. “At the beginning of rehearsal (4:30 on the video), I tried doing a warm-up in unusual meter,” is an example of time identification that is specific and relative to the lesson activity.

Atypically, four participants (Jenny, Nick, Randy, and Wendy) chose an ongoing or pervasive issue or characteristic of the whole lesson (rather than a discrete moment) on one of their VRWs. For example, Jenny wrote on one VRW about students going in and out of the classroom throughout the period—a series of events.

When participants chose a single, discrete moment, their answers to question one helped determine the time segment of the moment on each video recording. When participants chose an ongoing issue or characteristic, I searched the video recordings for
short time periods that represented an example, or multiple examples, of the issue or characteristic. I took a liberal stance when demarcating the beginning and end of moments by including a few minutes before and after what seemed to capture the moment.

Most of the time, participants indicated the time of the moment by sequence, for example, partway through the piece. To be confident that I chose the correct time period, I watched each video in its entirety. In the rare event that there was more than one time period that resembled the description given by the participant, I reviewed the corresponding VRW to clarify which was more likely correct. Some participants indicated specific times (in minutes and seconds) at which the moments happened (or began), which I used as the starting point for the clips. Even so, I continued to watch each video in its entirety before deciding where to end the clip.

I used Final Cut Express (version 4.0.1), a video editing and authoring software program, to separate the moment from the full-length videos, or to create each clip. I labeled each clip file with the participant’s name, the word “clip,” and the same placement and order conventions as the full-length recordings (Tricia_clip_E.1). All clips are contained in one, password-protected folder on the same hard drive as the full-length videos. Remaining unsure how to proceed with the accurate/inaccurate analysis, I set it aside to begin the process of considering each participant individually.

Narrative Analysis

I used two overarching ideas to consider individual participants’ reflections: *story to live by* (Connelly & Clandinin, 1999), and the *cycle of reflection* (Schön, 1983). Table
7 outlines the specific ideas and questions within the two overarching ideas, some of which emerged in the midst of this step of analysis.

Table 7

Questions Guiding Narrative Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Story to Live By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What are the clue words to dilemmas or deeper meaning?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How does the participant’s language use reveal about his or her views of the students, the cooperating teacher, him or herself, or his or her mistakes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Are there changes in description between VRW questions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How is the participant storying this event?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Who are the actors; what are the actions and reactions?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is un-written or unspoken?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What lies beneath what is said?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What is the deeper level of the dilemma?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Does the moment sustain or confirm the participant’s identity or conflict with it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How is the participant existing in the three-dimensional narrative space?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Temporal (forward-backward), Personal/Social (inward-outward), Place (physical and other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• What differences or connections exist between VRWs?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cycle of Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• What clues are present for detecting reflective activity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Can the phases of the reflective cycle be seen?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Is there reframing activity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Is there evidence of change in perspective in viewing phenomenon? Does the participant shift from self-centered to student-centered interpretations of the moment or event?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Does reframing result in change in conclusions about the moment or event, or in implications for practice? Is there a change in the “I should haves?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o In the course of reframing, does the participant draw from personal experience as a student to make sense of his or her pupils’ positions?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Narrative Analysis Procedures

I began by analyzing the VRWs of seven participants who did not turn in any video recordings as part of the assignment, or whose videos did not correspond to their VRWs. I proceeded with three participants who had turned in one or two videos and
corresponding VRWs. Finally, I analyzed the VRWs of the remaining six participants, who had turned in three or four videos and corresponding VRWs.

Throughout the narrative analysis, the ways I considered the overarching ideas evolved. I learned how to analyze by doing it; thus the questions (Table 7) and the ways I considered them gradually changed over time. After I analyzed all sixteen participants’ VRWs, I read my analytic notes for all sixteen participants. Reading my notes allowed me to examine the ways in which my questions had morphed as I analyzed each VRW. I was able to see that I consistently considered story to live by questions for each participant, but that I had considered reflective cycle questions in more depth for later participants. To “even-out” my application of questions across all participants, I returned to the first ten participants (Joe through Rhonda), re-examining their VRWs with the same depth of focus on the reflective cycle. Examining the process of analysis by noting changes in questions across participants heightened my awareness of the continually emerging process. As I examined the metamorphosis of questions during this narrative analysis, 17 codes emerged, which are listed in Table 8.

Table 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes That Emerged During Narrative Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>coming in mid-cycle of reframing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dominant cultural narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evidence (inferred or observed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hidden problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keeping up appearances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>many ways to teach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not my classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cover story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>potential influence of participating</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Codes are in no particular order.
As an added means of checking the consistency of my narrative analysis, I coded my analytic notes using the 17 codes in Table 8. I printed out the source material for each code by participant. The printout facilitated a comparison of what I wrote about each participant regarding the questions I had asked during the narrative analysis (Table 7). I was able to determine that I consistently considered each question for each participant. This process helped reveal the codes that seemed most important either because they were most common across participants, or because they seemed an important exception or anomaly. Two of the codes from this step became headings when I restoried participants’ VRWs (Story to Live By, Dominant Cultural Narrative).

Restorying Participants’ VRWs

I decided to write a summary profile of sorts for each participant by restorying participants’ reflections. Restorying the data is a narrative technique for reporting findings (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000) that often involves arranging participants’ statements into chronological order, highlighting important characters and events as well as meanings participants seemed to derive from the events (akin to the “moral of the story”). Restorying is considered a technique that preserves participants’ voices, illustrates themes about which the researcher has drawn conclusions, or illustrates the phenomenon under study (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). At this time, I reconsidered including the three participants (Barb, Neeta, and Rhonda) who handed in only one VRW. I questioned the appropriateness of attempting to write a profile based on a single VRW. Because of this, I decided to exclude Barb, Neeta, and Rhonda from this portion of the report.
I based the profiles of the thirteen remaining participants on my analytic notes for each of them. While writing the profiles, I returned to the source material (VRWs) to check that what I was writing was grounded in the data as represented in participants’ own words. A technique that was particularly helpful in this task was to look for quotes I could extract from the VRWs to insert in the portraits as examples of what I described. Many times I found illustrative quotes, which I considered confirmation that my profile reflected participants’ VRWs. Sometimes I did not find quotes, which convinced me to revise my analysis for that participant. The profiles resulting from this step of analysis are included in Chapter 6.

**Checking with an Auditor**

Auditing strengthens two aspects of trustworthiness: dependability and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1986). Schwandt (2007) describes auditing as, “a procedure whereby an independent, third-party examiner systematically reviews an audit trail maintained by the inquirer” (p. 12). The *audit trail* consists of the data of the study, a study of the theoretical framework of the study, concepts or models developed to help make sense of the data, the researcher’s journal (logs, memos), and a statement of the findings or conclusions. In the present study, I asked a colleague, Joanne, to serve as an auditor. Joanne is an experienced music educator and music teacher educator who earned two master’s degrees (Music Education and Music Performance) and an Education Specialist (Ed.S.) degree. She has research experience both as a part of her coursework

---

9 pseudonym.

10 The Ed.S. is an advanced degree for those who already have a master’s degree and do not want to pursue a doctoral degree.
and as an assistant in a doctoral study of beginning teacher professional development (she facilitated interactions with one group of participants).

The auditor judges dependability by looking to see if the researcher’s procedures for conducting the study are transparent and logical; she judges confirmability by examining analyses and conclusions to confirm or disconfirm that findings flow logically from the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1986). I trusted Joanne would examine my study with a critical eye, ask challenging questions about my procedure and findings, and be candid in her judgment of dependability and confirmability.

Joanne read my dissertation proposal to become familiar with the background and theoretical framework, and my plan for data collection and analysis. She read all VRWs prior to reading any findings. After I had analyzed data, as outlined herein, I sent Joanne initial documents outlining my findings. Shortly thereafter, we met at her home for several hours. She asked questions to clarify ideas and procedures, and suggested other ideas to explore (e.g., the possibility that gender might be connected to the types of events on which participants reflected). Finally, she confirmed that my findings represented the data, and that my procedures seemed sound and logical.

**From Beginning to End: The Research Journal**

Throughout all the steps I took from receiving consent to participate, to restorying participants’ identities, I kept detailed notes in several electronic documents that constituted my researcher’s log (Richards, 2005). The documents were a log trail, change log, analytic memos, field notes, and reflective memos. The qualitative researcher’s log is an important source for establishing trustworthiness because it makes transparent the researcher’s process. According to Borg (2001) a log (or journal) serves as a “reminder
of past ideas and events which guided subsequent action,” provides a “record of plans and achievements,” supplies an “account of events and procedures,” allows one to “recall and to reproduce the thinking behind key decisions,” and provides an “account of experiences and ideas,” “which can spark further insights” (pp. 171-172).

The log trail is an overall record of the process of conducting the study; of the actions I took, when I took them, and in what files the actions were documented. The change log, as one might assume, is a detailed log of any changes in procedure I considered, whether necessitated by circumstances beyond my control or occurring to me as options in the midst of the study. The change log includes, as applicable, the date I considered the change, the reasons to consider the change, options for implementing the change, considerations about or implications of the change, and my decision (if there was more than one option from which to choose). Analytic memos contained ideas and questions that related directly to the data. Field notes were about the process of research, the technical details, and “asides” not as closely related to the data as analytic memos.

Reflective memos were notes about me, as a person, a teacher, and the researcher, interacting with the data. If, for example, something in the data or the process of analyzing data provoked an emotion, stirred up a memory, or otherwise brought me to the forefront of the data, I left the analysis task to write about the distraction. For example, during my narrative analysis of Deena’s VRWs, I realized I had strayed from my purpose. I found myself evaluating her teaching based on her description of classroom events rather than noting what she wrote about and how she storied it.

When I realized I had changed perspective, I paused to write a reflective memo, asking myself what caused me to change perspective. Another example occurred when
analyzing Drew’s VRWs. Drew was my student in secondary school, and I paused to write about how my understanding of him, initially built through my interactions with him in secondary school, entered into my analysis of his reflections. A third example occurred each time a participant’s word choices or tone upset me. In those instances, I paused to write about why I was upset, ask myself where it was coming from, and consider how it might influence my analysis.

Writing reflective memos helped me understand how my personal interaction with the data could color my analysis. It also reminded me to purposefully look for alternatives when analyzing data related to reflective memos; and be willing to find and accept the unexpected. Writing reflective memos about my changes in perspective, prior knowledge of participants, and reactions to their words helped me both set my feelings and memories aside and bring them into the analysis.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I provided a detailed account of the analytic and interpretive steps I took to examine the data, and the procedures I used to establish trustworthiness (including reflexivity, recursive analysis, and external auditing). I began data analysis with a first-pass coding of participants’ VRWs, in which I coded data segments that seemed to represented important ideas. First-pass coding resulted in a list of 30 codes (Table 4), which I considered and compared by examining source data associated with each code, revised codes and looked for possible categories among the codes.

I then used the revised codes and categories (Table 5) in a second-pass coding. The second-pass at coding served to clarify and solidify categories and codes, which I again considered and compared by examining source data associated with each code; the
result was a list of second-pass codes and categories (Table 6), which I later used to frame results in Chapter 5. Next, I coded the data for inference and discrimination statements and considered whether I would be able to code them for accuracy, as I had planned.

I completed a narrative analysis of individual participant’s reflections using Connelly and Clandinin’s (1988, 1999) three-dimensional narrative space and MacKinnon’s (1987) clues to detecting reflective activity (Table 7). I recorded codes that emerged during narrative analysis (Table 8); and I examined the process of narrative analysis, and coded my analytic notes to check the consistency with which I analyzed. I used the narrative analytic notes to restory participants’ VRWs, creating the profiles of participants contained in Chapter 4.

Finally, I employed an auditor to evaluate the dependability of my analytic procedures and judge the confirmability of my conclusions. The auditor affirmed the dependability and confirmability of my procedures and conclusions. Throughout the process of the study, from receiving consent to restorying participants’ VRWs, I kept a research journal of detailed notes about procedures and analysis, including reflective memos, which helped organize the study, and provided an audit trail for the auditor to examine.

Up to now, this report has proceeded chronologically, connecting one step to the next in linear fashion. Hereafter, this report represents the holistic and web-like nature of qualitative research. Categories are intertwined and connected, which makes pointing from a specific conclusion to a specific result nearly impossible.
PART II

STORIES

Part II contains two chapters: storied identity, and reflections and beliefs. In chapter 4, I present brief stories of participants as they emerged from participants’ Video Reflection Worksheets (VRWs) and videos. I also provide the context and manner in which I knew each participant (background). Following the stories are plotlines that emerged across individual stories, and act as summaries of the stories. In chapter 5, I present summaries of participants’ reflections, organized around the five Video Reflection Worksheet (VRW) questions, and an additional category, beliefs, that ran through all VRW questions.
CHAPTER 4

STORIED IDENTITY

In this chapter, I present the storied identities of the thirteen participants I included in my narrative analysis. I begin with *Stories of Participants*, in which I provide background information about each participant and my interpretations of his or her *story to live by* (Connelly & Clandinin, 1999). Following the Stories of Participants, I describe three emergent *plot lines* from participants’ stories (*Dominant Cultural Narrative*, *Musician Identity*, and *Conflicting Stories*).

**Stories of Participants**

Following are descriptions of participants (in alphabetical order), which consist of two parts: Background and *Story to Live By*. Background refers to whether and how I knew each participant prior to this research, and the types and amount of data each participant turned in for his or her Video Reflection Assignment (VRA). Each *Story to Live By* is my interpretation of participants’ storied identities based on their Video Reflection Worksheets (VRWs). I attempt to preserve the voice of each participant by including his or her own words (quoted from VRWs)\(^{11}\) and reflecting through language the general tone of his or her VRWs (including colloquial terms that do not represent direct quotes and general formal or informal wording and structure). Even so, I remind the reader that participants’ stories are unavoidably filtered through my own experiences with and understandings of participants, thus my voice is also present in the stories. By

\(^{11}\) The Words and phrases enclosed in quotation marks and block quotations are the actual words of participants, taken from their VRWs. Block quotations are followed by a parenthetical reference to the VRW and the number(s) of the question(s) from which they are taken. For example, a quote from a participants’ first elementary VRW, question 2, would be referenced as “E.1.2.”
describing whether and how I knew participants, and my general impressions of their personalities (if I knew them), I seek to share insight into my lens for viewing each participant.

**Adam**

**Background.** I met Adam at the beginning of this study. Adam completed his secondary placement first, followed by his elementary placement. He chose an instrumental general music class for his secondary VRA, and a first-grade general music class for his elementary VRA. He turned in one VRW for each placement, with no corresponding videos or lesson plans.

**Story to Live By.** Adam strives to motivate his students by using “songs they know and enjoy.”\(^ {12}\) By using songs students know, Adam finds a way to achieve one of his teaching goals: to help students understand connections between his lessons in music class and their music of choice outside of music class. Adam believes if he “proves” to his students he is “on the same musical wavelength as they are” by using a “proper outlet and method” of teaching, they will be motivated to participate in music class, and “learn what [he] want[s].” Adam not only wants his students to learn, but hopes they will “[have] fun doing it.” As when he performs, Adam aims while teaching to “[leave] the students wanting more.” He is excited to “transfer” his ideas about music to students in the course of teaching. Adam takes pride in his students’ success, which he views as “absolute proof” that “what [he] had been doing . . . was working” (i.e., he has done his job well).

\(^ {12}\) Adam intimates he is able to do so in his placement by owning the inferred consequence of choosing a song, saying, “By playing songs like ‘Jack and Diane,’ I both prove to the kids . . .”
Adam used to believe he could teach only secondary students because he could not picture how he could connect with elementary school students. Through his experiences in his elementary placement, he discovers he can connect with young students.

I learned that even 5 and 6 year olds can decipher differences between classical instruments, that I can teach that to them, and that one just needs to find the proper method of transferring ideas to younger students, and they can learn anything. (E.1.4)

He believes he can teach anything, because he is able to figure out what teaching strategy will work with his students.

**Bob**

**Background.** I met Bob at the beginning of this study. Bob completed his elementary placement first, followed by his secondary placement. He chose a third-grade general music class for his elementary VRA, and a middle school music theory class for his secondary VRA. He turned in one VRW for each placement, with no corresponding videos or lesson plans. Bob’s university supervisor observed him teach the third-grade class he video recorded for the VRA.

**Story to Live By.** Bob is confident and aims to portray confidence at all times. He strives for smooth and efficient performances with impeccable timing. To achieve smooth, professional performances, he believes he must control the classroom. Bob sees times when he makes mistakes as potentially “bad situation[s].” For example, in one VRW, he was “in the front of the room” (i.e., in front of his students and cooperating teacher), and he “had the time the class was over wrong” (he thought the period was over 20 minutes before it was). He confidently avoided the bad situation by concealing his
mistake and his panic (“YIKES!”), and “simply continu[ing]” what he was doing. By concealing his mistake, he proved to himself he is a “pro.”

Sometimes Bob attributes bad situations to the wild “nature of the beast” (i.e., the wild nature of the students). For example, when a student “rudely” calls out that she cannot hear him, he is “surprised that she [can’t] hear” him. In this instance, Bob lacks confidence; he feels “helpless” and “quite embarrassed” because, while his university supervisor was observing him, he “[doesn’t] know what to do.” He notes many students playing out of turn, and admits that “it would be quite difficult to learn if you are unable to hear instructions”; but he abdicates, certain that such mistakes are “the nature of the beast” (i.e., not his fault).

Bob is confident he will be better able to teach effectively when he has his own classroom because he will be able to arrange a “different classroom/environment” more conducive to controlling student behavior and maintaining his professional appearance. For example, one of the reasons Bob gives for the noise that kept the rude girl from hearing him is that “the students are sitting twenty to twenty-five seats away”; therefore, in his own classroom, he will arrange desks so students sit closer to him.

Deena

**Background.** I met Deena at the beginning of this study, though I did know I would be her elementary placement supervisor prior to meeting her. Deena completed her elementary placement first, followed by her secondary placement. She chose two second-grade general music classes, to whom she taught the same lesson, for her elementary VRA; she chose two different classes for her secondary VRA, a high school
music theory class and a high school band rehearsal. She turned in two VRWs for each placement, with no corresponding videos or lesson plans.

**Story to Live By.** Deena tries to find ways “to teach . . . material to [students] so that it is between being too easy and too hard,” and strives to “word [her] explanations” clearly.

I was explaining to them what they should be doing. I stated repeatedly what the assignment was, but they continued to ask questions that I thought I had addressed. While I was teaching, I was trying to figure out why they didn’t understand what I wanted them to do. (E.2.1)

When she has “trouble” during a lesson or is not “really sure what to do,” she tries to figure out why by watching and listening to her students. Deena sets high standards for herself. She believes she should be able to “anticipate problems” that might arise in her lessons by “prepar[ing] more.” Deena has clear ideas about how to improve her lessons, and is confident that she will learn to “ma[ke] the right decision” for her students.

Deena places importance on what would be best for the group, and makes decisions accordingly.

Should I have stayed and worked with [one] player or move [sic] to the band since I only see them every six days? . . . Individual help is valuable, but they really need to experience blending with a large number of other players . . . . I will make sure that I have a . . . sectional before the next rehearsal so we do not have to spend a ton of time on that part of the piece while the [other] players are sitting out. (S.2.3, 4, & 5)

Deena teaches as though the band is her instrument: “I [emphasis added] worked on each percussionist's part individually.” She counts herself a member of the theory class: “we [emphasis added] were sight-singing an excerpt in solfege.”
Drew

**Background.** I knew Drew prior to the study. He was a student in my former school district. I was his instrumental and choral music teacher in middle school, and continued to be acquainted with him throughout high school and at the university. My first impression of Drew as a middle school student was that he was personable (with students and teachers alike), unusually conscientious for a middle school student, and a talented musician. Throughout the years we knew each other as teacher and student, our interactions supported my first impression. My understanding of Drew (as a character in my own ongoing story of teaching) informed my analysis of his VRAs.

Drew completed his secondary placement first, followed by his elementary placement. He chose one third- and one fourth-grade general music class for his elementary VRA; he chose two high school ensemble rehearsals for his secondary VRA (symphonic band and jazz band). An unusual aspect of Drew’s elementary VRA is that the two classes were a month apart (based on the dates he recorded on the VRWs), one near the beginning of the placement and one near the end. He turned in two VRWs for each placement and one corresponding lesson plan, but no videos.

**Story to Live By.** Drew has high expectations for himself as a teacher. Drew thinks of himself as *likeable*. He does not miss a beat: he is aware of everything going on in the classroom. He believes he should be able to “read the class,” “pick up on” what is happening, and “react quickly” to take advantage of every “teaching opportunity.” Drew tries to plan classes and rehearsals as interactive and fun for both his students and himself. He tries to “balance . . . . letting the kids have freedom and having a productive rehearsal at the same time.” Drew believes that, as he becomes “aware” and learns new
skills, he can “incorporate” them “into [his] teaching,” and he holds similar expectations for his students. He believes, at least in secondary ensembles, that his job is mainly to point out issues to students, and “allow the students to fix their own mistakes without . . . correcting them.”

James

**Background.** I knew James prior to the beginning of this study as a student in a class in which I was a teaching assistant. I knew him to be confident, with a sarcastic wit. James completed his secondary placement first, followed by his elementary placement. He turned in two VRWs for each placement, with no corresponding videos or lesson plans. James chose two rehearsals of a high school choral ensemble for his secondary VRA; he chose one first- and one second-grade class, learning the same lesson plan, for his elementary VRA.

**Story to Live By.** James views teaching as “the business of developing kids and building them up, and also correcting them.” He believes he can deal with “any situation that occurs” by making sure “the proper procedures take place.” His sharp sarcastic wit is an important tool that he uses to “make a fun example” of mistakes so students will “catch [his] drift” and correct themselves. At his core, James has good intentions; he wants his students to succeed and learn music correctly, which “takes lots of work and dedication.” He sometimes experiences conflicts with students because his sarcasm belies his good intentions.

James uses his instincts to make sense of classroom events. He writes about “a-ha moments” and how solutions sometimes “appeared to him.” He punctuates his descriptions of events—especially problems—with emotional words (“awesome,”
“happy,” “so incredibly frustrating,” “bothered”), exclamation points, and all capital letters ("THIS IS UNBELIEVEABLE!!!!!!"). Once James articulates his emotions about events, he often steps back and learns valuable lessons from them. For example, “Well, it really made me realize that if something is not working, it needs to be simplified”; “It prepared me to understand that I need to understand the kids before going into the class”; “Really it was proof that patience is key”; and “I learned that there needs to be multiple ways to approach things.”

**Jenny**

**Background.** I was a teaching assistant in a class Jenny took prior to her participation in this study. I knew her to be serious, conscientious, and motivated to succeed. Jenny completed her secondary placement first, followed by her elementary placement. She turned in two VRWs for each placement, with corresponding videos and lesson plans. Jenny chose two fifth-grade general music classes for her elementary VRA to whom she taught the same lesson; she chose two high school choral ensemble rehearsals for her secondary VRA, in which she rehearsed the same piece.

Around the time the first placement VRA was due to be turned in to the seminar teacher, Jenny asked a question about the VRW. She was unclear as to what the instructor wanted her to write about on the VRWs (the moment or event). She remarked that she thought the thing she really wanted to write about was not worthy of the assignment (i.e., not what he was looking for). The instructor assured her that she could (and should) write about anything that was meaningful for her as she watched her videos.

**Story to Live By.** As a self-defined strong musical and interpersonal leader, Jenny strives to be aware of everything in the classroom. However, she knows it will
take time to “develop that extra sense” to “be able to teach the material while simultaneously being aware of all that is going on in the classroom apart from the lesson.” Jenny takes learning seriously, and hopes her students will too. She “invites” students to participate in her lessons, but leaves it to students to “choose to participate.” Even if they choose not to participate, she expects them to respect her “as an authority” and not interfere with other students’ learning. She believes she should be strict about behavior to “cut down on distractions and keep students focused on what [she is] teaching.”

As a strong musical leader, Jenny believes students will learn if they “listen carefully and duplicate exactly” what she does. She plans activities carefully and strives to “be clearer with my instructions and directions for the students” and to “make [her] expectations known.” Jenny wants her students to try their best to focus on learning. She has high standards for them and does not want to be a teacher who “settles” for less than what she expects. She wants to “draw the connection” for students from the “isolated elements of the elementary music classroom” to “‘real’ music,” and between ensemble warm-ups and repertoire.

Joe

**Background.** I was a teaching assistant in a class Joe took prior to his participation in this study. I knew him to be enthusiastic about teaching, inquisitive, confident, and personable. He always said hello to me outside of class, and we sometimes conversed about teaching, studying, performing, or future plans. Joe completed his elementary placement first, followed by his secondary placement. He turned in one VRW for his elementary placement—a third-grade general music class. He
turned in two VRWs for his secondary placement consisting of two middle school band
rehearsals. Joe turned in no corresponding videos or lesson plans.

**Story to Live By.** Joe stories himself as a nurturing artist-teacher. His art is both
music and teaching. He strives to perfect the “subtle art” of engaging students in learning
through “dynamic changes, eye contact and myriad strategies.” The way Joe engages
students is illustrated in the following story from his elementary VRW.

A girl in the front row said, “Can we hear that again?” I introduced the tune as
“really cool” and played it quietly so that the students would lean forward and
listen. On the video I smile at her and we both laugh. (E.1.1)

Joe notes the girl “was interested enough to ask for more,” which confirms the lesson was
“going well”; that he was successfully teaching. Conversely, if students’ “body language
express[es] boredom” in class, he knows he has “lost the class” and the his lesson has
become “pointless.” He wants to “eliminate” pointless moments from his teaching.

Joe wants his students to have fun and learn while “immersed in the experience.”

His basic goal in teaching music is elevating students’ musicianship to a “higher level
than easy listening” by exposing them to quality music and setting high standards for
musicianship. He wants his students to learn that music is “something worthwhile and
exciting.” Joe is confident and proud of his competence as a teacher. He believes in the
power of engaging teaching.

I chose this moment because it relates to my last reflection and shows how I can
correct a problem . . . . By presenting a section that had bored the group (and
made them feel like they weren’t succeeding) in a different way in which they
could achieve success, I cultivated interest and helped the students advance.
(S.2.2 & 4)
Nick

**Background.** I was a teaching assistant in two classes Nick took prior to his participation in this study. I knew him to be enthusiastic about teaching, inquisitive, thoughtful, hard-working, and confident. Nick always said hello to me outside of class, and we had many conversations about teaching, philosophy, and life in general. Nick completed his elementary placement first, followed by his secondary placement. He chose two fifth-grade general music classes in which he taught the same lesson for his elementary VRA; he chose two high school choral ensemble rehearsals for his secondary VRA. Nick turned in two VRWs for his elementary placement. He turned in one VRW for his secondary placement, but included a note that he referred to two classes in that one VRW. Nick turned in four corresponding videos and two lesson plans (one for each placement).

**Story to Live By.** Nick strives to exist in music while teaching. He believes that music class should immerse students in music—music should be “dripping from the walls,” and students should be “filled with audiation.” When he talks too much, Nick senses “a disconnect” with students, so he tries to limit his own (and his students’) talking, sometimes doing “battle with [his] own chattiness.” He wants his lessons to be “magical,” and uses his “usual contagious excitement” to “grab” students’ attention. He and his lesson are one in the same; if his activity is engaging, he is engaging; however he has to be careful not to be “too enthusiastic.”

Nick’s teaching is “considered and crafted,” “soundly structured,” and “mapped out.” He makes sure to have “many options planned.” He sees teaching, and perhaps
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13 *Audiation* is “hearing and comprehending in one’s mind the sound of music that is not, or may never have been, physically present” (Gordon, 2007, p. 399).
life, as an unfolding story (“the narrative of the lesson”) akin to a play that he can, and
does, rehearse to make it go smoothly. If he prepares the plan well by rehearsing, and
executes the plan well, students will do what he wants. Teaching is theatrical—not in the
sense of entertaining students, but in the sense of prolonged engagement of their
attention; if activities “flow” well from one to the next, students stay engaged in the story
of the lesson.

While I’m not there to entertain, I felt that the flow of the activity was broken
severely when I talked as much as I had early in the lesson. This particular
activity was passive enough (possibly too much so). And, [it added] a lot of blah-
blah-blah to an already tenuous activity in terms of engagement. (E.1.3)

Nick values the relationships he develops with his students, and he wants them to
understand themselves in relation to music.

I really liked the “feel” of this lesson overall. I liked the idea of taking a song,
introducing the idea that language makes singing different, that they were
different (and musicians) because they had sung so much. The timbre changes for
a single activity were a good idea, but then circling back on the activity would
have been smart. (E.2.5)

There is a selfless component to Nick’s identity. His students’ needs take
priority. Students’ needs outweigh teachers’ needs to better “serve” the interest of
student engagement and learning.

I was struck by how tired I seemed even before the lesson started . . . . I seemed
exhausted. I think this affected my flow a great deal. I was not as quick to
change or react to what they were or more importantly, weren’t doing. I wasn’t
hearing them . . . . I was projecting my own condition on the students: concluding
that what I needed was what they needed . . . . And, I let that guide the lesson
rather than the plan guiding me. (S.1.1 & 2)

Randy

**Background.** I met Randy at the beginning of this study. Randy completed his
secondary placement first, followed by his elementary placement. He chose two different
classes and lessons for each placement: a seventh-grade band rehearsal and a beginning instrumental lesson for his secondary VRA, and fourth- and second-grade general music classes for his elementary VRA. He turned in two VRWs for each placement with corresponding videos, but no lesson plans. Randy’s elementary placement was in the school district in which I formerly taught, and his cooperating teacher was a friend and colleague.

**Story to Live By.** Randy strives “to create a comfortable atmosphere for learning” in his classroom. He respects his students, and wants them to be “respectful to their classmates in order to have a good time.” He is genuine with students, and wants to help them “hone in on” the correct answers.

I want to create a comfortable atmosphere for learning, and saying no to things that they genuinely thought they heard would make them feel inadequate and not want to answer another question. I remember wanting to hear about all of the things they heard and wanting to help them hone in on what they were actually hearing. (E.1.1)

Randy sees his role as encouraging students, noticing what they do, and helping them make connections. He has fun teaching and wants his students have fun learning. Randy believes there are “proper” and “effective” ways to teach, and is confident in his ability to make choices about how to teach “on the spot.” Randy uses a lot of physical metaphors to describe the challenges he and his students face. One “comes up against” challenges and should “attack” them. Sometimes one has to “step back and look at the challenge” before it can be “beat.” Randy also talks about trying to balance “pushing” students too hard and acknowledging their achievements. His physicality is manifested in his efforts to “get his ideas across” by modeling for students. In one of his videos, instead of explaining how he wanted students to play a glissando, he repeatedly sang how
it should sound, embellishing the sound with arm, hand, and body movements. Randy also sees his role as a life-coach of sorts. He wants to help students learn to face challenges they encounter in music class so they will be better able to face life’s challenges. He believes students should be “open-minded” about learning.

Randy, like Adam, used to story himself teaching secondary ensembles only because he could not imagine himself being able to connect to elementary students. He thought it “would be hard to take charge of so many young children” or get them to “follow his wishes.” He discovered, however, that he is capable of teaching them—capable of providing “structure and encouragement,” and capable of “figuring out” the steps required to make challenging concepts and skills easy to achieve. Now, his story includes the possibility of teaching young children.

I thought it would be hard to take charge of so many young children, especially because I thought that in the past I was unable to connect to such younger children. Turns out all they need is encouragement and some structure in the classroom. Also, I never knew I could have so much fun with this age group, and I am now re-thinking what age group I would like to teach. (E.2.2)

Sue

**Background.** I had met Sue prior to her participation in this study, but had not interacted with her as a graduate assistant or instructor. Sue completed her elementary placement first, followed by her secondary placement. She chose a seventh-grade general music class for her secondary VRA, and a Kindergarten general music class for her elementary VRA. She turned in one VRW for each placement, with no corresponding videos or lesson plans.

**Story to Live By.** Sue cares passionately about music and her students. She hopes to inspire all her students to “fall in love with music.” She wants to touch peoples’
lives and teach them “life-lessons.” She “wake[s] up every single day thinking I can take
over the music world and change the lives of my students.” Sue tries to make her
students feel “connected” to what they are learning because she believes they need to care
about what they are learning to want to pay attention. She strives to make her lessons
“somehow pertain” to students’ lives. Sue believes that students “deserve” to learn music
“correctly,” meaning, she should use correct teaching procedures.

Sue wants to inspire students to care about music and learning, to be “willing to
try.” She also wants to be “realistic.” She wants to assert control over students’ behavior
regardless of whether they care about music and learning (i.e., if they “refuse to help
themselves learn a little bit about music”). She uses proximity to “make [her] presence
known,” and communicate to students that she is “not messing around” when she tells
them “to stop being disrespectful and to quiet down.” In Sue’s parallel roles, she is
powerful in two ways—as inspiration and enforcer.

Tricia

Background. Though I met Tricia at the beginning of this study, we each knew
who the other was before beginning this study. My general impression of Tricia prior to
this study was that she was pleasant, polite, conscientious, and straightforward. Tricia
completed her elementary placement first, followed by her secondary placement. She
chose two fifth-grade general music classes learning the same lesson plan for her
elementary VRA; she chose two rehearsals of a middle school string ensemble for her
secondary VRA. She turned in two VRWs for each placement with corresponding
videos, but no lesson plans. Tricia’s university supervisor observed her teach the fifth-
grade class she video recorded for the VRA. During the semester, I happened to see
Tricia in the hallway at the University before seminar class. She remarked that she did not like the format of the VRW. She thought it would be more valuable to choose a general topic on which to write, such as classroom management or lesson planning, rather than a specific moment or event. She believed it would have been much more useful for her, and that the wording “moment or event” did not mean much to her.

**Story to Live By.** Tricia is a confident and efficient musical leader. Her lessons run like “well-oiled machines.” Tricia strives to “think of possible pitfalls” inherent in activities so she can “take a pro-active [sic] approach” to planning and avoid them. This includes anticipating when students will need “specific instructions” and “guidance” for a task. If she plans well enough, her students will be able to follow her directions quickly and quietly. Knowing something about her students outside of music (e.g., standardized test scores) helps Tricia “draw from the experiences of the students” to “personalize” lessons so they will be “engaged in the material.” Tricia thinks it is important to take time “out of her lesson[s]” to “integrate core curricular subject matter,” such as math or social studies. She constructs and executes lessons “to keep the momentum and flow . . . going forward.”

If activities do not run according to Tricia’s plan (the way she anticipates), she feels as though the class is in “chaos” and “spinning out of control.” Tricia learns quickly what activities are “ineffective and hard to manage” or that “waste instructional time,” and she removes those time-wasting activities from her teaching repertoire. Tricia had difficulty anticipating what she would need to work on when directing ensembles in her secondary placement. The following two quotes illustrate this difficulty.
I had some ideas as to what the group needed to work on while I was observing, but when I got on the podium . . . . many concepts came to mind and I had a hard time deciding which to address first, if at all [sic]. Making a list of important concepts to address before a rehearsal starts is difficult for me because I believe I do better thinking on my feet in a rehearsal setting. I originally had ideas and a plan of action, but I got side tracked. (S.2.1)

I tried to push the tempo in the [sic] “Cripple Creek” . . . . I initially used a metronome (like Mr. Greenly), and resorted to clapping. I did minimal conducting because I had not seen Mr. Greenly conduct this ensemble (I didn’t know if they knew what a pattern meant!). (S.1.1)

Tricia felt “uneasy” about her lessons because she had difficulty anticipating what she would need to do. She realizes that “a defined lesson plan,” in an ensemble context, is “not really the most efficient tool” for teaching. She learned what to do from these experiences: plan in less detail, and “wing it,” or decide what to do “on [her] feet.” This method of planning lets Tricia prepare for any possibility, and maintain her identity as a confident and efficient leader.

Wendy

Background. I was a teaching assistant in a class Wendy took, and we were both students in a combined graduate and undergraduate course prior to her participation in this study. My impression of Wendy was that she was quiet, a bit shy, conscientious, and hard-working. She and I occasionally had conversations about teaching music outside of class. Wendy completed her elementary placement first, followed by her secondary placement. She chose two sections of middle school general music that occurred two weeks apart for her VRA. She turned in no VRA materials for her elementary placement, and two VRWs with corresponding videos for her secondary placement.

Story to Live By. Wendy tries to be conscientious about teaching and aware of herself and her students in the classroom. She thinks it is important to “involve the
students by asking questions and having them play” for her, rather than stand in front and lecture. She “concentrat[es] very hard on pacing” her instruction, and tries to keep her explanations “clear and concise” so “everyone, not just the fast-paced students, can understand them.” Believes she should be calm and confident when teaching, and sees her pacing and rate of speech as indicators of how “nervous or unsure” she is feeling. Wendy hopes her students like her and enjoy her class; she wants them to listen to her and “value [her] directions and explanations.”

Zeb

**Background.** I was a teaching assistant in two classes Zeb took prior to his participation in this study. I knew him to be intelligent, conscientious, quiet but not shy, and generally nice. We often said hello outside of class. Zeb completed his elementary placement first, followed by his secondary placement. Zeb’s elementary placement was in a K-8 school, which I mention because he chose one seventh- and one eighth-grade general music class for his elementary VRA; however, grades seven and eight are generally classified at the secondary level. All other participants who were placed in K-8 schools chose lower grades (Kindergarten through fifth) for their VRAs—grades generally classified as elementary. For his secondary VRA, Zeb chose two lessons he taught to a high school theory class. He turned in two VRWs for each placement with corresponding videos, but no lesson plans.

**Story to Live By.** Zeb strives to engage his students by presenting interesting content. He sees himself as the knowledgeable authority in front of the group, presenting topics in which he is an expert. As an expert, he is able to, and frequently does, stray from the text to “explain a concept in greater depth or simplicity.” Zeb feels “a great
Zeb believes teachers open students’ minds to new possibilities. To that end, his goal is to “have students do music in class, not just talk about it.” Doing music helps students “connect rules and notation with real-life every-day music: to extend class to life outside school.”

This was theory class’ first instrumental experience all semester, and I was very relieved and happy that most students were able to take something practical from a lesson . . . . I doubt that Brianna listens to much blues in her free time, but this experiential learning might open her mind to new possibilities. (S.1.1 & 2)

While Zeb does not expect students to know what he knows (or more than he knows), he does believe he should give students a “sense of ownership” over some aspects of their music education (especially when it comes to popular music). Therefore, he lets them “share their knowledge” about lesson topics, which “feeds their enthusiasm” for the new information he “presents them with” about the topics. Zeb is excited and fulfilled when he sees that his students’ are engaged in the content of his lessons and he sees that they understand (“I remember thinking ‘wow, they’re really getting it!’”).

Dominant Cultural Narratives

Cultural narratives explain social relationships between people and the role of things in a culture; they tell us who we are, who we have been, and who we can be (Lousley, 1999, Rappaport, 1995). Dominant cultural narratives are over-learned stories that are known by most members of a culture (Rappaport, 1995). They are represented in the mass media, and present in the social institutions touching the lives of
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most people in a culture. They form the backdrop for personal narratives. Dominant cultural narratives often illustrate stereotypes (ideas), but DCN are distinct from stereotypes because people enact them as they live their lives and create meaning from experiences (Rappaport, 1995). For example, the *dominant cultural narrative* of “adolescence” (in the United States) explains the traits of middle school students; they are lazy, rebellious, resistant to authority, and driven by hormones (Finders, 1998). Members of American culture understand this *dominant cultural narrative* of adolescence, even while recognizing variations on the narrative and allowing that personal (individual) narratives may run counter to the DCN.

The *dominant cultural narrative* of “teacher” allows for several archetypal identities, among them disciplinarian, knowledge possessor, romantic inspiration, nurturer, friend, judge, or bumbling incompetent (Latham et al., 2006, p. 149). The *dominant cultural narrative* of “school” revolves around hierarchy and conforming to social norms; it includes ideas such as respect for authority, regulation of behaviors and emotions, efficiency, and structured experiences (Lousley, 1999).

I have found little research specifically examining “dominant cultural narratives” that may exist in *music education*, or that may exist for music education within the institutional narrative of school. That I found few studies regarding dominant cultural narratives in music education may be due, in part, to inconsistent terminology. For example, Thompson, Campbell, and Barrett (2011) use a linguistic term for the tacit assumptions about teaching and learning—*the grammar of schooling* (p. 94); Barrett and Stauffer use simply “cultural narrative” or cultural discourse, but do not define what they might be in music education. Brewer (2010) references the educational, cultural, and
political *agenda* of school when recounting his experiences in the music-teacher-as-gatekeeper role. All of these terms could represent facets of dominant cultural narratives of music education.

Thompson and Campbell’s (2003) *root metaphors* for music teacher archetypes represent aspects of cultural narratives. For example, *production* metaphors (teacher as authoritative transmitter-of-knowledge) seem to align with traditional, dominant cultural narratives of school; *growth* metaphors (teacher as tireless, selfless change-agent) and *travel* metaphors (teacher as knowledgeable guide) seem to align with counter narratives of school.

Clandinin (2009) asserts that educational disciplines are structured by their own dominant narratives, including music education. She notes three dominant narratives that emerged across several music education studies (see Barrett & Stauffer, 2009): 1) the institutional narrative of marginalized music education, “in which music teachers do not have classrooms and have meager resources” (p. 204); 2) a “dominant cultural narrative of music education as a process of teaching musical skills and concepts” (p. 204); and 3) the counter-narrative of one teacher who “foregrounds communication and social skills” (p. 205) within a curriculum built around musical skills and concepts. Participants in the present study aligned themselves with or against *dominant cultural narrative* plot lines along a continuum; some aligned closely (*enactors*), some in opposition (*enacting counter-narratives*), others somewhere in between (*along the continuum*).

As you read my characterizations of participants with regard to dominant cultural narratives and counter-narratives, please keep in mind my self-characterization with regard to dominant cultural narratives. I story my teacher identity as a counter-narrative;
and my own metaphor for teaching music is represented in Thompson and Campbell’s (2003) travel metaphor. My identity as counter-narrative-enactor is rooted in my experiences and beliefs regarding social justice and my feminist worldview. I regard traditional, dominant cultural narratives of school as negative and oppressive to students because they “privilege the teacher and subject matter over the student” (Thompson & Campbell, 2003, p. 52). Because my counter-narrative music teacher identity is the lens through which I view and make sense of participants’ stories and sense-making, my characterizations of participants are colored by my voice as counter-narrative-enactor. Others might not view dominant cultural narratives as negative and counter-narratives as positive; however, I hope to portray here that differences do exist between and among participants in the ways they characterize students, students’ behaviors, and learning; and I posit that those ways of characterizing influenced what and how participants learned about teaching during the internship.

**Dominant-Cultural-Narrative Enactors**

Four participants, Tricia, Bob, Jenny, and Zeb, enact dominant cultural narratives of school in their stories to live by, particularly the ideas of the teacher as possessor-of-knowledge, and as the authority who is in control of the classroom. Enacting these narratives in practice during the internship may impede student teachers’ professional growth because they may see no reason to change their unsuccessful practices; and change is necessary for growth. When student teachers are unsuccessful in the classroom, they may blame others or defend their behaviors rather than consider different perspectives that might lead to successful changes. Words that emerged as clues that participants enacted *dominant cultural narratives* in their teaching practice were: respect,
authority, control, rude, strict, smooth, proper, life-lesson(s), give up, effort, motivated or unmotivated, make a scene, serious, waste of time, and efficient. Participants who enacted dominant cultural narratives may hold production metaphors or growth metaphors for teaching music (Thompson & Campbell, 2003).

Zeb stories himself as an authority who delivers “content” and “presents” “new information” to students. He believes he should “remove . . . impediments from [students’] paths” to learning. The impediments he mentions are “lethargy,” and confusion (they are “bemused”). While he acknowledges some students might be “motivated learners,” he explains the seventh-grade students he has are “slackers or average students.” Control emerges in Zeb’s story in his desire to have the “power to control” all aspects of his lessons. I believe Zeb thinks his cooperating teacher (secondary placement) is sub-par when it comes to “doing” music, and because Zeb has to work within the system of his placement, he does not have the power to control everything. Zeb also mentions how he “strayed from the text’s sequence to explain a concept in greater depth or simplicity” (“many times”). His authority as the possessor-of-knowledge extends to the textbook; he seems proud of his ability to stray from the text.

Bob, as an authority, also enacts the dominant cultural narrative of school. In his VRWs, he controls (or wants to control) both how he appears to others, and student behavior. He is “quite embarrassed” when things do not go well “because [he] was being observed,” and proves his professionalism when he realizes his mistake “in the front of the room” but keeps teaching as if he was not mistaken. When students play xylophones when they should not be playing, he says, “it is difficult to have control over 25 students who have only had you two [sic] previous classes.” In other words, he knows that seeing
students more often would facilitate control. He stories two other techniques he “would” use “if [he] were to have a music classroom.” One is proximity. He “would never have traditional rows of seats” because students would be “sitting twenty to twenty-five seats away,” as they are in his cooperating teacher’s classroom. Another technique is having a non-verbal signal “that causes the students to stop playing and stops the extraneous noise.”

Likewise, control emerged as important in Tricia’s VRWs. She seems to pride herself on detailed, thoughtful planning, in which she considers every contingency and makes sure everything will follow her expectations for the lesson. When “something [she] was not expecting to happen” happened in one elementary lesson, she stories it as “chaos” and “spinning out of control.” She writes five times on the VRW for the lesson how she “didn’t know” that she should have given more “specific instructions . . . or guidance” for the activity. She says her lack of instructions caused “a major pitfall” in the lesson and made it “backfire on [her].” She even stories the reason her cooperating teacher got up to help students at that moment as “attempting to regain control.”

Jenny enacts the story of authority and control by emphasizing hierarchy. When students talk and go in and out of the classroom without permission, when they should be listening to her, she says “the students feel as if they have free reign in the music wing” and that they are “disrespecting [her] as an authority.” When students struggle with activities, she continually stories the same three reasons for their struggles, two of which are behavioral. 1) Students are not trying because they do “not tak[e] the activity seriously”; 2) they “chicken-out too easily” and do not succeed for lack of effort; and 3) they are trying, but do not understand what they are supposed to do. Jenny believes
students need to be “made aware of the fact that they are being evaluated,” which will motivate students to “participate and do well.” In other words, she will use assessment as reward and punishment for behavior. Throughout her VRWs, Jenny tries to align her reality with her dominant-cultural-narrative story to live by, saying she “needs to take more charge of the classroom and really make my expectations known so that the students are quieter and better behaved.”

**Enacting Counter-Narratives**

The biggest clue that participants enacted stories to live by counter to dominant cultural narratives was the absence of the clue words used by participants who enacted them. These participants’ tone was generally non-critical or non-judgmental when storying students’ behaviors and learning. Participants who enacted counter narratives may hold growth or travel metaphors for teaching music (Thompson & Campbell, 2003). Participants’ counter-narratives can be illustrated by contrasting them with other participants’ interpretations of similar events. This contrast is particularly distinct in three participants’ narratives: Drew, Joe, and Randy.

Drew generally stories students’ behaviors neutrally. When “several of the kids got out of their seats” in his elementary listening lesson, they did so “to move to the music.” He goes on to describe how he did not “react” to the kids—meaning he did not take advantage of the opportunity to incorporate movement. Rather than reference the DCN rule that students should sit still and only move with permission, he realizes the students were demonstrating their understanding through movement, and folds the idea into his *story to live by*. Contrast the way Bob stories a girl who calls out that she cannot hear him: she is rude. She broke the same rule as Drew’s students—she did not raise her
hand and ask permission to speak. Bob and Drew story similar events in quite different ways, perhaps because they enact the dominant cultural narrative of school differently.

Randy never uses the word “control.” Instead, he wants his students to “respond to” his “wishes” for lessons. He wants them to learn correct information, but he uses the word “accurate” rather than “correct.” While the two words are synonyms, “accurate” refers to careful execution while “correct” refers to exact product, which is a subtle, but perhaps important, distinction. When Randy describes students’ behaviors, he seems unconcerned with judging them “good” or “bad.” When his student walks away from a lesson during a difficult exercise, Randy says the student is “upset” and “discouraged,” but does not say the student gave up.

Randy stories students who felt “comfortable sharing their ideas” during a discussion “open-minded,” which is value-laden, but the students who did not share were “more reserved,” which is not value-laden. Students who cannot play the glissando correctly do not make a mistake or play it wrong, they are “[un]aware of what they should be listening for and how it should sound.” Contrast how Zeb and James story similar events. When only one student raises his hand to answer a question, Zeb says the other students are “being slow or lazy,” are “bemused” by his question, and are “[un]motivated learners.” When “one set of students messed [the dance] up and threw everyone else off again into the wolves,” James concludes that they are not “capable of achieving” what he thinks “they should be able to achieve.”

Consider Joe’s story of events from his secondary VRWs. When his students’ “shoulders slump” after struggling with a passage repeatedly, he says they are “bored.”
“cultivated interest and helped the students advance.” Contrast how Jenny stories a similar event. When her students struggle repeatedly with a piece, she says it shows students’ “lack of focus and . . . familiarity,” which she “tried to fix” by getting students to “listen carefully and duplicate exactly what [she] did.” Rather than consider different ways to teach the piece to “these students,” she stories a successful resolution impossible.

Drew, Joe, and Randy make no statements that lead me to believe they actively reject dominant cultural narratives, but they consistently interpret events and behaviors non-critically. Their interpretations seem counter to enacting dominant cultural narratives because they seem to story student actions separate from character judgment. Student actions do have value in that Drew, Joe, and Randy learned from them what their students needed, or how to change their practice; but, at least on their VRWs, they did not attribute student actions to good or bad character traits.

**Along the Continuum**

Five participants, Sue, James, Adam, Nick, and Deena, seemed to sometimes enact, and sometimes refrain from enacting dominant cultural narratives of school in their stories to live by. Their VRWs sometimes contained DCN clue-words and critical tone, and sometimes the clue words and critical tone were absent.

Sue’s story to live by relative to the DCN of school seems dualistic. Sue writes at length about inspiring students, which seems to illustrate Thompson and Campbell’s (2003) *growth* metaphor—that of a tireless, selfless agent of change. She wants to “have that super power” to “to touch and change every student” and make them “fall in love with music.” She wants to teach students important life-lessons, saying, “While they do not need to love the music they do need to respect their classmates and also myself”
because that is a life lesson.” When Sue writes about more “realistic” concerns, however, her language reveals dominant cultural narrative themes in which knowledge is fixed, the teacher specifies the ends and the means of learning, and teacher efficiency and control are necessary—Thompson and Campbell’s production metaphor (though Sue’s motivation to inspire students is still present). She believes that “students deserve to learn . . . music correctly” (i.e., there is one correct way). She stories herself and her students as adversaries in a battle, another cultural narrative associated with authority and control; she “fight[s] with them for the attention of the class.”

On the one hand, in Sue’s philosophical story to live by, she wants to inspire students to care about music and learning [Thompson & Campbell’s (2003) growth metaphor]. On the other hand, in Sue’s lived, realistic story to live by, she wants to assert control over students’ behavior for the sake of efficiency and classroom management [Thompson & Campbell’s (2003) production metaphor]. Those two stories to live by illustrate dominant and counter cultural narratives, which could cause dilemmas for Sue as she makes sense of her experiences in the classroom.

James’ language appeared, at the outset, to be completely negative, and harshly judgmental of students. He begins each VRW with emotional descriptions of events, in what seem to be tirades of incredulity. However, in each VRW, as James moves beyond description to interpretation, he seems to shift his perspective and shed his emotional tone, and his negativity lessens. His judgmental tone at first caused me to story him situated firmly in the dominant cultural narrative.

In one elementary VRW, James is mystified by a class that cannot remember the steps to a dance. He says there is “no rhyme or reason” for it because other classes were
able to remember. Searching for an explanation, he adds, “there weren’t even that many kids with an IEP in the class!” In other words, he believes the cultural narrative that students with special needs can impede group success. He is “flabbergasted” that one special needs student, “who is normally out of hand,” is “so in control,” more so than the students without an IEP. James shifts his perspective, however, acknowledging that he needs to be willing to adjust his expectations based on his students’ present abilities.

In a secondary VRW, James says that a student, Markus, was the “biggest culprit” in making a mistake. A culprit is responsible for a crime or misdeed, which implies an intent to offend (students are antagonistic). When James tried to “joke” with Markus to get him to conform, Markus gets upset. James says Markus “took it the wrong way”; that he “decided to be insulted and chose not to participate for the rest of the class.” Again, James shifts his perspective. He acknowledges that he needs to “understand the kids before going into the class” so he will “know the right procedures” to “handle” any “situation” that may arise. His negativity turns into regret that he offended a student and he accepts responsibility for his words.

Deena seemed more closely aligned with dominant cultural narratives of school in her secondary placement. Her reaction to a student’s emotional outburst during an activity is, “c’mon Antony, you don’t have to make a big scene about it.” She seems to be less bothered by his complaint that he “just couldn’t do solfege” without writing in the syllables, and more bothered by the way he complained—by making a scene. She goes on to describe how “these students” are “constantly” complaining that “the basics” are too hard. Deena’s statements about “these students” indolent attitudes reflect the dominant cultural narrative of adolescence—they are lazy, rebellious, and resistant to
authority (Finders, 1998). In her elementary placement, however, Deena uses less critical language to story students’ behaviors, and seems to take responsibility for their behaviors. When her students are unsuccessful with activities, she says they “didn’t understand” her directions and that she “had a hard time getting her point across.”

Adam values efficiency. Efficiency is one of the clues to enacting dominant cultural narratives, and indicates he might hold a production metaphor for teaching music (Thompson & Campbell, 2003). Adam uses efficiency, to a certain extent, to gauge his effectiveness as a teacher. He says he chose a moment of success for his secondary VRW (over other moments in the class) because “there wasn’t much else that went on that stuck out in [his] mind.” In other words, the lesson proceeded according to his plan; no time was wasted and nothing surprising happened. He concludes that he would not change anything if he taught the lesson again because it “went smoothly and efficiently.”

Adam uses the language of ownership when describing classroom events, which aligns with the control aspect of the dominant cultural narrative. He has “several ‘tiers’ of difficulty in [his] iTunes, and [his] finalists managed to outlast even the most difficult ones [he] sent their way.” The finalists, the game, and the level of difficulty are his. Adam also describes teaching as “transferring ideas” to students, which represents the teacher-as-possessor-of-knowledge aspect of the dominant cultural narrative. Otherwise, Adam uses non-critical language to describe student behaviors and learning. He believes if he can “find the proper method” to teach, students “can learn anything.” Even though the “strum patterns and chord changes had finally [emphasis added] locked in,” he stories that students “[learned] what [he] wanted”; they were “both together and enjoying themselves.” He stories the event as success through
perseverance, with no apparent frustration that it took so long. Contrast James’ incredulity over the time it took his students to learn a dance. James says, “It took most of the class for the kids to really comprehend the task at hand. What do I remember thinking?? WILL THEY EVER GET THIS??!?!?”

Nick, like Deena (in her elementary placement), uses non-critical language to story students’ behaviors, and seems to take responsibility for them. When students are unable to sing what he wants them to, he says they were “shell-shocked” because he “talked too much” and “threw too much information at them.” When singers half-heartedly participated in a warm-up, he says it is because he “executed” it “poorly.” When he feels “a disconnect” from the class, he says “their engagement lessened” rather than “they checked out” (i.e., he was not engaging). Statements like these add an element of selflessness to Nick’s story, which represents Thompson and Campbell’s (2003) growth metaphor. Nick’s non-judgmental language caused me to story him aligned counter to dominant cultural narratives (the opposite of my impression of James).

Upon deeper examination of Nick’s VRWs, hidden aspects of the dominant cultural narrative emerged, namely, control and authority. Nick’s authority is that he is the author of the story of each lesson, and the success of each lesson depends entirely on his execution of the story (if he is engaging, he controls the unfolding narrative). When considering the disconnect from his students, he says he “needed . . . to shut up and start making music and things would more naturally fall into place.” The reason his students were unable to sing what he wanted was because he “prevented them from audiating.” The singers’ unwillingness to participate in the warm-up was because he “wasn’t . . . energetic and excited to be there.” Nick’s focus is entirely on himself, and he only refers
to his students as “them,” “they,” “the class,” or by their grade level (e.g., fifth grade, freshmen).

**Lived Cultural Narratives.** While several participants lived out dominant cultural narratives of authority, control, and hierarchy, and others lived out counter-narratives, each enacted the narratives through different means. Some were hyper-prepared (e.g., Tricia), some used proximity (e.g., Bob, Sue), some through awareness (e.g., Drew, Joe). At least one participant (Jenny) projected her dominant cultural narrative onto students; they refused to enact her vision of the narrative, and she dismissed them from her learning.

One may consider Zeb, Bob, Tricia, and Jenny’s dominant-cultural-narrative-aligned plots inherently negative; Joe, Drew, and Randy’s plots inherently positive; and consider Deena, Sue, Adam, and Nick’s plots somewhere between negative and positive. I believe it may be important here to inform the reader (and remind myself), that aligning with the dominant cultural narrative, while it may cultivate an air of negativity, is not inherently bad. Similarly, aligning away from the dominant cultural narrative is not inherently good. I found evidence in nearly all participants’ VRWs that they are motivated by the best intentions. (I also note a lack of evidence for good intentions is not proof of bad intentions.) Zeb wants to help students develop knowledge about music and the skills to perform music; in her efforts to plan for every contingency and control all aspects of her lessons, Tricia wants to remove all obstacles to learning and set her students up to succeed; and Jenny wants to help her students become truly “knowledgeable” musicians with a wide range of experiences and skills. Likewise, Drew wants his students to develop musical self-awareness; Randy wants to help his students
learn to tackle any challenge; and Joe hopes to excite his students to learn more about music. No less, Sue wants to pass on her passion for music; Deena wants students to work hard to succeed; Adam wants his students to develop skills to understand the music they know and enjoy; and Nick wants his students to understand they can have a relationship with music.

The participants in this study strive to engage, inspire, and excite students, and teach music to the best of their abilities. Regardless of where participants align on the continuum of the dominant cultural narrative, they want students to succeed, and they feel proud when students do succeed. What is apparent from participants’ stories of classroom events is that they made sense of who they are and who they can be, understood their relationships with students and cooperating teachers, and defined their roles as music teachers through lenses colored by cultural narratives.

**Role as Musician-Teachers**

Four sub-plots seem to run through participants’ roles as musician-teachers:

*“real” music, same wavelength, teacher-artist, and conductor-as-musician.*

**“Real” Music**

Several participants seemed to story their role as somehow connecting students to “real” music, which took several forms. Jenny believes classical music is real music, and stated her intentions to make the connection for her students outright.

I think that the students need more help making connections to the purpose of an activity, and seeing the relationship between music class activities and “real,” classical music . . . . the point of reading a selection drawn from classical music is for the students to make the connection . . . . that these rhythms do occur in classical music and are not isolated elements of the elementary music classroom. (E.2.3 & 4)
Other participants strive to elevate their students’ musicality or musical tastes and open students’ minds to music, as if their students are somehow closed-minded about music participants considered real. It seems a small leap to say participants intimate the music students are generally open-minded about (i.e., popular music) is somehow lowly, or inferior to classical music or some genre other than “pop” music. Joe states the sentiment overtly: “my basic goal as a music teacher is to make my students enjoy music on a higher level.” Sue tries to connect the blues with music her students like to listen to.

A few of the students were failing to make the connection that the music they listen to was created through the movement of blues music. Although I had told them many times . . . . Next time I teach the lesson I will most certainly try and incorporate more aspects of current music into the later [sic] music I am talking about so that I will not lose the two boys to their talking. (S.1.1 & 5)

**Same Wavelength**

While “real” music is about elevating students’ musical interests or connecting them to something other than popular music, *same wavelength* is about the music teacher understanding and validating students’ musical interests. The heading “same wavelength” comes from Adam’s own words in his secondary VRW (an emic code). He writes at length about choosing music that is age-appropriate as the “proper outlet and method” to engage students.

By playing songs like “Jack and Diane”, I both prove to the kids that I’m on the same musical wavelength as they are, and that they themselves can play along with songs they know and enjoy. (S.1.4)

Other participants present *all* music as engaging and worthwhile; they try to recruit students’ interest in whatever music they choose to use in the classroom. For example, when Joe presents a song to his elementary class, he “introduce[s] the tune as ‘really cool’ and play[s] it quietly so that the students [will] lean forward and listen.”
Some participants try to connect with their students as members of the same discourse (“musician”). They want to share what it means to be a musician, and help their students learn musician understandings (be on the same wavelength). Nick states, “one of things [he] really want[s] [his] freshman to experience is a lessening of self-consciousness necessary for all good singing,” and he “liked the idea of taking a song, introducing the idea that language makes singing different, that they were different (and musicians) because they had sung so much.” Another example occurs when Randy realizes his students are unaware of how to play a glissando, and he helps students become “aware” of what it should sound like.

**Teacher-Artist**

Several participants seemed to realize that teaching skills and musical skills are separate. They ascribe artistry to teaching in much the same way they would ascribe artistry to performing music; musicians must engage their audience with their playing; and a good musician draws the audience into the performance, in a sense getting them to “do” what they want. The idea that teaching is performing drives the teacher-artist subplot. Joe says, “I’ve learned that engaging the students is often a subtle art in which dynamic changes, eye contact and myriad strategies need to be employed.” Adam realizes that, although he has students who “can outplay [him]” on an instrument that is “not [his] forte” he “can still connect with students and have them learn.” James realizes that, “once everything is happening, it is much tougher . . . to focus and be correct,” and that he needs to practice the teaching skills as well as the musical skills (breaking the dance into smaller steps is the teaching skill; doing the dance steps is the musical skill). In all four VRWs, Nick mentions how he needs to “practice” the lesson plan. Zeb writes
that he needs to “hone [his] delivery” and realizes his “content” can be “compromised” by “dull or unpolished delivery” (i.e., lackluster performance).

**Conductor-as-Musician**

The conductor-as-musician sub-plot occurs in secondary placements for the most part. It seems some participants either consider themselves a part of their ensembles, or consider the ensemble their instrument. They use personal (I) or inclusive (we) pronouns to describe ensemble performances. Participants believe secondary musicians are advanced players, possibly near musical equals to themselves; secondary musicians should be able to do and understand the “basics” (as defined by the participant). Teachers should not “baby” them by letting them do easy things, but should have high standards for achievement. Often, participants become frustrated when they cannot get the ensemble to play the way they want them to play. Tricia tries to (get the ensemble to) play with rubato.

I tried running through the piece as much as possible, but inevitably ended up stopping for various reasons . . . . this disables the ability to do any sort of rubato or musical phrasing, which I wanted to implement . . . . This was the first time I really tried pushing the tempo on the ensemble, and I was frustrated by the fact that they could not handle the tempo right away. (S.1.1-2)

Deena wants (her class to) sight-sing using solfege syllables.

*We* [emphasis added] were sight-singing at excerpt in solfege. When we got two measures into *[sic]*, Antony stood up and announced that he just couldn’t do solfege and had to right *[sic]* it in . . . . *I* [emphasis added] went on to practice a few more sight-singing exercises without giving them time to write in the syllables. (S.1.1 & 3)

Another time, Deena’s percussionist incorrectly plays something she had already practiced (with him).
We [emphasis added] got to the percussion feature of Variations on a Korean Folk Song. I [emphasis added] had worked on each percussionist’s part individually . . . I will make sure that I have a percussion sectional before the next rehearsal so we do not have to spend a ton of time on that part of the piece while the wind players are sitting out. (S.2.1 & 5)

Other participants kept themselves separate from their ensembles, but still became frustrated by their lack of success. Perhaps this relates to the control expert musicians may feel over their own success (in the sense of being responsible for one’s own success through effort and practice). Participants believe the ensemble should be able to do what they want, when they want it done (i.e., immediately). Jenny laments that her students are unsuccessful with a warm-up and piece in 7/8 meter, and states that they could be successful if they watch her and copy her exactly.

Conflicting Stories

Three types of conflicting stories emerged in the VRWs of seven out of thirteen participants, which are delineated by the location of the conflict, and who tells the conflicting story. One type of conflict emerged between preconceived and lived stories of teaching told by participants’ themselves (internal-self). A second type of conflict emerged between participants’ self-stories of philosophy-in-practice, and their perception of their cooperating teachers’ philosophies-in-practice (internal-other). A third type of conflict emerged between participants’ stories of classroom events and their cooperating teachers’ stories of those events (external-other).

Internal-Self

Wendy, Jenny, and Nick storied internal-self-conflicts when their lived stories of teaching—what they saw on their videos—bumped (Clandinin, 2009) against their preconceived stories of themselves as teachers. Wendy saw and heard herself talking too
fast while teaching; Jenny saw and heard her students “disrespecting” her as an authority; and Nick saw and heard himself spending too much time talking instead of making music, and lacking a “core” of energy and excitement. Each searched for reasons why the discrepancies existed between their image of themselves and their reality. Wendy’s fast rate of speech, which two weeks later became her rushed pace of teaching, was due to being “nervous or unsure” of herself. The disrespect Jenny felt from her students was due to their character (“chickening out” or being “silly”), or to the context of her internship, in which she had to conform to her cooperating teachers’ classroom management style. Nick’s talking was due to lack of rehearsal, causing him to have to “vamp” because he could not remember the lesson sequence, and he lacked energy because he had “suffered an injury,” the room was cold, and he was “clearly just beat.”

**Internal-Other**

Tricia and Zeb storied *internal-other* conflicts between their preconceived stories of teaching and their cooperating teachers practices. The conflicts are internal because it was unclear whether they discussed the conflicts with their cooperating teachers. Tricia describes how her cooperating teacher “disables” her ability to “implement” the expression she wanted with the ensemble. Her tone reveals her frustration. For a teacher who values control, being disabled by something beyond her control created a *bumping place* with her cooperating teacher’s practice. Zeb continually returns to the theme of “doing” music. He says, “having students do music in class, not just talk about it [represents] my goal in teaching [this class]: to connect rules and notation with real-life every-day music.” Zeb emphasizes that doing music is *his* goal. He adds, “this was [the] class’ first instrumental experience all semester.” Since the lesson took place near the
end of the school year, Zeb intimates his cooperating teacher does not “do” music in the class; connecting rules and notation with “real” music is not his cooperating teacher’s goal. The difference in Zeb’s preconceived goal of teaching and his perception of his cooperating teacher’s goal created a *bumping place* with his cooperating teacher’s practice.

**External-Other**

Drew and Sue storied *external-other* conflicts. Both chose lessons for their VRAs in which their cooperating teachers storied their teaching differently than they did. Sue experiences conflict when she decides to skip a step in teaching a song to her students. She says, “the students learned the song very well.” Sue thought the students sang the correct pitches with “solid rhythms,” and even confirmed her assessment when watching the video. She contradicts her assessment of the lesson by following each success statement with an exception (“but” or “however”). She “feel[s] that [she] did not execute the lesson and the song in the best way possible” because she “skipped crucial steps” while teaching the song. She says her decision to skip a step “backfired” on her, implying she was wrong to skip a step. However, she does not describe *how* it backfired on her, or how skipping “crucial steps” impeded students’ learning. She admonishes herself: “I need to always remember the simple steps that truly make teaching the songs work. I need to always follow the procedure so that the students can benefit.” Sue’s self-contradictions suggest her cooperating teacher storied her teaching differently than Sue did: she should have followed the procedure without skipping a step. Another interpretation might be that Sue’s cooperating teacher saw or heard mistakes in the students’ performance that Sue did not hear. It is clear she checked her understanding
when she watched the video; perhaps she is mystified, and decides she should just take her cooperating teacher’s word for her mistake. In either scenario, Sue’s story of the lesson *bumped* against her cooperating teacher’s story of the lesson.

Two of Drew’s VRWs indicate *overt* conflicts. These two conflicts represent Drew’s only mention of dominant-cultural-narrative language (“comply,” “strict,” and “control”). In one elementary VRW, he asked a student to sing alone. Drew says, “the student complied” and could “sing on pitch and with confidence.” In addition, the rest of the class “sung [sic] the response . . . on pitch,” and “they sung [sic] at the correct time.” In other words, Drew stories the lesson successful; however, it seems his cooperating teacher restories the lesson as a potentially bad situation. She sees the possibility that the student might not comply, but instead refuse to do the task. The contrast seems to shake Drew up because he says he chose the moment because he “should have read the class and picked up on this fact.” (“Reading the class” is a major theme in Drew’s VRWs.) His story of the lesson changes. Now, he says he is “lucky [emphasis added] that the student answered without resistance,” and adds that he “should have” asked a group to sing the part “before moving to individual students.” In other words, his initial “read” of the class was incorrect, so he makes a rule so he can avoid the possibility of a bad situation in the future. Drew’s story of the lesson *bumped* against his cooperating teacher’s story of the lesson.

In Drew’s secondary placement, a contrast between his and his cooperating teacher’s stories to live by emerges with regard to classroom management. Drew describes the Moment as follows.
I took a few minutes after I had announced the run of the piece to even get the piece started. This directly contradicted the whole point of “focus” that I had been trying to get across to the ensemble in my previous lessons and I should have just said “let’s run it” and given the downbeat. (S.2.1)

When Drew explains why he chose that moment, the first thing he does is reference his cooperating teacher. He says he and “Mr. Miller . . . had been discussing strategies for classroom management.” Drew does not directly mention his cooperating teachers in his other three VRWs. Drew’s description of this lesson is unique among his VRWs in another way: he hedges on possible changes. Drew is usually direct and confident when he says he “need[s] to incorporate” ideas of which he is now “aware.” He says he “will” change the next time he teaches each lesson. Here, Drew says he needs “to practice what [he] preach[es] . . . if [emphasis added] [he] want[s] to get this message across to [his] students.” He says he “can [emphasis added] be more strict about keeping control of the class,” (which he contrasts with “balance”) and he will “try [emphasis added] and keep on top of” classroom management. The mention of Mr. Miller and the way Drew hedges on changes he will make in the lesson suggest Drew’s story and Mr. Miller’s story bumped against each other and created conflict for Drew.

Positioning and Conflicting Stories

Problems sometimes arose out of conflict between participants’ storied identities and their cooperating teachers’ storied identities. Narratives of teacher identity are constructed personally and socially (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). Cooperating teachers, elementary and secondary students, administrators, and university supervisors position student teachers within the structure of each setting as much as student teachers position themselves (Danielewicz, 2001; Søreide, 2006). The social structure of the internship is
largely determined by the practices of each cooperating teacher, which are grounded in
his or her own story to live by. In the present study, the relative consonance or
dissonance between student teachers’ storied identities and cooperating teachers’ storied
identities emerged as an important factor in the ways participants positioned themselves
in the setting.

Student teachers’ relationships with their cooperating teachers are one of the most
important factors in determining what they learn from the internship about who they are
as teachers (Danielewicz, 2001; Smith, 2005). The relationship is “hierarchical and high-
stakes” (Smith, p. 52), as student teachers learn to negotiate who they can be in relation
to their cooperating teachers. When student teachers’ ideals directly oppose cooperating
teachers’ ideals, student teachers’ identities as teachers are called into question
(Danielewicz, 2001).
CHAPTER 5
REFLECTIONS AND BELIEFS

In this chapter, I detail the results of a cross-case analysis of 16 participants’ VRWs (45 VRWs in total). Six sections in this chapter feature the six categories that emerged from analyzing the questions on the VRWs: The Moment, Reasons, New Understandings, Plan to Change, I’ve learned, Evidence, and Philosophy. The first four categories (The Moment through Plan to Change) correspond with questions one through four on the Video Reflection Worksheet (VRW); the last three categories (I’ve learned, Evidence, and Philosophy) were present in answers to various questions on the VRW.

The Moment

When asked to “Choose a specific moment or event in the video that sticks in your mind” and “describe what happened,” most participants chose a single Moment from their lessons that involved an unexpected event caused by students. Less frequently, participants chose an issue that occurred throughout the lesson (interestingly, caused equally often by students and participants themselves). Three participants identified a single Moment and an issue within the same VRW. Some of the single Moments participants chose they only observed after the lesson (i.e., moments they were unaware of while teaching). In these instances, participants either noticed the Moment themselves while watching the video, or their cooperating teacher pointed it out to them.

Of the single moments from a lesson, most were unexpected events occurring during an activity; and some represented the successful culmination of an activity. The issues occurring throughout a lesson consisted of specific behaviors. Moments participants chose are further delineated by who caused the Moment (said or did
something unexpected)—students or participant. Table 9 contains the number of Moments by type (*single-during, single-culminating, and issue*), and the number involving students and participants.

Table 9

*Number of Moments participants chose to write about on VRWs, by type*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Total # VRWs</th>
<th>Single</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>During</td>
<td>Culminating</td>
<td>Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deena</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2(^c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neeta</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhonda</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1(^b)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeb</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caused by Students</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>n/a(^d)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caused by Participants</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Three of Drew’s Moments he discovered after the lesson was over.
\(^b\) \(^c\) Discovered after the lesson was over.
\(^d\) All *single-culminating* events involved both students and participants.
Based on the moments chosen by participants, the VRWs did not evidence change in a single particular event or issue from one to the next, as I had expected. Instead, most participants chose completely different and often unrelated moments to write about in successive VRWs. This may be due to the fact that only a few participants completed the VRA in the way it was assigned. Student teachers were to video record the same lesson or class repeatedly, complete a VRW in between each video of the lesson, and turn in two video-VRW pairs (segments).

Because the two segments would contain the same participant, teaching the same lesson, I assumed student teachers would choose to write about the same moments, or at least related ones. However, of the seven participants who completed the VRA as assigned, only three (Joe, James, and Nick) chose the same or related Moments in the two segments of the same lesson. Joe chose a moment in which his ensemble struggled with playing a passage of a piece. In the first segment, he presented the problem; in the second segment, he resolved the problem. James chose a moment in which his students struggled to learn a dance. The first-segment class was able to learn the steps; the second-segment class was unable to learn the steps. Nick chose a Moment in which he talked a lot and his students’ engagement lessened for both segments.

Other participants who recorded the same lessons or classes chose different moments to write about on successive VRWs. Jenny, for example, chose a lesson in which she taught the same exercise to two classes (secondary). In the first VRW, she wrote about her difficulties with the exercise. In the second VRW, she wrote about classroom management issues.
Reasons

Question 2 on the VRW asked why student teachers chose a particular event or moment over others in the video. Participants provided clear answers in response to that question, and often supplemented in subsequent questions. Two codes emerged within this category, *success* and *failure*. Generally, participants who provided reasons for choosing successful moments referred to teaching techniques or strategies “working,” or figuring out what to do. Participants providing reasons for choosing failure moments often referred to unexpected events or not being able to figure out what to do. Participants stated nearly twice as many *failure* Reasons (32) than *success* Reasons (17).

Interestingly, female participants chose only three successful Moments, while male participants chose fourteen. Males also chose a greater total number of Moments on which to reflect, and nearly equal numbers of success and failure Moments. Females chose more than five times more negative Moments than positive. This is the only category is in which gender emerged as a possible influence. The auditor for the present study, Joanne, first suggested there might be gender differences in choice of *success* and *failure* Moments. Prior to meeting with her, I had considered gender differences in other ways, but none became apparent until I tallied *success* and *failure* Moments by gender. Figure 1 illustrates this finding, which was unexpected, but not surprising to me because of my background of social justice issues regarding gender. Due to the small number of participants (for quantitative data), this finding may not be generalizable to a larger population of music student teachers; it might, however, warrant further investigation.

Carter (2010) examined issues of gender in the identity of a female undergraduate composition major. He found gender influenced the composer’s initial development,
attitude toward competition, her view of herself as a composer, and her perception of
gender inequities. Green (1997) examined gender roles in the context of a school music
classroom. Green found that girls favored passive musical activities and boys favored
more individual, risk-taking activities.

Those gendered preferences might relate to the ways participants completed the
assignment and presented their experiences as positive or negative in the present study.
Female participants tended to choose only one moment or event from their videos, as
instructed, whereas male participants felt free to include more than one, regardless of
instructions—a subtly riskier move. As I previously stated, generalizing about gender
and moments student teachers notice from the present study may not be possible or
appropriate, given the small number of participants; however, because others have found
gendered differences in musical behaviors and preferences, further research into the topic
of noticing success and failure in music student teaching and gender might be warranted.

Participants used confident language when explaining their success. Many of the
Reasons seemed to confirm participants’ identities as teachers. Adam wrote, “I chose
this moment because this was absolute proof that what I had been doing was . . .
working.” James wrote, “it was really an awesome experience.” Joe wrote, “it . . . shows
how I can correct a problem.” Barb wrote, “after asking [the students] to listen first and
then tap with me, they tapped the correct rhythm.” Deena wrote, “I ultimately made the
right decision.” Zeb wrote, “This lesson confirmed many things I already knew.” Some
successes surprised participants, and expanded their teacher identities to include grade
levels or topics in which they did not story themselves teaching. Randy is one such
participant.
I enjoyed seeing the students learning something new and understanding it very quickly due to proper instruction on my part. I thought it would be hard . . . . to connect to such younger children . . . . I never knew I could have so much fun with this age group, and I am now re-thinking what age group I would like to teach. (Randy, E.2.2)

![Figure 1. Total number of Moments, and failure and success Moments by gender. Numbers above each bar represent the total number of moments for that bar.](image)

Some participants’ failures caused them to question their teacher identity. Many of James’ comments about teacher identity reveal that he already felt like a strong, capable teacher, but his experiences shook his confidence. He wrote, “This particular class made me feel like I have never taught anything before in my life!” Sometimes participants felt helpless or embarrassed because they did not know what to do or had lost control of the class. Bob wrote, “I felt helpless at this moment. I didn’t know what to do and was quite embarrassed.” Neeta wrote, “in that activity, I felt a loss of control.” Tricia wrote, “I remember feeling like things were spinning out of control.”
Sometimes participants were embarrassed because they were unaware of a problem while they were teaching. Participants were surprised that their perception of classroom events or their teaching behaviors did not align with their cooperating teachers’ perceptions or with what they saw on their videos. Participants became aware that their intentions and actions did not achieve the results they intended, or even the results they perceived while teaching.

I see myself on the video sometimes turning my head toward them and “seeing” the students entering or exiting, but I must have dismissed it in my mind because it never stood out to me before as much of an issue until I saw it on tape. (Jenny, S.2.1)

Some participants fell short of their own expectations by “missing” teaching opportunities or “settling” for less than success. Drew wrote, “I . . . should have taken this opportunity to do some movement,” but “I wasn’t aware enough to react and read the class so I didn’t make that choice here.” Joe wrote, “I should have just gone right back into singing the tune.” Nick writes, “I chose this moment because it highlights a missed teaching opportunity.” Jenny wrote, “I feel like I settled for the result I got.” Tricia noted how she could not anticipate whether or not a plan was going to work with a particular group or in a specific situation until she was in that situation, with that group. Tricia seems to be saying that awareness of what to teach is difficult to develop unless you are actually teaching. Because an important component of Tricia’s teacher identity is preparedness and anticipating “pitfalls,” her inability to figure out ahead of time what to teach becomes a Moment of failure.

One participant, Nick, seemed to struggle to find a way to “be himself as a teacher” (reconcile his personality with his teaching style), as evidenced in statements he
made about talking while teaching. He acknowledged that talking is a large part of who he is, but learned that “talk is almost incongruous in a music classroom” because it “it breaks the mode, stops or limits audiation, and inevitably draws attention away from making music.” His failure in this instance is that he talked too much and prevented his students from “existing in music.” He describes how he later resolved the problem to a certain extent, saying “I . . . have taken to ‘talking’ in music, whether in chant or in sung ‘recitative-style’ instructions. Then, I can talk more while still maintaining context.”

**New Understandings**

The category *New Understandings* comprises a list of ideas that seem to underlie participants’ statements about what they learned from the moment. Question 4 on the VRW asked, “How did that moment or event help you learn about the class, your students, yourself, or your teaching?” Participants answered the question with widely varying responses, and sometimes ideas included in this category were contained in their responses to other questions. Sometimes participants directly stated the pre-conceived ideas and New Understandings, sometimes they were implied in participants’ statements.

Three codes emerged within the New Understandings category: *expectations*, *learning*, and *interpersonal*. *Expectations* encompasses participants’ learning about what to expect from students, and what they “should” be able to do either musically or behaviorally (the “basics”). Table 10 contains a list of New Understandings regarding *expectations*.

*Learning* has to do with the “ways” to teach or the ways in which students learn. Many participants thought there was a “correct” or “proper” way to teach something, but learned there are many ways to teach correctly. Table 11 contains a list of New
Understandings regarding learning. Several participants formed New Understandings about “ways” to teach something, especially to young children. Participants realized that there is more than one way to teach a topic or skill, that there exist ways to teach of which they had not been aware, and that different age students learn best from different ways of teaching.

Table 10

Expectations: Participants’ pre-conceptions and corresponding New Understandings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-conception</th>
<th>New Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young children cannot discriminate</td>
<td>➢ They can discriminate timbre, if taught “right.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>timbres.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students always understand when</td>
<td>➢ They may not understand when phrases end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phrases end.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young children cannot understand</td>
<td>➢ They can, but might express their understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>style or form.</td>
<td>through movement rather than words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Players understand what they sound</td>
<td>➢ Not if they have not heard themselves from the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>like to an audience.</td>
<td>audience’s perspective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowing the definition is</td>
<td>➢ Knowing the definition does not equate to the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equivalent to the ability to do</td>
<td>ability to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>something.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clapping is easy (rhythms).</td>
<td>➢ Saying is easier.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpersonal encompasses participants’ realizations about interacting with students and cooperating teachers, and the effects their interactions can have on learning. Participants became aware of the way their “delivery” of instruction could affect whether students learned and whether they had fun learning. They also realized the effects of their tone of voice and rate of speech, movements or positioning in the room, energy, and classroom procedures on student learning and enjoyment. Zeb, for example, noticed that the way he talked confused students and caused them to disengage from his lesson. Nick noticed that his copious talking resulted in students looking around, shifting in their seats,
Table 11

*Learning: Participants’ pre-conceptions and corresponding New Understandings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-conception</th>
<th>New Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading solfege syllables helps students sing well.</td>
<td>☑ Reading solfege syllables and singing are separate skills or tasks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I cannot “baby” students (activities must be challenging).</td>
<td>☑ I also cannot defeat students (activities must be attainable).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual practice will lead to understanding of ensemble.</td>
<td>☑ Ensemble experiences lead to understanding of ensemble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students learn by hearing, seeing, and saying.</td>
<td>☑ Students also learn by moving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>I can do many things at once while teaching.</em></td>
<td>☑ Doing many things at once increases difficulty, and decreases my focus and success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If students are having difficulty, repetition helps them improve.</td>
<td>☑ Repetition may help, but is not the only way to improve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students will make connections on their own.</td>
<td>☑ I must make connections overt for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is simple, only one step, or the simplest way to learn or do this activity.</td>
<td>☑ There may be even simpler parts to this activity, or more steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is easy, students will do it quickly.</td>
<td>☑ It is not as easy as I thought. Students need more time, repetition, and reinforcement than I thought.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures for teaching are inflexible; there is one “right” way to teach.</td>
<td>☑ Procedures for teaching are flexible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

and being unsuccessful when finally asked to participate. Several participants noted that their directions for activities confused students, even though they thought the directions had been perfectly clear. Table 12 contains a list of *interpersonal* New Understandings.

**Plan to change**

Participants usually directly stated changes they would or should make in answer to Question 5 on the VRW (“What will you do differently, if anything, the next time you teach this lesson?”). Participants also proposed potential changes in answer to other questions. Even though the verb tense in Question 5 specifically oriented student
Table 12

*Interpersonal: Participants’ pre-conceptions and corresponding New Understandings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-conception</th>
<th>New Understanding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will understand my good intentions when I joke with them.</td>
<td>➢ They might not; I need to get to know them first.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple is boring for students.</td>
<td>➢ I can make simple activities engaging by how I teach.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students understand what I say when I explain things; I am clear.</td>
<td>➢ Students can be confused by the way I explain things or ask questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All my students were confused.</td>
<td>➢ I only paid attention to those who were confused.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students do not want to participate in class or learn what I am teaching.</td>
<td>➢ They <em>do</em> want opportunities to participate and learn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students do not care about rudeness or disruptions of the lesson.</td>
<td>➢ They do care, and exert social pressure to manage each others’ behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teachers to forward-looking language (“what *will* you do”), some participants answered in backward-looking language (“I *should have*”), which indicated some participants were generally focused on the past (regret), and some on the future (hope, confidence).

Two codes emerged in the Plan to Change category: *specific* and *non-specific*. Both *specific* and *non-specific* plans to change focused on three components: *self* (how participants teach), *classroom management*, and the *lesson plan*. Changes that were *specific* contained a plan, steps, or action, and were generally confidently stated (“*I will ___*”). *Non-specific* changes were vague or general, often with hedging (“*I will try to ___*”); they did not contain a plan, steps, or action. Table 13 contains participants’ stated plans to change by code and component.
Table 13

Plans to change stated in VRWs by code and component

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Specific</th>
<th>Non-Specific</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self</strong></td>
<td>Classroom Management</td>
<td>Lesson Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Speech</strong></td>
<td>Non-Verbal</td>
<td>Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>rate, volume</td>
<td>position, location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>speech, volume</td>
<td>non-verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gestures</td>
<td>physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Practice</strong></td>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>patterns, steps, procedures</td>
<td>change seating, separate students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>practice</td>
<td>give pitch, sing whole song first, change strum pattern</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>away from stand, to see feet better</td>
<td>announce ahead of time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td>Pro-Active</td>
<td>Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>keep on top of it,</td>
<td>change order, leave out or add step, use specific strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use right procedure,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>get to know Students,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be more strict</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tools</strong></td>
<td>post schedule</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>focus where needed,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>adapt quicker or better,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>be more aware, read the class</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                | statement created an emic\textsuperscript{15} category, which emerged to include statements about learning the discourse of music teaching, whether participants literally said, “I’ve learned” or not. Six types of learning emerged as codes in this category: what teachers value, what works with students, what to focus on musically, what are teaching

\textsuperscript{15} An emic code or category arises from the data and is often built from participants’ own words. The opposite is etic, which arises from literature or prior research.
strategies/skills, what is bad, and what my teaching weaknesses are. Table 14 lists examples of specific learning within each code (Codes and examples in the category, I’ve learned).

Table 14

*Codes and Examples in the Category, I’ve learned . . .*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What music teachers value</td>
<td>Respect, awareness, smooth execution/delivery of instruction, skill advancement, realism, commitment, challenge, time, clarity, strength, good behavior, responsibility, control, preparedness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What works with students</td>
<td>Group work (secondary), movement (elementary), practice (repetition), variety (of teaching techniques, methods, and materials), connecting topics to youth culture, age-appropriate lessons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to focus on musically</td>
<td>Blend, beauty, listening, imitation, entrances, ensemble.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are teaching strategies/skills</td>
<td>Moving position in the room, modeling, giving examples, “breaking it down” (simplifying), variety, planning, connecting (activity with purpose of activity), dynamic changes (speaking voice), eye contact, musical cues and gestures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is bad</td>
<td>Too much freedom (behavior), mistakes or failure, talking (from both teacher and students), confusion, the unexpected, disrespect, idealism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What my teaching weaknesses are</td>
<td>Ability to engage student interest, maintaining control, anticipating problems, setting up procedures or giving directions (clarity), lack of variety (repertoire of “ways” to teach), talking fast, poor “delivery,” unrealistic expectations of students (too high or too low; ability to change perspective), insufficient practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An unusual idea that only one participant, Nick, seems to have learned is that depth is more important than breadth (“. . . limiting material, tightening objectives, spending more time . . . ”). Otherwise, depth over breadth is absent from music teacher discourse of the participants in this study.
Evidence

Instead of citing observable, overt behaviors as Evidence of student learning in response to Question 3, participants provided general observations without making an inference or, alternately, made inferences with little or no support. Participants may not have understood what “evidence of student learning” meant, as their answers indicated they understood the question to ask about their success as a teacher. Appendix I contains two tables of inferences made by participants on VRWs (found in any question, not just Question 3) and Evidence they provided to support the inferences, in placement order. Sometimes the supporting Evidence consisted of observations of overt behaviors, sometimes it consisted of other inferences or restatements of the original inference, sometimes, participants gave no supporting Evidence at all or even contradictory evidence.

Categories of Observations

Participants made observations that can be grouped in six general categories.

- *Emotions* refers to individual students’ feelings (e.g., “he was upset”), the feeling of the participant (e.g., “I felt helpless”), or the general feeling of the lesson (e.g., “it was an awesome experience”).

- *Efficiency* refers to whether or not the participant believed the lesson proceeded according to plan (e.g., “it went smoothly”), and whether or not time was wasted.

- *Body language and gestures* (e.g., “their shoulders slump”), and *speech* (e.g., “he said 10:05”) refer to overt behaviors.
• **Connecting past with present** refers to participants’ mention of previous classes, undergraduate coursework, or other groups of students.

• **Music** refers to musical behaviors (e.g., singing, moving, reading, playing).

### Levels of Specificity

Two levels of specificity emerged within the examples of Evidence provided by participants: *superficial* and *detailed*. *Superficial* evidence consisted of inferences made with little or no supporting detail, typically related to *emotions* or *efficiency* (e.g., it was fun, it worked, or my cues stank). *Detailed* evidence typically consisted of inferences supported by descriptions of overt behaviors or comparisons between past and present (e.g., their shoulders slumped, it worked with the other class but not with this class, they sang in tune, or they giggled). Most participants provided *superficial* evidence on their VRWs; *detailed* evidence was rare. Table 15 contains examples of *superficial* and *detailed* Evidence (one example for each category of observation). Participants were best able to provide Evidence of student learning through citing musical behaviors (e.g., students played or sang in tune, rushed, dragged, or played in the wrong meter) or “correct” or “incorrect” answers provided by students.

A major theme arising from answers to Question 3 was that the Participants focused more on Evidence of their own perceived success than on student learning. Five participants (Randy, Rhonda, Nick, Barb, and Bob) particularly focused on their own actions. Randy’s reflections are filled with inferences about his students, but nearly all are filtered through himself and what he did (“I played the recording,” “I led a discussion,” “I was level-headed,” “I broke down the . . . parts,” they learned “due to my
Rhonda and Barb, like Randy, focus on what they did over what their students did. Nick only mentions students in general, referring to “them,” “they,” or “a

Table 15

*Examples of paired superficial and detailed evidence for each kind of observation*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinds of Observations</th>
<th>Levels of Specificity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Superficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>emotions</em> (e.g., Deena, S.1)</td>
<td>Antony made a “big scene”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>efficiency</em> (e.g., Tricia, E.1)</td>
<td>“things began to fall apart”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“there was a moment of chaos”; the students were confused; and the “activity was ineffective and hard to manage”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>body language/gestures</em> (e.g., Joe, S.1)</td>
<td>“the students were clearly checked out of the lesson”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>speech</em> (e.g. Adam, E.1)</td>
<td>the class was “the best, by far . . . at listening and hearing the different instrument families”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“four kids . . . . had won in their respective rows” (They said the correct answers.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>connecting past &amp; present</em> (e.g., Sue, S.1)</td>
<td>David and Robert “felt it was ok to talk through the lesson”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the band’s articulations still weren’t together and crisp” and “they don’t understand how their playing sounds”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nick’s only observations of students are that they shifted in their chairs and made noise, and that “a student” asked a question.

A final theme involved the accuracy of the participants’ inferences (whether the Evidence they cited could accurately support the inference made). As I explained in the Methods chapter, I decided to set aside analyzing “accurate” versus “inaccurate” statements. My decision was due to a combination of a lack of video recordings for every participant and the question of whether some inference statements could be determined accurate or inaccurate based on video evidence. While I viewed and was familiar with all video recordings I received, I did not formally compare participants’ statements with their videos.

However, when coding statements in the Evidence category, I did note that a number of participants’ inference statements and discrimination statements did not seem accurate from what I knew of their videos. For example, Randy noted that his students were “instantly” able to play the glissando with “greater accuracy.” I did not, however, hear any change in the sound of the glissando on the video recording, though Randy did model it several times by singing, gesturing, and having his cooperating teacher play it. Another example of inaccuracy is Rhonda’s assertion that her students were able to define ostinato on their own. In her video, what Rhonda described as “walking them through it a bit” seemed to be more like giving them the answer (having them repeat her words) when they did not offer any answers.

Bob did not hand in any videos, so I believed I had no context with which to understand the accuracy of his VRW statements. However, when coding statements in the Evidence category, I realized I was familiar with Bob’s elementary placement school.
I had supervised four student teachers in that school prior to the study, and one in the second half of the semester, immediately after Bob finished his placement there. My familiarity with his placement school provided me an image (visual understanding) of Bob’s classroom. Bob’s description of his classroom—part of his excuse for the problems with the lesson—did not match what I knew about the arrangement of his classroom. I would argue that the desks were not set-up as Bob described: in “traditional rows” in a way that placed students “twenty to twenty-five feet away” from the teacher. On the contrary, I had seen the desks set up only in columns with ample space for the teacher to move up and down the aisles, which would facilitate moving among students as needed. My knowledge of Bob’s placement school allowed me to assess the accuracy of his statements, something I was unable to do with other participants’ statements.

Beliefs

This category emerged when some participants used the words, “my goal” on their VRWs. Most often their goal statements were broad statements about music teaching, statements about “we” music teachers, or statements about the profession in general. Their broader goals emerged as glimpses into underlying philosophy. Codes in the Philosophy category are: music learning and teaching, music teachers, and students. When goal statements seemed to be lesson-specific objectives, I did not include them in this category.

Music Learning and Teaching

Participants made many remarks about what music learning and teaching should be, more so than what either should not be. According to most participants, music learning should be fun and active (“doing”); it should be connected to students’ interests,
other subjects, and “real” music; and it should raise students to a “higher level.” Inherent
in some (but not all) participants’ philosophies seemed the notion that music education
should be available to all students. Participants’ seemed to believe music teaching should
cultivate students’ interest in music, be challenging (difficult), serve students, and play a
dual role—social and musical—in students’ development.

**Music Teachers**

Similarly, music teachers should provide students opportunities to participate in
or learn about music. Music teachers should hold high expectations (social and musical)
for students, yet be patient. They should be flexible in approach to teaching, and possess
the ability to find effective approaches to attend to all students. Effective music teachers
are strong leaders (especially in the sphere of classroom management); they are
trustworthy, responsible, and engaging. Above all, it seems, music teachers should not
make mistakes.

**Students**

Students (according to the statements of many participants) should behave; they
should not talk in class, and should be respectful, especially of the teacher. In addition,
students should try to learn, and exert great effort, even if they do not want to learn;
students should care about learning, or take it seriously. In a way, it seems like
participants wanted students to be perfect (not make mistakes) in the same way they
expected themselves to be perfect.

**Discussion**

I find it interesting to consider possible assumptions behind the philosophical
ideas that emerged from participants’ VRWs. For example, what could be the
assumption behind “teachers should be patient”? That students try teachers’ patience?
Behind “students need to _try_ to learn”? That students are uninterested in learning—they
do not care? Such assumptions about students may be truths some of the time. They
certainly reflect stereotypes. Many participants’ philosophical statements could align
with _dominant cultural narratives_ of school. Those dominant cultural narratives story
teachers as knowledge-possessors and students as empty vessels; students and teachers as
adversaries; and students purposefully thwarting teachers’ lesson plans. As a teacher
educator, I certainly want student teachers to learn and/or practice patience. Perhaps a
positive spin on the idea that “teachers need to be patient” relates to participants’
changing expectations about the time and repetition necessary for learning. As one
participant said, she was “expecting miracles,” and what she thought was a short-term
goal was really a long-term goal.

**Summary**

The seven categories in this chapter outlined similarities and differences among
16 participants’ answers to VRW questions. I defined and gave examples of each
category and codes within each category, and I noted exceptional instances or
participants within each category. In addition, I explained some issues arising during
analysis that might have affected my analysis.
PART III

CONCLUSIONS

Part III contains four chapters: three-dimensional narrative space, reflective practice, musician identity and teacher identity, and implications and suggestions. The first three chapters represent conclusions surrounding the guiding questions of this study. Chapter 6 represents the analysis of participants’ reflections using Connelly and Clandinin’s (1988) three-dimensional narrative space: temporality, sociality, and place. In chapter 7, I detail the elements of the reflective cycle (MacKinnon, 1987) as revealed in participants’ VRWs, and some common themes related to the reflective cycle and the Video Reflection Assignment (VRA). In chapter 8, I describe three themes of Musician and Teacher Identity, as revealed in the language participants used when writing their reflections. In chapter 9, I describe possible limitations of the present study, and five contributions of the present study.
CHAPTER 6
THREE-DIMENSIONAL NARRATIVE SPACE

Connelly and Clandinin (1999, 1999, 2000) hypothesized three dimensions of narrative understanding based on Dewey’s (1938) concept of experience. The dimensions are temporality, sociality, and place. Each narrative dimension is multi-faceted. The temporal dimension includes past, present, and future; the social dimension includes looking inward (self) and outward; the physical dimension (place) includes any overt physical characteristic of the teaching environment and the positioning (physical) of people within the space. During narrative analysis, I considered how these three dimensions played in participants’ stories of classroom events (on VRWs, and informed in some instances by videos). While it is possible to see each of the three dimensions separately in participants’ words, the temporal, social, and physical are interconnected and intermingled.

Temporality

Temporal Cycles and Borders

Connelly & Clandinin (1999) describe the importance of temporal cycles and temporal borders in schools. Teachers plan around chunks of time, divided into minutes, hours, days, seasons, and events. Music teachers’ temporal cycles include many of the same characteristics or components as other teachers: grading periods, daily schedules, school-wide events, and school year and summertime. Music teachers’ temporal cycles also include discipline-specific components: concerts and trips, rehearsals and meetings during and outside of the school day, and the temporal nature of music itself (sound...
organized largely by time). Because music is afforded relatively little time within the school curriculum, using time wisely becomes a heightened concern.

Temporal borders in school carry moral and professional value regarding the respect of one’s colleagues and the cycle of school. An example is starting and ending class on time. Time is a valuable commodity to teachers, especially music and arts teachers, because they are expected to do so much within the cycles of school time. Teachers who waste time (or allow students to waste time), or who cross temporal borders by taking time from another teacher, lose the respect of their colleagues and let students control time.

Considering temporal cycles and borders sheds light on the importance of Bob’s secondary VRW Moment, in which he forgot the ending time of the class. It is so important that Bob says, “This could have been a bad situation.” For Bob, being a professional (“pro”) includes adhering to temporal borders. Participants wrote of wasting time, giving time, using time, being allotted time, spending time, every time, the same time, taking time, saving time, the whole time, enough time, running out of time, and the correct or proper time. Even when they did not use the word “time,” temporal cycles and borders were present. Barb mentioned the sequence of instruction (ordinal time) in her lesson. Her students, “at first . . . tapped random rhythms,” but “after” she modeled the correct rhythm for them (musical time), they “tapped the correct rhythm.”

Wendy was concerned with the pace of her teaching and her rate of speech. Deena had to “move on to another activity” because “time was running short” (i.e., she had to cover everything). Jenny demonstrated how temporal borders are more important than student learning when she lamented she “settled for the result [she] got, because of
time constraints.” Some participants’ focused on problems with musical time (rhythm, meter, tempo) in The Moments they chose.

Temporality as a dimension of narrative brings into play many other aspects of identity, including metaphors, preconceptions, and beliefs, because they are formed by past experiences and stories of those experiences.

**Past, Present, and Future**

Clandinin and Connelly (2000) describe temporality in narrative thinking as “locating things in time” (p. 29). Looking to the past helps people make sense of the present and create meaning for the future.

When we see an event, we think of it not as a thing happening at that moment but as an expression of something happening over time. Any event, or thing, has a past, a present as it appears to us, and an implied future. (p. 29)

Participants’ stories of classroom events on their VRWs revealed this three-dimensional narrative space (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000).

**Past.** Participants looked to the past overtly, remembering many experiences and previously-held ideas. They looked back to previous lessons with the same class, previous encounters with the same problems or successes, prior experiences with students and conversations with cooperating teachers, pre-existing anxieties and concerns, pre-student teaching observations of other teachers, previous music education coursework, past experiences as ensemble members, and pre-conceived images of music teaching and music teacher identity. Participants also looked to the past covertly, hinting at memories by the ways they described events.

Joe seems to look back to his own experience as an ensemble member when he interprets his students’ slumped shoulders as indicators of boredom (rather than
Music Education students often represent the best musicians in their high schools (Thornton & Bergee, 2008). It stands to reason that Joe felt bored when he had to practice the same passage of a piece repeatedly, as he was likely—as one of the best players—not the one having difficulty and causing the need for repeated practice. He may remember such a time in his past, when he may have slumped in his seat because he was bored, so he interprets his own students experience as “bored.”

Adam might look back to a teacher he had who seemed to be “on the same musical wavelength” with him as a student. Perhaps being on the same wavelength helped motivate Adam to try harder, or perhaps his teachers’ interest in Adam’s musical wavelength sparked solidarity and inspired Adam to give his teacher “the time of day.” Sue might also remember a teacher who inspired her or helped her learn “life-lessons.” She writes at length (compared with the length of most participants’ VRWs) about her belief that she can inspire her students to love music, and her frustration with students whom she cannot seem to inspire. Research indicates many Music Education students decide to become teachers because of an inspiring teacher they want to emulate (Thornton & Bergee, 2008). Perhaps Adam and Sue are among them.

Even the Video Reflection Assignment itself required participants to look to the past, albeit the recent past, by watching videos of lessons they previously taught. The verb tense participants used on VRWs varied within VRWs from past to present to future. Certainly, the questions focused participants on these temporal dimensions (describe something that happened, what you learned, and what you will change); however, participants switched between tenses when describing events on the video. I believe the
ways participants switched tense revealed how the videos caused them to re-live events as they reflected on them.

Jenny’s description of The Moment on one secondary VRW is almost completely in the present tense. Students “are (emphasis added) talking in the background” and “leave (emphasis added) the classroom and come back, unannounced and unmonitored.” She says, “I don’t (emphasis added) notice the goings in and out of the students in real time,” and “the students feel (emphasis added) as if they have free reign in the music wing, and they are (emphasis added) disrespecting me as an authority.” It seems Jenny feels the emotions she felt during the lesson while she reflects on it; the memory is present as she remembers it. Randy chooses one Moment because he wants to re-live it.

I did not have any other students cry in a lesson. I also wanted to have a chance to see if I would have acted differently if I was given a chance to think about the situation and come up with different methods to approach it. (S.2.2)

Randy did not experience any other instances of a student becoming upset and crying to compare to this instance. He uses the video intentionally as a surrogate experience of sorts, to explore other possibilities and prepare for similar instances in the future.

**Future.** Participants looked to the future, mostly (but not exclusively) in response to Question 5, “What will you do differently . . . ?” Looking to both the short- and long-term future, they imagined possibilities and adjusted their stories to live by. They imagined teaching the lesson again, with or without changes. They envisioned the future of their students and storied how their students’ present experiences might affect their future experiences. They created and adjusted images of themselves as professional teachers, in their own classrooms, informed by their present experiences. They
questioned how they might change, either to better align with their pre-conceived stories to live by, or to chart new territory.

Drew looks forward with confidence that he will change in three of his VRWs. He says he “will” do specific things differently next time. In one secondary VRW, he looks forward with a question about whether or not he will be more strict, and whether he wants to espouse that goal. His language reveals his questioning, as he says he will “try and keep on top of it,” and adds he “can” be more strict, “if” he wants to. He is not sure he wants to be more strict, but he does want to be aware of practicing what he preaches to his students.

When Deena’s students complain that lessons are too hard, she looks forward to their futures, worried for their success as they encounter more difficult music lessons. I note that she assumes her secondary band students will follow her path, continuing on in their music studies to college-level courses. Randy looks forward to his students’ futures, imagining they will understand what he taught them “for the rest of their lives.” He also looks forward to caring relationships with students, and figuring out how to “push” students just hard enough to challenge and motivate them.

Jenny looks forward to her immediate future in her secondary placement, in which she anticipates continuing to feel disrespected. She looks forward to the near distant future and anticipates getting a job teaching choir in which she will have control over the things that bother her in VRWs. Bob also looks forward having his own classroom, in which he will establish a different “environment,” have control over the things that cause him problems in his internships, and be able to teach more effectively because of it.
Wendy looks forward, admonishing herself about what she perceives as her “biggest problem,” speaking too fast. Looking back, she remembers that she talks fast when she is nervous or unsure. She reminds herself of her story to live by, in which she should not talk fast, even if she is nervous or unsure. And she creates a rule to help herself, “When I think I am speaking slowly, I’m still probably speaking too fast.”

Several participants look forward to using newfound awareness, understanding, or techniques. Tricia looks forward to “winging it” during ensemble rehearsals and thinking on her feet. Barb, Neeta, Jenny, and Deena look forward to planning with careful attention to sequencing, modeling, and clarifying directions and expectations. Drew and Deena look forward to anticipating similar experiences and planning to accommodate them. Randy and Adam look forward with revised stories to live by that include the possibility of teaching elementary students.

Sociality

The social dimension of narrative includes the personal (self) and social (Clandinin & Connelly, 2000). In the present study, participants’ stories of classroom events were imbued with personal, “internal conditions, such as feelings, aesthetic reactions, hopes, and moral dispositions” (p. 50). Participants lived out these internal conditions in social interactions with students and cooperating teachers. The social dimension of narrative understanding is related to dominant cultural narratives and the discourse of identity (Danielewicz, 2001), and is revealed in participants’ language. This dimension is present in participants’ stories to live by. I refer the reader to Chapter 4, which contains the stories of participants and discussions of plot lines.
A figurative notion of “place” was present in the outward facet of the social dimension. The notion of place in social relationships, in this study, was related to hierarchy, power, and authority, and was sometimes manifested in physical place (e.g., proximity of teacher to student as a technique of control).

**Place**

In the present study, participants described elements of the physical space of the classroom, their place in it, and their place in relation to students. School itself is a physical place, and a teacher’s place, or space, in the school is an important part of stories of school (Connelly & Clandinin, 1999, 2000). Place represents a manifestation of temporal and social dimensions of teaching and learning; places have history (past), utility (present), and possibility (future). Connelly and Clandinin (1999) describe two places in which teachers work. *In-classroom places* are secret, private, safe places in which teachers live stories of practice. Teachers speak of *my* classroom, which is a place where they can try, fail, and succeed in private. *Out-of-classroom places* are the public places in schools, in which teachers live out institutional stories. In out-of-classroom places, teachers must represent the story embodied by the institution of the school in which they teach.

**Teacher Position**

Place seems to be important to Sue. She mentions that the boys who were talking were behind her, and that she moved closer to them to “make [her] presence known” and let them know she was “not fooling around” when she told them to stop talking. *Presence* is an interesting word in a discussion of place because it is both figurative and physical. One can be in the presence of another (physical proximity); one can feel the
presence of another (figurative proximity), and one can possess presence (poise, charisma).

Several participants describe being “in front” of the class while teaching. Drew describes the difference between the sound of the ensemble “from a distance,” where the audience would hear, and “in front of the band,” where he was during rehearsal. He concludes that he should move around the room when teaching to assess the sound from both perspectives. Tricia describes how she had ideas for her rehearsal plan “while [she] was observing” but changed her ideas “when [she] got on the podium.”

**Classroom Place**

Place is controversial for music educators because we often are displaced in the school building by other teachers and classes. Many music teachers’ in-classroom places are actually other teachers’ classrooms, out-of-classroom places such as auditoriums or cafeterias, or are physically outside the school building in a temporary building (also known as a trailer or portable unit). Certainly, place is an important factor in the student teaching internship, in which student teachers are placed in schools and with cooperating teachers. When teacher educators talk to student teachers about the internship, we often ask about place (“Where are you teaching?”). Knowing where a student teacher is placed tells us something about who and what he or she will encounter during the internship.

During the internship, student teachers never (legally) get to learn to teach in their own in-classroom place; they are guests in another teacher’s classroom. They have to work within that teacher’s system (curriculum, plans, classroom management, procedures), and in that teacher’s space. Student teachers may or may not be given a space of their own within the cooperating teacher’s classroom (e.g., a desk or closet), and
student teachers rarely have the opportunity to choose how to arrange desks, chairs, risers, and instruments within the classroom.

The student teacher-cooperating teacher relationship is situated in the in-classroom space, and the figurative place of both teachers represents a bit of a border-crossing (Connelly & Clandinin, 1999). Because the student teacher is learning the discourse of music teaching from the cooperating teacher (Danielewicz, 2001), the subordinate position of the student teacher (as a student) is confounded as student teachers cross the border into the teacher position with the students of the cooperating teacher.

The student teacher has few secret stories of teaching (Connelly & Clandinin, 1999), at least not secret from the cooperating teacher. In a way, the student teacher must maintain a cover story (Connelly & Clandinin, 1999) in the place in which other teachers are safe to authentically experience secret stories. If the student teacher’s story to live by and the cooperating teacher’s story to live by are out of alignment, they bump against each other (bumping place, Clandinin, 2009), which creates a dilemma. In this bumping place, the safety of the shared in-classroom place is compromised. If the student teacher’s and cooperating teacher’s stories align harmoniously, the two teachers share secret stories and cross the border to out-of-classroom places together. Participants in the present study experienced such dilemmas and harmonious relationships with cooperating teachers.

**Positioning**

When creating a story to live by, student teachers position themselves within the profession of music teaching (Watson, 2006). In narrative, positioning refers to how the
teller of a story places him or herself in the story. Discourse analysts would examine the pronouns people choose for themselves. Participants in this study positioned themselves (through language use) in three ways throughout their VRWs: in the midst of the Moment, removed from it, or outside of it. Figure 2 illustrates the three positions.

When participants could imagine possibilities for change, they placed themselves in the midst of events by using first person language (e.g., I, my) that was active, and often inclusive (e.g., we—the student teacher and the students). When participants could not seem to imagine possibilities for change, or when they had exhausted all the possibilities they could imagine, they removed themselves from events by using first person language that was not inclusive (e.g., they, these students, he/she, the lesson, this room). Perhaps this indicates an escape to a position of safety.

When participants seemed to see themselves as unable or helpless, they placed themselves outside the Moment by using third-person language (e.g., the students were instructed to, my lesson was taught well). Their language was passive, as if they were watching themselves teach or the event(s) unfold. Perhaps they did not yet see themselves as the teacher, or did not see themselves as able, so they did not identify as the teacher in the event(s).

Participants in the present study seemed to be in the process of reconciling their preconceived story to live by with the realities of their stories in practice, which might have been another influence in positioning. What participants saw on their video recordings were the realities of how they were living out their stories to live by—the stories in practice. I believe participants positioned themselves outside or removed from the Moment when they experienced dilemmas of identity because their stories in practice
did not support their preconceived stories to live by. The ways participants positioned themselves in each placement and VRW may have interacted with the way they framed their experiences, and influenced whether or not they reflected on or rationalized their teacher behaviors.
Figure 2. Ways participants positioned themselves in stories of classroom events.
CHAPTER 7

REFLECTIVE PRACTICE

In this chapter, I discuss reflection-in-action (Schön, 1983), and the reflective cycle (MacKinnon, 1987) with respect to reframing, rationalizing, conflicting stories, and suspending interpretation. The Video Reflection Assignment (VRA) in the present study consisted of video recordings (videos) and Video Reflection Worksheets (VRWs).

The Video Reflection Assignment

Perspectives from the literature

Using video recordings of teaching to enhance and facilitate reflective practice has become widely accepted, especially in teacher education (Lundberg et al., 2008). Teacher educators and researchers agree that video facilitates reflective practice because it can help one see oneself more objectively, thus more accurately (Struyk & McCoy, 1993). Danielson (1996) states, “Reflection is most informative if accompanied by making a videotape of a teacher’s own teaching . . . . the benefits are enormous. There is simply no other way to understand the details of how one’s lessons are presented and received by students” (p. 54).

Teachers who use video base a significantly larger proportion of their analytical reflections on evidence than those who do not use video (Lundberg et al., 2008). Welsch and Devlin (2006) found that students who used videos of themselves for reflecting, when compared to those who reflected from memory, were able to give more specific and accurate evidence regarding the extent of student learning and the ways their teaching methods or activities were effective. Lee and Loughran (2000) used video recordings and interviews to guide the reflective practice of six post-graduate student teachers in a nine-
week internship, and to examine participants’ concerns (Fuller, 1969) and reflective cycles (MacKinnon, 1987). They found participants’ concerns changed in frequency and importance over the internship, especially after Week 3; changes were most evident in increased student concerns and decreased teacher concerns (Fuller, 1969). Participants reframed concerns or problems numerous times over the internship, each time gaining a deeper or better understanding.

Lee and Loughran (2000) and Husu, Toom, and Patrikainen (2008) both determined that video could facilitate reflective practice, but video reflection guided by an experienced teacher (e.g., cooperating teacher, supervisor) assisted student teachers in shifting their focus from self to students; guided reflection helped student teachers learn to reframe their experiences. Welsch and Devlin (2006) used written guided reflection, which they determined helped student teachers see themselves more objectively and accurately. Aten (2003) also used written questions in a study of in-service teachers. Guided journaling fostered many levels of reflection among participants, who perceived it as professionally valuable, because it helped them see students as individuals rather than groups, and presented them opportunities to reflect on the nature and outcomes of their professional judgments. Journaling helped them perceive themselves more accurately than they had before the study, and facilitated the complete reflective cycle (framing, reframing, and resolving). Aten concluded that “prompt-guided journaling has potential for promoting reflection” (p. 103).

The Present Study

In the present study, ten participants made statements about viewing videos. Some made overt statements about the usefulness of video recording; some used videos to
check their memories of events or think about alternative actions they could have taken; some were able to understand problems they encountered but did not understand while teaching; and some were surprised that the videos revealed their misperception of events (positive or negative). Some participants were able to find new information in their videos about the problems they experienced but “could not figure out” while teaching.

The other six participants did not seem to notice anything new, or at least they did not mention it on their VRWs. They seemed to see only what they perceived while teaching, and the VRA seemed only to confirm or validate what they already thought about the lesson they viewed.

**The Reflective Cycle**

The three elements of MacKinnon’s (1987) *reflective cycle*, as previously explained, are framing, reframing, and resolving. MacKinnon noted that student teachers took into account their own experiences as students when reframing problems. Viewing the problem through their memories of being a student helped them understand the students’ perspective, which helped them see new particulars in the situation.

MacKinnon contrasted *acts of reflection*, which include reframing, with *acts of rationalization*, which are moves taken to justify or defend teaching behaviors or initial interpretations of problems rather than reframe them. When analyzing participants’ VRWs in the present study, I looked for the presence of an initial problem, conclusion, and implication (framing), and indications participants reframed the problem from their students’ perspective (or another perspective).

A few participants engaged in rationalization only; most participants engaged in reflection sometimes and rationalization other times. Participants sometimes stated the
initial problem they encountered outright; when they did not, the problem was implied in statements of initial conclusions or implications for teaching. In either instance, participants usually remembered the problem as something they noticed while teaching, but became aware of it after teaching, before completing the VRA, possibly when a cooperating teacher or supervisor called their attention to it. Occasionally, a participant stated he or she was unaware of the problem until viewing the video recording of the lesson (e.g., Drew’s reflection about his ensemble’s articulation and Wendy’s reflection about her rate of speech).

Reflecting

Deena provides a good example of the reflective cycle, complete with multiple reframings, on her second elementary VRW. Deena frames the problem: students did not understand how to do the assignment. The implication for teaching is that she had to re-explain the directions. This does not represent initial problem setting, however, because she later explains both she and her cooperating teacher had experienced “trouble” with this part of the lesson before, and could not seem to “get [their] point across” to the students. It seems she was already aware of the problem before teaching the lesson, and likely discussed reasons and implications with her cooperating teacher.

She already had one new implication for teaching: explain before passing out materials, which she does. (Perhaps she had shifted her perspective to the students’ by imagining trying to listen to instructions with materials in hand.) But explaining before passing out materials did not resolve the problem, so another reframing is needed. Deena says the students “continued to ask questions that [she] thought [she] had addressed,” which represents another strategy she tried (including the answers to common questions
in her explanation). Once again, “while [she] was teaching” she tried to reframe the problem. She continues to answer students’ questions until she gets “the feeling most of them understood.” But it is an uneasy success (“there were still questions”).

Deena also prompts some students to “draw a connecting feature”—a part of the activity that had proven difficult, and one that every student still did not understand; she resolves that she could “leave [that] part out.” At the end of the VRW, the problem remains that students do not understand what to do. Though she has made a valiant effort, Deena seems to have run out of ideas, and concludes that the students “are not at the level [she] thought they were.” There is no clear evidence Deena has drawn on her own experiences to understand her students’ point of view, even in deciding to explain before handing out materials (an idea that could just as easily have come from her cooperating teacher). Even so, there is clear evidence of reflection.

Randy is one participant who uses his perspective as a student to reframe problems. He is a teacher-nurturer, so he already focuses on his students’ comfort with the classroom environment and his teaching. In one of Randy’s secondary VRWs, he is moved to use his own experiences of facing challenges in learning and life in general to reframe a problem. Randy is surprised at a student’s strong, emotional reaction to making repeated mistakes. During the lesson, before the student walked away, Randy may have framed the problem as not taking the lesson seriously because the boy made jokes to avoid playing (evidenced in the video). However, when the boy starts to cry, Randy reframes the problem: “the student becomes very upset for not being able to understand a part of an exercise which he thought he had mastered.” Randy realizes students are defeated by “the smallest things” that are not “challenging” for him.
remembers his own experiences playing difficult music, and how it feels to face a challenge and overcome it and empathizes with the student, which helps him reframe the Moment.

Jenny’s secondary and elementary placement VRWs were on opposite sides of the reflection-rationalization fence. In Jenny’s elementary VRWs, she shows inklings of willingness to reframe her experiences. She lists her go-to reasons as conclusions about the problem: students could not do the activity because, 1) they did not take it seriously, 2) they “chickened out,” or 3) they did not understand what to do. She does not reframe her initial conclusions or implications (that she needs to explain better), but in Question 5, she adds, “I will be more careful . . . to clearly state my expectations at the beginning rather than expecting students to understand how it is supposed to work.” She considers whether her expectations are reasonable. In her other elementary VRW, Jenny states the idea straightforwardly.

Sometimes I assume they will understand what is expected of them and will be able to listen to the recording and follow that beat automatically while chanting their rhythms. It seems easy enough to me, but I have to put myself in the mindset of a ten- or eleven-year old who has probably had many fewer musical experiences. (E.2.4)

Contrast Jenny’s secondary VRWs, in which she rationalizes. She seems willing to consider alternative explanations of issues in the classroom, but continues to evaluate the merits of the alternatives through her present point of view, or dismisses them completely. She frames a problem she encounters—her students are unable to move or chant in irregular meter, even though they were able to do so three weeks earlier. She does consider her own difficulty with the task, saying, “Even I struggle with 7/8 meter if I am not really focusing, and I have certainly spent more time with it than these students
have.” But concludes that these students could be successful if they focus, or “listen carefully and duplicate exactly what [she does].” Another example is when Jenny momentarily thinks of the point of view of some students who “are not learning what [she is] trying to teach.” They already had rehearsal today, so “it is possible that this was a repeat for them.” She quickly dismisses that viewpoint, however, by adding, “though this is never a good or acceptable thing.” Jenny’s rationalization in her secondary VRWs may be exacerbated by her conflicting story with her cooperating teacher.

**Rationalizing**

Bob provides a good example of rationalizing. He frames the problem on his elementary VRW, saying, “One of the children in the back of the class said quite rudely to me that she couldn’t hear me.” She pointed out his “helplessness” to everyone, including his university supervisor, by calling out that she “couldn’t hear.” She broke two social rules of the dominant cultural narrative regarding the authority of the teacher: she did not ask permission to speak, and she called attention to the teachers’ mistake, effectively usurping his authority. Bob says, “the other students were playing their xylophones when they weren’t supposed to be,” which demonstrates he can understand why she cannot hear. But because Bob’s story to live by is centered around control and appearances, he is unable to see her perspective—she wanted to hear him but could not—and instead blames others and his situation for the problem. He does not change his initial problem, or initial implication for practice: “that this lesson could have definitely been effective in a different classroom/environment.”

Tricia straight-out rationalized on all four of her VRWs. In one of her elementary VRWs, she frames the problem as classroom management “spinning out of control”
because she did not give detailed instructions for an activity. She defends herself at the opening and closing of the VRW by saying, “This particular 5th grade is a very difficult group to handle,” “I didn’t know that leaving out specific instructions during this activity was a major pit fall [sic] in the lesson,” and “Because this was my very first time teaching this lesson, I learned quickly that the . . . activity was ineffective and hard to manage.” Her teaching behaviors and her problem are justified because the class was “difficult” to “handle,” she “didn’t know,” and it was her “very first time.” She does not reframe the problem nor change her implications for practice; she blames the students and her ignorance and inexperience.

Tricia continues to place blame for her problems in her secondary VRWs. In one instance, her cooperating teacher “disables the ability” of the ensemble to follow her conducting. (Note how she veils her criticism of her cooperating teacher using passive language.) In another instance, the University music education program “instilled in [her]” the idea that “using very detailed lesson plans” was the “norm,” when her experiences lead her to “believe” that a “defined lesson plan (while sound for musical/pedagogical reasons) is not really the most efficient tool in a rehearsal.” Note how Tricia softens her criticism of the University through careful use of language (e.g., she allows that a detailed lesson plan has theoretical merit but is convinced it is practically inefficient). Rather than frame the problem as her own inability to anticipate the needs of the ensemble, Tricia blames the University for “forcing” her to use an inappropriate tool.
Rationalizing and Showcase Moments

For the most part, participants rationalized failure Moments. Two participants chose successful Moments to showcase the way they lived out beliefs about teaching music. Tricia chose one showcase Moment (E.2); Zeb chose three showcase moments (E.2, S.1, S.2). Both Tricia and Zeb rationalized about these successes rather than reconsider what happened from different perspectives. In other words, they justified their actions or teaching decisions because they felt successful. For example, Tricia “was extremely proud of the students for knowing the answer to the math question [she] asked” about how old an instrument is (she asked them to add 2010 and 180). She “chose this moment to showcase how integrating core curricular subject matter into a lesson is easy to do.”

Her pride in her students seems overblown, because she assumes that adding the two numbers correctly indicates her students understand the concept of BCE, the year zero, and the concept of time. In addition, she determines that the students who put their hands down after the correct answer was given looked frustrated because they also knew the answer but were not called on. She assumed that everyone with his or her hand up knew the answer. Tricia may have been giving her students the benefit of the doubt, but her sincere tone communicated her statement was genuine.

Zeb frames his showcase Moments as demonstrations of the ways he makes music learning relevant for his students, and to demonstrate how he “reached” all his students. In one instance, students happened to know a song in the lesson and got excited about it, and Zeb claimed it as successful teaching on his part. He says it himself, “It was a lucky coincidence that the song was meaningful to them, but I felt that I was able to feed their
enthusiasm by asking them to share their knowledge with me.” Zeb chose one secondary VRW because it “confirmed many things I already know.” He chose the other because he “was reaching” all the students in the class when he “strayed from the text’s sequence to explain a concept in greater depth or simplicity,” which “occurred often in this class.” For Zeb, the Moments were successful because they demonstrated his teaching prowess. In both Zeb’s and Tricia’s showcase VRWs, they interpreted events and students’ behaviors only through their perspectives.

**Reframing Perspectives**

MacKinnon (1987) recognized that student teachers took their own experiences as pre-college students into consideration when reframing problems. However, in my study, that was not always true, even when student teachers reflected. In secondary placement VRWs, participants did use their own experiences as secondary music students to reframe events. For example, Deena seemed to call upon her experience of having to “sit out” while other sections worked on their part in ensemble rehearsal.

They also compared their choices as ensemble directors to choices made by their ensemble directors at the University. For example, Joe described how a technique he used to try to help his middle school players improve worked in a college ensemble setting, but did not work with middle school students.

In elementary placement VRWs, participants tended not to use their experiences as school children, but as undergraduate music education students to reframe their experiences. They rarely tried to take on the perspective of young students, especially the very young, such as Kindergarten. Instead, they cited rules or guidelines they learned in music education methods classes or heard from their cooperating teachers. Drew, for
example, determined his students’ spontaneous moving to music was their way of demonstrating musical understanding. He mentioned incorporating movement in the future as a way to engage kinesthetic learners; he used “teacher language,” which I believe indicated his perspective as an undergraduate rather than a school student.

Randy is one exception to the tendency to reframe using preservice teacher education experiences. In one elementary VRW, Randy appears to draw on his own memories of being a student who felt ignored or harshly corrected by a teacher, which made him want to give up trying. He describes what he remembered thinking and feeling during the lesson.

I took all of their suggestions and did not turn any down . . . . saying no to things that they genuinely thought they heard would make them feel inadequate and not want to answer another question. I remember wanting to hear about all of the things they heard. (E.1.1)

The experiences he calls on in this instance could be from Randy’s undergraduate education, but they seem more general and less specific to music education methods.

**Reflection-in-Action**

In the present study, some participants’ descriptions of the Moment on their Video Reflection Worksheets (VRWs) evidenced reflection-in-action. Reflection-in-action involves the partner processes of problem setting and problem solving (Schön, 1983). Problem setting is examining the many variables of a practice situation and choosing on what to focus and toward what end (goal) to strive (p. 40). While framing a problem of practice, one chooses to what one will attend and in what context, meaning, one also chooses what to ignore. Problem solving is selecting a technique to deal with the problem and implementing the technique (Schön, 1983).
Participants’ answers to VRW Question 1 revealed reflection-in-action. A sub-question prompted participants, “What do you remember thinking or feeling at this moment when you were teaching? In answer, some described a solution they tried in the midst of teaching. For example, Deena wrote, “While I was watching the students, I was trying to figure out a way to explain the activity in a better way. I then realized that time was running short and had to move on to another activity.”

In this instance, Deena describes how she was aware of the problem while teaching, which she framed as inadequate explanation on her part, and tried to devise a solution on the spot, which entailed figuring out a better explanation. The problematic situation is allayed; however, the problem remains unsolved. Deena’s goal of getting through the lesson trumped her goal of getting students to do the activity correctly, so she abandoned continued reflection-in-action regarding the problem of explanation. She revisits the problem using reflection-on-action while watching the video.

Another example of reflection-in-action comes from James, who describes a problem he encountered while teaching a choral rehearsal. His reflection-in-action resulted in successful change.

As soon as we got to the song and the accents in the pre-chorus, the students sang it as they always had. Previously, I had mentioned the accents in other rehearsals, but was frustrated with no change in sound. It appeared to me, and on the tape, that reminding the students of the warm-up gave them another clue as to what the accents needed to sound like. Essentially, the “A-ha” moment happened collectively as a group, and honestly, I was pretty happy with the results. (S.2.1)

A third example comes from Jenny, who describes a problem she encounters while playing a game with students. This time the description is truncated, but still describes reflection-in-action. Jenny says, “I found that I was constantly revising the ‘rules’ as
students progressed because I wasn’t getting the results that I wanted.” She set the
problem—students did not play the game the way she had planned; she formed a
solution—revising the rules of the game; and she relates the result—revising the rules did
not work (because she had to do it “constantly”).

**Suspending Interpretation**

In one elementary VRW, Deena seemed to suspend the initial problem she set and
framed while teaching, and actively look for aspects of the problematic situation she did
not initially see. Whether Deena did so purposefully is unclear, however, she did notice
something in the video that she did not notice while teaching. The students were
supposed to freeze (from walking) at the end of each musical phrase, but they did not
freeze at the correct time.

During the lesson, she thought they did not understand her explanation of the
activity and tried to revise her directions, which was unsuccessful. When she viewed the
video, she saw that her students watched her moving during the activity, and surmised
they were just copying her. Deena did not change her “should have” in this instance
(clarifying directions), but she did consider new evidence, from a new perspective. I did
not see this same type of activity in other participants’ VRWs. They may have done the
same outside of the VRA, if they video recorded other lessons, but I saw no evidence
they did the same thing on their VRWs

**Reflecting Influenced by Conflicting Stories**

Whether participants reframed or rationalized seemed affected by their
cooperating teacher to a certain extent. This notion emerged in participants whose stories
to live by conflicted with their cooperating teacher’s story to live by. Most notably,
Jenny seemed to almost dismiss her entire secondary placement. She rationalized on both of her secondary VRWs, in large part due to blaming what she perceived to be her cooperating teachers’ lack of classroom management. She talks about “these students” rather than “my students,” and she explains at length how they disrespect her authority because her cooperating teacher lets them disrespect his authority. They “get away with” talking and coming and going as they please, and she can do nothing about it. It may be true that she cannot change the classroom environment to accommodate so drastic a difference in behavioral expectations, but it is beside the point. If her story to live by had not conflicted so strongly with her cooperating teacher’s story, might she have been willing to view her classroom management problems as something she should and could change? Instead, she explains how she will someday be able to take care of the problem by enacting her vision of teaching in her own classroom. Jenny’s story to live by seemed to align more closely with her elementary cooperating teacher’s story; and she seemed more open to considering alternative ways to frame problems she encountered.

Any clear positive influences cooperating teachers may have had on participants’ abilities to reflect are largely absent from participants’ VRWs, except in Jenny’s VRWs, in which there was marked contrast between placements. That is not to say they had no positive influence, but it was unclear whether participants reflected on their own or with assistance. It seems reasonable to assume that most cooperating teachers did contribute to participants’ reflections because part of their role is to help student teachers understand what happens and what to do in the classroom. They likely posed alternative explanations of events and offered ideas for change.
During analysis, I had gut feelings about changes in perspective and perception that seemed creditable to cooperating teachers. For example, Joe’s seemingly sudden change of perspective on his problem in one secondary VRW. He initially described how his students “clearly checked-out” of the lesson (their motivation was the problem), but in Question 4, his method of teaching becomes the problem. He states, “I learned that I need to develop interesting and different ways when teaching in middle school. Slowing down this section and picking it apart would work in a college wind ensemble, but not in this atmosphere.” To me, Joe’s comment contrasting middle school and college ensembles sounds like the voice of his cooperating teacher.

**Connections to the Literature**

The results of this study regarding the reflective assignment largely support the findings of others who have researched the use of video and guided reflection (Bailey, 2000; Schoen, 2006; Sumision, 2000), in that reflecting on videos of teaching using questions to guide written reflections helped some participants but not every participant. The VRA magnified the direction in which participants were already moving (or from which they came). Some participants moved ahead; even though they may not have consistently reflected on all VRWs, they seemed readily able and willing to engage in reflection. Others dug-in to their positions; while they may not have consistently rationalized on all VRWs, they seemed unable or unwilling to reflect, and tenaciously held to their preconceived stories to live by and interpretations of student motivation. Still others were defeated; they stalled where they stood upon entering the internship or placement.
Researchers have suggested several factors that contribute to preservice teachers’ willingness or abilities to reflect on practice. One may be a lack of training in and practice using reflective tools (Marcos, Sanchez, & Tillema, 2011; Russell, 2005), and a lack of models of reflection in the form of teacher educators sharing their reflective thinking (Brookfield, 1987). Another may be that preservice teachers see no relevance of reflective assignments to their immediate concerns and practical issues of the classroom (Bailey, 2000). Some preservice teachers may have a general disposition toward practicality (doing over thinking about doing) or negative images of reflection (Sumision, 2000). Preservice teachers may also be at different points in the developmental process of reflection (Pultorak, 1996; Schoen, 2006). Certainly, these factors could have operated in the present study.

From my experiences at the University in the present study, I know at least two music education methods classes include reflective assignments as part of coursework. In my experience with one of the methods courses using reflective assignments, some students complete them in a cursory manner, no matter how much prodding or assistance they receive from instructors and graduate teaching assistants. Tricia’s comments to me about her perception of the usefulness of the VRA indicate she might have found it impractical or irrelevant to her needs during the internship (she felt restricted by having to choose a moment or event rather than a general issue or topic). I cannot say how participants’ experiences using reflective tools in coursework, or their dispositions toward or attitudes about reflection may have influenced their VRAs; however, because results supported others’ findings about the helpfulness of video reflection and guided
written reflection, it seems some of the same factors may have operated in the reflections of participants in the present study.

Researchers who have studied the use of video in conjunction with interactive guidance have found that discussing videos with a mentor or peers enhances reflective practice over reflecting on video alone, or self-reflecting without video (Harford, MacRuairc, & McCartan, 2010; Miksza & Austin, 2010; Welsch & Devlin, 2006). Lee and Loughran (2000) used video recordings and interviews to guide the reflective practice of student teachers. They suggest that the support of experienced teachers (university supervisors or instructors) is crucial to engage student teachers in reflection. The VRA in the present study was completed, to my knowledge, by participants reflecting alone, which may have been another factor in the relative helpfulness of the assignment.

The participants in the present study who handed in videos, for whom I noted discrepancies between their perception and my perception of events in their lessons, might have benefited from viewing the videos with their cooperating teachers or supervisors, who might have pointed out the discrepancies, or offered alternative explanations and recommendations for practice should similar situations arise.

With the exception of the Reasons category, gender did not emerge as an important influence on participants’ VRW responses. While I looked for differences among participants with regard to placement order, I found none. What did seem to bear on the events participants chose, how they described events, and the meaning they made from events, was the relative congruence with or conflict between the stories to live by of participants and their cooperating teachers.
Summary

In this chapter, I presented findings about the VRA. I provided a research-literature context for using video recordings and guided reflection during student teaching internships, and described general information about how participants in the present study used the VRA. I described the *reflective cycle* (MacKinnon, 1987); and discussed and provided detailed examples of participants’ VRWs with respect to *reframing, rationalizing, conflicting stories, reframing perspectives, reflection-in-action* (Schön, 1983), and *suspending interpretation*. I then connected my findings with the literature.
CHAPTER 8

MUSICIAN IDENTITY AND TEACHER IDENTITY

I previously described how the many facets of music teacher identity—beliefs, metaphors, cultural narratives, discourses, images, preconceptions, and musician identity are interrelated and inseparable in the larger notion of identity (Beauchamp & Thomas, 2009; Bernard, 2009; Bullough & Stokes, 1994; Butke, 2003; Calderhead & Robson, 1991; Danielewicz, 2001; Finders, 1998; McClean, 1999; Pajares, 1992; Regelski, 2007; Roberts, 2007; Schmidt, 1994; Thompson, 2004; Thompson & Campbell, 2003). While I have not addressed individual facets of identity in the body of this report, I believe they are present and operating in many of the results and conclusions already presented.

In this chapter, I discuss three emergent ideas about music teacher identity: the interplay of musician and teacher identities, how participants musician identities might have contributed to expectations of perfection in teaching, and some taken-for-granted assumptions about teaching and learning music participants seemed to hold.

Musician Identity Influences Teacher Identity

Research literature often presents musician or performer identity at odds with developing music teacher identity (Bernard, 2005; Desmond, 1998; Roberts, 2007; Regelski, 2007). Pellegrino (2009) outlined the current debate on the topic along five themes: teacher versus performer identity conflict, personal and professional benefits of music making, holistic view of musical identities, roles and situated identities, and defining music teacher identity. She summarized commonalities among the themes in two categories. One, identity is dynamic and individually constructed, and taking research “shapshots” of music teacher identity is problematic because it may not
represent how identity changes over time and with experience. Two, ideally, music teacher identity is a product of integrated musician or performer identity and teacher identity in the context of the classroom. While the debate goes on, it seems no one debates that the student teaching internship represents an important transition from student to teacher, from performing musician to music teacher. General agreement exists in the current debate that identity is central to understanding student teachers’ experiences; and that preconceived beliefs about the nature of knowledge and learning and prior experiences as students form the conceptual framework within which student teachers make sense of internship experiences and through which their music teacher identities emerge.

Roberts (2007) explains how identity is situated, and understood in relation to what matters to others in the situation. He also describes how the notion that self having multiple identities is “more than accepted as a given” (p. 2). Roberts also acknowledges music teacher educators agree that preservice music teachers come to their teacher education with well-formed musician identities. In view of currently accepted notions that self consists of multiple identities, along with constructivist ideas that people understand new information and experiences by comparing them with and integrating them into what they already understand (Dewey, 1933), it stands to reason that preservice music teachers would understand teaching in relation to their musician identities.

In the present study, participants’ musician identities emerged in their teaching as a parallel to, or a mirror image of, their musician identity. It seems they might have lived out their musician identities in teaching, at least partially, by trying to model the discourse of “musician.” In the process, participants emphasized the ways they live the
discourse of musician, an identity in which they are likely secure. Whether their students are successful or unsuccessful, they interpret the reason for it through their musician identities.

Jenny described how her students could, and did, achieve success by watching her closely and imitating her precisely. One of her “go to” reasons for students’ lack of success was a lack of focus. Formal music education entails learning to do things the “right” way. When presented with a musical instrument a student has never played before, how different is the reaction of a young student from an older student? A young student might immediately pick up the instrument and explore how they might make a sound on it, whereas an older student (at least a musically trained student) will likely stand back and wait to try to play until they have been shown the way to hold it and how the sound is made. Carefully copying the teacher’s model might be an important component of being a musician for Jenny. Perhaps she teaches students to be musicians by expecting they should pay strict attention to her as the musical model.

Tricia became frustrated when her ensemble could not keep pace with her conducting tempo. She panicked when, after failing to give “specific instructions” or “guidance” on how to do an activity, her students began to figure out how to do the activity by themselves. Her focus on planning for and controlling all details in the classroom might be akin to the image she holds of “conducting.” Professional conductors are, after all, addressed as “Maestro” (i.e., Master), which implies a level of control beyond that of teacher. Even if musicians in professional ensembles, who might have many years of experience and lead ensembles themselves, have a vision of how a piece should sound, they acquiesce to the Maestro’s authority to decide every detail. It makes
sense she might expect that younger musicians (who do not have much experience) need
her to make every decision and anticipate every possibility. Perhaps she teaches students
to be musicians by expecting they should follow her lead no matter what.

Deena became upset when a student “made a scene” about his difficulty with
sight-singing. It launched her into a tirade about students taking responsibility for their
learning and trying their best to learn instead of giving up. Two aspects of musician
come to mind: one, that they should do what she asks of them because she knows what
they need and has their best interests in mind; and two, they have a responsibility to pull
their weight in the group. Perhaps Deena lives out the discourse of ensemble musician by
always trying hard to learn her part and play it well, out of responsibility to the ensemble.
Perhaps she teaches students to be musicians by expecting they should do the same,
without calling attention to themselves or making excuses.

Nick, Drew, Randy, and Joe seemed to focus on aspects of community and
relationship in their VRWs. Nick wanted his students to experience “a lessening of self-
consciousness necessary for all good singing,” and worried when he felt disengaged from
his students. Drew described how he wanted to “balance” freedom and productivity; he
spoke of teaching as fun for his students and himself. Randy wanted to create a
“comfortable atmosphere” for learning; he wanted his students to be respectful and he
wanted to respect his students by “not push[ing] too hard.” Joe wanted to present music
as “something worthwhile and exciting”; he considered himself successful when he
“cultivated interest and helped the students advance.” Perhaps for Nick, Drew, Randy,
and Joe, community and fun are as important as making music well; the discourse of
musician might revolve around relationships with music and musicians. Maybe they
teach students to be musicians by establishing relationships with them in the midst of making music together.

For other participants, their experiences of the discourse of musician might center around individual artistry. Perhaps poise, practice, perfection, or communicating with audience dominate their musician identities and emerge in their teacher identities as well. If musicians’ identities are strongly performance oriented, it stands to reason they might see teaching as performance. Flawless performances are a goal of performing, which might help explain why participants were harsh with themselves when they thought they had made mistakes, especially when they thought they should have known better. Interestingly, they were also harsh on their students for making mistakes or not understanding, especially when participants believed the way they had taught something should have worked.

**Expecting Perfection**

The need for perfection as a teacher is palpable in participants’ stories. They often describe their mistakes with self-deprecating statements such as “I should have known” (Tricia), “I *must* fix _____” and “I *never* want to seem unsure” (Wendy). Participants were most frustrated when they could not figure out what to do while teaching, saying, “I tried to fix it” (Jenny), and “I didn’t know why they didn’t get it”; or if they failed to notice a problem or opportunity while they were teaching. Student teachers are under constant scrutiny because they cannot legally be left alone with students, so one might expect them to be upset about their mistakes. Even so, I believe a connection may exist between the goals of perfection in musical performance and perfection in teaching performance. Some participants’ more than others storied
themselves as confident, competent, and able to handle anything. They were especially upset when caught in a mistake, and tended to explain that it was not that bad with statements like “it wasn’t completely out of control” (Tricia).

Taken-for-Grantedness

Clandinin (2009) describes taken-for-grantedness as the way people familiar with certain contexts simply “understand” some things that are never said. The danger in taken-for-granted assumptions is that they operate outside of our awareness, yet still influence our understandings of situations and the ways we frame events. In music education, taken-for-grantedness is the notion of what should happen in the classroom, musically and socially; and what students should be able to do and understand.

In this study, participants’ expectations were formed by their own experiences as students (Latham et al., 2006; Lortie, 1975; Thompson, Campbell, & Barrett, 2011), which they had woven into a story of school and of music education—their story to live by (Connelly & Clandinin, 1999). Participants’ storied expectations were evident in the “should-have” statements (MacKinnon, 1987) in their reflections. (See Appendix H, Analytic Monologue 2, for an example of taken-for-grantedness in my own story of learning to teach music.)

Participants in the present study brought expectations to their student teaching internship experiences that seem to have been forged by their experiences as highly trained musicians and performers. As musicians, participants took for granted what is easy and what is difficult. Several expressed surprise at their students’ inability do something “basic” such as walk to the steady beat of a recording. They expected young students to be able to perform skills participants defined for themselves as easy or basic.
They expected older students to be advanced players able to understand and do the same things participants (as fellow advanced players) understood and did.

Participants also took for granted that practice would enable their students to play anything. Underlying this expectation is that perseverance is the key to success; as long as you do not give up, you will succeed. In addition, they took for granted that once students had worked on a skill, they had mastered it. They expected their students to correctly play repertoire, or parts of repertoire, they had previously played correctly (even once), especially in secondary performing ensembles. When students were unable to do basic things or were frustrated by repeated failures, participants became at times surprised, incredulous, and indignant.

The negative attitude of some preservice music teachers toward teaching elementary music may be related to their taken-for-granted assumptions about what is easy or difficult and about perseverance and mastery. If participants have always been able to walk to the steady beat of a recording, never struggled with singing in tune, or always experienced success through perseverance, they may be metacognitively unaware of how they know what they know, why a strategy works for them, or even what strategies they use when playing, singing, or moving. Perhaps they cannot understand how a student could not understand the most basic concepts of music, or cannot imagine how they might teach students to understand. Perhaps participants want students to simply “be up to speed” with them so they can communicate musically in ways with which participants are familiar.

Two other taken-for-granted expectations represent a conundrum of sorts in music education. Namely, that verbalizing (explaining) is the way to express understanding (as
opposed to moving, for example); and that “doing” is demonstrating understanding (and vice-versa). In other words, playing and singing indicate understanding of the abstract concepts undergirding those skills. On the one hand, music teachers expect students to be able to define terms and state facts. On the other hand, music teachers assume students understand that which they can play or sing. Participants in this study revealed their adherence to these taken-for-granted expectations in goal statements that students should do music in class, not just talk about it (e.g., Zeb), and incredulous statements about students’ inability to “do” a concept even though they were able to explain it with words (e.g., James). Drew illustrated this expectation by stating that his students sang on pitch, which “proved” to him that “they understood how [emphasis added] to sing on pitch.”

Effort and attitude are social components of the expectation that doing demonstrates understanding. Some participants believed students of any age should know what is expected of them socially, and act within those expectations regardless of any other factors such as emotions or motivation. Participants revealed these social components in negative statements. For example, when Jenny’s students were unsuccessful in activities, she took for granted that most students did understand, and should have been able to do what she asked, but did not exert enough effort to demonstrate understanding by doing, or did not take the activity seriously (attitude). Some participants (Jenny, James, Sue, Deena) assumed purposefulness on the part of students: students chose to give poor effort or be silly during an activity, or they refused to try to learn or to be respectful.

Participants in the present study held taken-for-granted assumptions about what is easy and difficult, and what students should know about teachers’ expectations of them.
socially. They also held that students who can define a concept should be able to perform the associated skill, that the ability to perform a skill indicates understanding of the concept(s) undergirding the skill, that perseverance leads to success, and that lessons learned once should be mastered. The danger in these taken-for-granted assumptions is when they remain unexamined and unchallenged, student teachers might rationalize their teaching behaviors and expectations regarding their assumptions rather than change their understandings and grow as teachers.
CHAPTER 9
IMPLICATIONS & SUGGESTIONS

In this chapter, I summarize the present study, and describe five possible limitations of the present study due primarily to the nature of the Video Reflection Assignment, and secondarily to decisions I made regarding setting and sampling. I describe how this study contributes to our understanding of music student teaching regarding five topics: using Reflective Cycle and Three-Dimensional Space frameworks to examine student teacher reflections; attending to student teachers’ stories of classroom events; possible miseducative consequences of the VRA; attending to alignment between student teacher and cooperating teacher Stories to Live By; and the interplay of musician and teacher identity. For each contribution, I pose possibilities for practice and suggestions for future research.

Limitations

Five possible limitations of this study are apparent: the limited view of student teachers’ reflections afforded by the Video Reflection Assignment (VRA), the mode of reflection, missing data, lack of control over how the VRA was completed, and that participants were all from the same university.

The Video Reflection Assignment completed by participants provided a “snapshot” of their reflections on practice because it represented only four lessons taught over the course of 15 weeks. It is probable participants’ habits of reflecting or rationalizing varied among their unrecorded reflections (e.g., unwritten, not documented by video recording). That some participants’ reflective practices varied within the boundaries of the VRA—over the course of the internship semester, and across two
placements—lends a measure of credibility to conclusions about participants’ tendencies to reflect or rationalize and factors influencing participants’ abilities to reflect.

Participants’ preferences for reflecting may have changed the nature of their reflections. Some participants may have preferred the mode of reflection employed by the VRA—writing answers to specific questions about discrete events; others may have preferred a different mode of reflection, for example verbal interaction with peers or mentors, more general questions, or free reflection with no guiding questions. I had no way of accommodating these differences, as the VRA was an established assignment of the seminar course. It is possible that some student teachers who did not consent to participate did so because they preferred other means of reflecting.

The lack of videos from several participants may have limited my analysis, as the videos I did receive enhanced my ability to analyze participants’ written reflections. I received so few lesson plans that the ones I did receive were of little use in making broader observations. I ended up discarding the use of lesson plans.

I have no way of knowing whether participants actually video recorded themselves or watched their videos when writing their reflections (unless they mentioned watching videos on their VRWs). Rhonda’s statements, for example, led me to believe she may not have watched her video; she states, “As I recall.” A synonym for “as I recall” is “if memory serves.” In other words, she leaves room for doubt or misremembering in her statement. I would not expect someone who watched herself on video to reference her memory in such a way. Whether she referenced her memory because she reflected from memory instead of the video, or because the video contradicted her memory, or some other reason, remains a mystery. I see no clear way to
have made sure participants actually video recorded and watch their videos while reflecting. If I were the seminar instructor, I could perhaps make sure student teachers handed in video recordings with VRWs; that they reflected while viewing videos would remain a matter of taking student teachers’ word for it.

Another limitation of the present study is that all participants were from one university. As such, their experiences were colored and shaped by the music education program at the university. That influence would likely be different at other universities and in other music education programs. Music teacher education would benefit, through a wider knowledge base, from investigations into video-based self-reflection practices in other institutions.

**Three-Dimensional Space and MacKinnon’s Clues as Analytic Tools**

When analyzing narrative data, tools such as Connelly and Clandinin’s (1988, 1999, 2000) *three-dimensional narrative space* and MacKinnon’s (1987) *clues to detect reflecting activity* could help researchers see aspects of student teachers’ reflections they might otherwise overlook or misinterpret. These tools might help researchers increase their awareness of the ways their emotions, preconceptions, preferences, and worldviews influence how they see student teachers and interpret preservice teachers’ narratives, which might help them consider alternative views and interpretations.

My own preconceptions and worldview colored my first impressions of participants’ reflections, especially those whose tone and language upset my egalitarian sensibilities like James and Zeb, but also—I later discovered—those whose tone and language resonated with me (e.g., Nick). James’ incredulity and Zeb’s formal language and descriptions of students pushed me to interpret their statements as judgmental and
paternalistic (see Analytic Monologue 3, Appendix H). I anticipated James and Zeb would only engage in acts of rationalization. Though I purposefully tried to step outside my negative feelings surrounding James and Zeb’s reflections, it was a difficult task.

What facilitated recognizing reframing activity on both James’ and Zeb’s VRWs was focusing my analysis first on the three-dimensional narrative spaces in their stories, and turning my attention second to looking for clues to detect reflective activity. My negativity toward James and Zeb, and other participants who used similar tone and language (e.g., Jenny, Sue) gradually faded (see Analytic Monologue 4, Appendix H). Especially helpful was searching for a change in the “should haves”—one of MacKinnon’s (1987) clues—from beginning to end on each VRW.

I later discovered similar preconceptions had colored my first impressions of Nick’s reflections, this time in the opposite direction. From my prior experiences with Nick, in- and outside of courses, I had come to think of him as a reflective person. I knew him to read more than the required coursework to explore ideas and concepts; he initiated lively discussions of ideas and seemed to confront his own beliefs and consider varied perspectives, which resonated with my worldview. Upon initial reading, his VRWs seemed quite “reflective” to me. When I examined his VRWs for components of three-dimensional narrative space, especially aspects of sociality, I saw his primary focus on self. When I looked for clues to detect reflective activity, I was surprised to find much evidence of rationalization, and little evidence of reflection. On the surface, he appeared to consider his students’ perspectives, but upon deeper examination, it was apparent he had not. He held fast to his own initial interpretations of problems, (initial problem,
conclusion, and implication). The tools of three-dimensional narrative space and clues to detect reflective activity facilitated clearer vision during analysis.

Many researchers have used Connelly and Clandinin’s three-dimensional narrative space to examine storied identity (a search for “three-dimensional space” in ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Database generated a list of twenty studies). I found few studies, however, citing MacKinnon’s study, and it was not clear whether they used his clues to detect reflective activity to analyze data. Nevertheless, it seems the clues can be used to examine student teachers’ reflective stories of teaching.

The ability to cleanse one’s research-lens-palate using theoretical concepts such as three-dimensional narrative space and tools such a clues to detect reflective activity may have implications for qualitative researchers, teacher educators, and cooperating teachers. Researchers’, teacher educators’, and cooperating teachers’ stories to live by sometimes align closely with student teachers’ stories; sometimes they do not align, but bump against each other and cause conflict. In either instance, using tools to see student teachers’ reflections differently could enhance the profession’s understanding of student teacher development. For those mentoring student teachers, these tools could inform and enrich feedback to student teachers, which would contribute to their growth as teachers.

MacKinnon’s (1987) and Connelly & Clandinin’s (1988, 1999) tools could also contribute to the professional development of those learning to be music teacher educators (i.e., doctoral students). For example, doctoral students might carry their own beliefs, metaphors, images, and stories to live by about what it means to be a professor, how to teach undergraduates and graduate students best, and what music education students should know and be able to do. Using three-dimensional narrative space and
clues to detect reflective activity to examine samples of undergraduate narratives of self and stories of field experiences could expose doctoral students’ emotions, preconceptions, preferences, and worldviews. This kind of activity could provide doctoral students opportunities to reframe their understandings, consider alternative views and interpretations, and grow as future teacher educators.

**Attending to Student Teachers’ Stories of Classroom Events**

Attending to the ways student teachers position themselves when describing classroom events might help supervisors and cooperating teachers recognize dilemmas of practice and patterns of positioning in stories. Student teachers in the present study used language to position themselves in their stories of practice either *in the midst*, *separate* from, or *outside* of the classroom events they experienced as student teachers. Calling student teachers’ attention to patterns in their storied reflections might increase their self-awareness and orient them toward looking for patterns themselves. Likewise, attending to student teachers’ metaphors can reveal their beliefs about teaching and learning (Bullough & Stokes, 1994; Thompson & Campbell, 2003). This could be important for teacher educators, especially internship supervisors and seminar teachers, who could bring awareness to the ways language reveals and shapes student teachers’ practice.

**The Video Reflection Assignment and Wendy**

The results of this study regarding the Video Reflection Assignment itself largely support the findings of others who have researched the use of video and guided reflection (Bailey, 2000; Kukanauza de Mazeika, 2001; Schoen, 2006; Sumision, 2000). VRWs revealed that video recordings helped some, but not all, participants see themselves more objectively; some seemed to see only what they perceived while teaching, which
confirmed or validated what they already thought. For the latter, VRW questions, which were intended to guide them to reflect, were ineffective. For able and willing participants, the VRA was useful, and helped them learn and grow as teachers; for unable or unwilling students, the assignment was simply another unwanted requirement that did not help them grow and learn as teachers.

The reflective assignment in the present study seemed to be either neutral or beneficial for most participants. There is unexpected evidence, however, that the assignment might have been less than neutral for one participant—it might have been miseducative. Wendy seemed to perseverate on an issue that she “would not have noticed” except for the videos—her rate of speech (an issue I did not notice in her video recordings). The magnitude of the issue grew disproportionately large in the second VRW where the problem became her pace of teaching. For Wendy, her rate or pace is the biggest weakness in her teaching. She reprimands herself, “Always speak slowly! . . . in every lesson.” The implication for Wendy in both VRWs is the same (she needs to slow down), but it seems bigger in her second VRW because of the emotion and hyperbole with which she states it. Wendy seemed to be distracted by the video from more important issues because she had not noticed the problem apart from the video. While researchers seem to agree that student teachers need guidance in how to reflect (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Kukanauza de Mazeika, 2001), the idea that a video reflection assignment in which student teachers reflect without interactive guidance might actually be miseducative is missing from extant research.

In light of Wendy’s experience with the VRA, a suggestion would be to allow student teachers to choose the type of reflective assignments they complete during the
internship, or require that they complete a variety of types of reflection. In addition, at least some reflective assignments should be guided or discussed with university supervisors, seminar instructors, or cooperating teachers, to check for the kind of distraction Wendy experienced, and to help student teachers learn what is pedagogically important for reflection.

Attending to Alignment Between Stories to Live By

Conflicts between student teachers’ and cooperating teachers’ stories to live by caused a shift in participants’ reflection toward rationalization in the present study. The ability and disposition to reflect on practice is considered critical to teacher growth and development, therefore student teaching experiences that encourage or sustain the tendency to rationalize are detrimental to students teachers development. Likewise, student teaching experiences that encourage or sustain the tendency to reflect benefit student teacher development. Therefore attending to alignment between student teachers’ stories and the stories of cooperating teachers with whom they are placed could be one way to prevent miseducative student teaching experiences.

Incorporating narrative techniques into the process of placing student teachers might facilitate more effective matches between student teachers and cooperating teachers. For example, preservice teachers preparing to student teach and potential cooperating teachers could read or listen to each other’s stories before agreeing to a match, then report their reactions or comments about the stories to the person in charge of placements. That person could then match student teachers and cooperating teachers armed with a narrative tool. If either student or cooperating teacher react very negatively to the others’ story, it might be a signal to re-consider the match.
The Interplay of Musician and Teacher Identities

The topic of music teacher identity is often represented in research literature and philosophical writings as a conflict between musician identity and teacher identity. Pellegrino (2009) outlined the current debate on the topic along five themes: teacher versus performer identity conflict, personal and professional benefits of music making, holistic view of musical identities, roles and situated identities, and defining music teacher identity. She summarized commonalities among the themes in two categories. One, identity is dynamic and individually constructed, and taking research “snapshots” of music teacher identity is problematic because it may not represent how identity changes over time and with experience. Two, ideally, music teacher identity is a product of integrated musician or performer identity and teacher identity in the context of the classroom.

Conkling (2003) found that preservice music teachers conceived of the processes of learning to teach and learning to perform music similarly, which may have influenced the ways they made sense of teaching experiences.

They may try to negotiate the process of learning to teach in a similar manner as they have negotiated the process of learning to perform . . . by: 1) looking for expert models, 2) rehearsing or problem-solving in their teaching performance in between lessons or classes, and 3) seeking out other practitioners, especially peers, for useful feedback and support. (p. 21)

While Conkling’s study was not about music teacher identity, it may point to a finding of the present study, that participants lived out their teaching practice through their discursive musician identities. Participants’ understanding of themselves as musicians—as a confident maestro, as focused and determined, as responsible and dependable, as a
member of a musical community, or as poised and engaging artist—served as a lens through which to make sense of teaching experiences.

Participants’ teacher identities seemed to emerge through their musician identities, but it was unclear whether they were aware of it. An implication for practice in music education would be to actively engage preservice music teachers’ understandings of themselves as musicians, and reference the process of learning to perform music as a resource for the process of learning to teach.

**Suggestions for Future Research**

As often happens in research, the results of this study generated more questions than answers. I see many directions for future research, including the following.

- Reflective practices in preservice music teacher education. A survey of current practices of music education programs regarding reflective assignments could shed light on innovative or established techniques for facilitating student teacher reflection. What practices effectively assist music student teachers to grow and change for the better? In addition, further investigation into the reflective practices of music student teachers would inform our current understanding of how they learn to teach, including ways musician identity influences teacher identity.

- The process of placing student teachers with cooperating teachers. A survey of current practice among music education programs for placing student teachers with cooperating teachers could reveal exemplary models. Questions could include, “Who makes placement decisions?” “Are some student teachers allowed
input into their placement?” “What factors facilitate or impede attempts at considered choices in placing students?”

- Using narrative to enhance learning during the student teaching internship. Experimenting with ways to use narrative to help match student teachers with cooperating teachers could inform the process in general. Experimenting with ways to use narrative to enhance the student teacher-cooperating teacher relationship and experience separate from placement decisions might also be useful. Student teachers and cooperating teachers could consider each other’s stories to live by as a way to understand each other’s perspectives on classroom events. It may be especially helpful in issues of classroom management and decision-making around cooperating teachers’ established procedures and practices.
I began this report with a Prelude to give readers a sense of the storied identity I brought to this research because I believed it would enhance their understanding of the paper. I explained how I realized I had been making sense of the data by negotiating past, present, and future; and that who I am in the present is shaped by understandings I constructed of my life experiences up to now—experiences which now include having completed this research. In some respects I still do not know that I can say where every idea came from, in the same way I might be unable to tell you how I know how to interpret a classroom event. The accumulation of all my experiences, including completing this report, has resulted in my “just knowing” when interpreting the data, even while I continually strive to be more aware. I believe it is appropriate to end this report with a Postlude to give readers a sense of how the process of completing this research has affected my own story to live by.

When I began this study, I could not imagine how my personal orientation toward social justice could influence my interpretation of the data. As soon as I received data in May, however, and throughout the summer months during which I analyzed data as a full-time job, I realized the many ways my analysis was colored by my personal worldview. I found myself at times offended and incredulous about participants’ tone. At other times, I found myself wrapped up in fond memories of participants. In the midst of analyzing data, I realized how I was imposing “shoulds” on participants—things I had taken for granted about student teachers and reflective practice—even while I noted that participants imposed “shoulds” upon their students.
I found that I needed to check my understandings and reactions to the data with colleagues in much the same way I had learned to check my understanding of social situations with trusted friends. The process of checking my understanding and becoming aware of places my story has woven itself into this study has continued through my dissertation defense as committee members called upon me to be more transparent in revealing my worldview and to consider that which I might not already have considered.

Thus, I realize that, indeed, the narrative of study is never finished. As I have moved through writing interim texts (Connelly and Clandinin, 2000), I have continuously retold and re-created the study, always integrating new thoughts and ideas into old. The “finished product” you read in this report is far removed from even the “finished product” I thought I had at the end of the summer of data analysis; and the narrative of the study continues into the future as I share what I have learned with my students, friends, and colleagues; and as I consider future directions for my research.
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APPENDIX A

STUDENT TEACHING SEMINAR SYLLABUS

Spring 2010
Syllabus

Perspective

The primary aim of your student teaching experience is to ease you into the role of music teacher by having you work under the mentorship of practicing teachers. This weekly Student Teaching Seminar will enable you to:

1. exchange experiences with others, and so expand your learning base;
2. discuss questions, problems, and philosophies in a group led by a veteran teacher of music; and
3. organize and manage your semester’s work in a way that will help you pursue a teaching contract.

In short, if you use this semester as it is intended, your primary attention will be on developing your teaching skills and your employability.

As with most worthwhile pursuits, student teaching consists of more than meets the eye, i.e., more than traveling to schools and accumulating teaching practice. The subtle tasks residing below the surface of the student teaching experience can feel irritating and distracting at times, but they are important. Some are designed to support the development of your teaching skills (Teaching Support Tasks); others are designed to enhance your employability (Professional Placement Tasks). These tasks, all encompassed by the structure of the Student Teaching Seminar, are described below.

Teaching Support Tasks

Writing Lesson (Rehearsal) Plans

You won’t be reading a plan while you teach a class or conduct an ensemble, but if you want a reasonable chance to succeed, you will have a plan. You will write lesson plans as a student teacher for two reasons:

1. Writing helps you formulate you plan. You put your thoughts down on paper so you can see them, evaluate them identify potential problems, and revise them into a final plan that gives you confidence. Then you study the plan you have transferred from your mind to paper until you return it to your mind in a neater, better-organized, more complete form. To do less, especially the early stages of teaching, is to court disaster.
2. There is no other way for either your cooperating teacher or your supervising teacher to know that you made a plan, or that you followed the plan if you did make one. Those who work with you to help you learn to teach will use your plans to
   a. Advise you of alternate approaches before you teach,
   b. See more clearly where and why your teaching took a good turn or a less-than good turn, and
   c. Help you in general to reflect on your teaching and make subsequent plans for improvement.

To make the most of the help available to you, be sure to share your plans at the outset with both your cooperating teacher and your supervising teacher.

Maintaining a Daily Reflective Journal

Immediately following each session you observe – and even more so each session you teach - your mind will be racing with detail about high spots and low spots, student reactions, and your reactions, causes and effects. As vivid as your thoughts are at that moment, most will fade with time – the greater time, the greater the loss. Therefore, you will want to put your reflections down in writing as soon as possible. Only by doing that will you have comprehensive, accurate information for discussions and for your own use in planning subsequent lessons.

In writing your notes, keep in mind that there are two basic levels of reflections:
   1. what happened and,
   2. what you think about what happened.

A simple list of events is worth much less than a reflection of your thoughts, feelings, evaluations, and analysis. One good approach is to identify the two kinds of information differently in your notes. For example, you might circle the deeper reflections in handwriting or bold them in printed copy. This will accomplish two things;
   1. you will monitor your notes as you write to be sure you are recording deep reflections, and
   2. when you use the notes, you will easily zero in on the deeper, more useful reflections.

Video-recording Your Teaching

Feel fortunate that today’s technology makes it easy for you to see yourself as other see you (painful as that can be at time). You will video-record yourself teaching sessions for later use by yourself and others.

Analyzing Your Teaching With Others

On many occasions your cooperating teacher or supervising teacher will talk to you about your teaching sessions from his or her observations. You will want to listen carefully and
take notes about important points. During those times you will also have questions to ask based on your self-observations. Interactions with your cooperating or supervising teacher will be most rich if you have first conducted an extensive self-analysis. Expect your supervising teacher to comment also on your written reflections, i.e., completeness and apparent usefulness. Expect both cooperating teacher and supervising teacher to sometimes watch video-recordings of your teaching with you as a way to offer more specific suggestions.

**Polishing Your Presentation Skills**

You may have already made PowerPoint shows and presented them as part of our music education curriculum. We have been incorporating that skill into our classes in recent years because we know it will be important to you as a teaching professional. You will make a Power Point present of the school district in which your first placement resides to be sure you have that skill in hand.

**Professional Placement Tasks**

**Developing a Resume and Preparing Your Career Portfolio**

You will want a complete, professional-looking resume and portfolio when you apply for a teaching position. Review and begin preparing the necessary components listed in the *Student Teacher Portfolio*. When we bring a guest to the seminar from Career Services to advise you about writing a resume and preparing your portfolio, your advanced preparation will provide the content you need to plug into the format you are given.

**Polishing Your Interview Skills**

You will not present well without the ability to represent yourself well in a face-to-face meeting with school administrators – including the abilities to listen carefully, answer questions articulately, ask good questions, and in general represent yourself well as a bright, personable, competent teacher-to-be. You will receive interview advice and opportunities to practice interview as a part of the Student Teaching Seminar.

**Materials**

- 6, 1-hour Panasonic mini-digital videotapes. (You must use only Panasonic tapes on school cameras.) For better price than you will find in stores, go to [www.tapestockonline.com](http://www.tapestockonline.com).

- DVD discs if you intend to make a DVD of your teaching.
Readings

Because of the primary aim of the student teaching experience, as described at the beginning of this syllabus, reading assignments as such are not an integral part of this course. You will need to read short teaching scenarios or case studies as provided and respond to questions in preparation for discussion in class. Still, there are some materials that your will need to use a lot the way to make your student teaching experience and professional preparation complete. The items listed below are a matter of your staying abreast of important general information. We will add to this list during the semester.

• Pennsylvania Department of Education Website
• Website for your placement school districts
• MENC Website
• PMEA Website

Course Assignments

1. A weekly Reflective Journal which includes dated daily entries and a weekly Reflection Worksheet sent to your supervising teacher and Mr. Norris by e-mail no later than noon on Saturday. NOTE: At the discretion of your supervising teacher, you may be required to submit your reflective journal more frequently – perhaps daily.

   You must keep your journal daily, even if you submit it only weekly. You should, in fact, write reflections at the earliest possible time after the event.

   Head each entry clearly with date, time, class, and other information that you or your supervising teacher might want to know later. Do not rely on remembering any details, no matter how vivid they are at the time.

   We will discuss common journal topics as described in your Reflection Worksheet in class protecting the identity of the writer. Please submit by email as a WORD attachment.

2. Lesson plans and rehearsal plans. Let the PDE Fine Arts Standards guide your plans. Incorporate goals, objectives, a sequential plan for delivery of the lesson, and means of assessing the results.

3. Cover Letter and Resume - Please submit by email as a WORD attachment.

4. A PowerPoint slide show presenting information about the school district from your first placement. Use the school website, photographs, and animation in the slide presentation.

5. Observation Guides (2) of your respective schools with a focus on classroom environment, classroom management, pedagogy, teaching/rehearsal strategies, and
musicianship. The observation guides are meant to guide your thinking as you observe music teachers in various music classrooms. *Please submit by email as a WORD attachment.*

6. **Student Teacher Self-Evaluation (2)** – *Please submit by email at the conclusion of each placement.*

7. **A Student Teaching Portfolio.** You will create a teaching portfolio to bring to a job interview. This will be a product-oriented collection of materials that must look professional and organized and easy to read. All materials in the portfolio should be typed, as should all organizers or headings and presented in an attractive notebook or binder that allows you to add and remove materials easily.

8. **A Notebook / Binder** for class notes, discussions and activities

9. **Video Reflection Assignments (two).** You will videotape yourself teaching during the 6th or 7th week of each placement and complete two Video Reflection Worksheets.

   • Choose one grade level, class, or ensemble that you are teaching. Send an e-mail to me (Mr. Norris) by the seminar class preceding the week of recording indicating your choice.

   • Videotape *every* time you teach that grade level, class, or ensemble as follows:

     **Elementary placement:** record a single lesson with as many classes as you teach in one grade level.
     e.g. If you choose third grade, and you teach three sections of third grade music in a week, you will end up with three videos and between one and three lesson plans. (If you taught the same lesson three times, only hand in one lesson plan.)

     **Secondary placement:** If the structure of your secondary placement includes several sections of the same class, record a single lesson with as many sections of that class. If your secondary placement does not include several sections of the same class, record every lesson taught to a single class or ensemble.
     e.g. If you choose concert choir, and the choir meets twice a week, you will end up with two videos and one or two lesson plans.

   • **View every** videotape you record and complete a Video Reflection Worksheet for *each* videotape before teaching the lesson or class again. If you will teach the same lesson or class again in the same day, jot down some notes on the VRW from memory before teaching again, then complete the VRW after watching the video later.
• Turn in the following materials by the seminar class following the week of recording: two (2) videos and VRWs, and the lesson plan(s) you used for those lessons. One must be the first video; you may choose the other video (indicate which one you chose on the VRW).

**Grading Policy**

Student enrolled in the Student Teaching Seminar are expected to attend every class, prepared required readings as assigned, participate fully in discussions, and turn in assignments before or on the due date. There are no excused absences. Each absence, missing assignment, poorly completed or late assignment will subtract from your total seminar grade.
APPENDIX B

VIDEO REFLECTION WORKSHEET

Music Education 4668: Video Reflection Assignment

Video Reflection Worksheet

Watch the video and complete this worksheet before teaching the lesson or class again.

Student Teacher __________________________ Date __________

Elementary/Secondary Placement? ______________ Class videotaped ______

How many times have you used this worksheet prior to this assignment? __________

Directions:

1. Prior to watching the video, read the questions on this worksheet.
2. Watch the video and begin to think of answers based on what you see in the video.
3. Write thorough answers to each question.

Questions:

• Choose a specific moment or event in the video that sticks in your mind. Describe what happened. (When and where did it happen? Who was involved? What do you see and hear on the video? What do you remember thinking or feeling at this moment when you were teaching?)

• Why did you choose that moment or event over other things that happened?

• What, if any, evidence does that moment or event provide that your students learned (or did not learn) what you wanted them to learn?

• How did that moment or event help you learn about the class, your students, yourself, or your teaching?

• What, if anything, will you do differently the next time you teach this lesson? Why?
APPENDIX C

LETTERS GRANTING ACCESS TO STUDENTS

Dear Alison,

I have reviewed Heather Russell's request for protocol review and understand she is interested in inviting music education students enrolled in Student Teaching Seminar in Spring 2010 to participate in her study. As chair of the music education and therapy department, I grant Heather permission to meet with the student teachers, provided (instructor of record) also grants Heather permission.

Sincerely,

Deb

Deborah A. Sheldon, PhD
Professor and Chair, Music Education and Therapy
Boyer College of Music and Dance
Temple University

Dr. Alison M. Reynolds
Associate Professor of Music Education
Boyer College of Music and Dance
Temple University
2001 N. 13th Street
Philadelphia, PA 19122

Thu, Dec 17, 2009 at 10:04 AM

Greetings Heather and Alison,

I reviewed all the documents provided for the Videotape Reflection Assignment research and enthusiastically agree to participate and support as needed. The Spring 10 Seminar class with 24 participants will work well for this project as we can begin with instructions on the first meeting in January.

Looking forward to being a part of this research. Let's plan to meet and discuss prior to the first class meeting January 19, 2010.

Best regards,

Mike
APPENDIX D

REQUEST FOR PROTOCOL REVIEW
Subcommittee B
Temple University Main Campus

Title: An Investigation of the Use of a Videotape Reflection Assignment with Music Student Teachers.

Primary Investigator: Alison Reynolds, Ph.D., Department of Music Education and Therapy

Student-Investigator: Heather A. Russell, Ph.D. Candidate in Music Education

Part I. Characteristics of Potential Subjects

A. About how many subjects will you need?

At least ten (10), but no more than twenty-five (25) participants are needed. Potential participants will be students enrolled in Music Education 4668-Senior Student Teaching Seminar in the spring 2010 semester. At present, twenty (20) students are enrolled in the course and the total number of seats in the course is twenty-five (25).

B. Describe the potential subjects in terms of gender, age range, ethnic group, economic status, and any other significant descriptors.

According to Temple University's Office of Institutional Research (2009 Student Profiles Factbook), the following ethnic groups are represented in the population of the Boyer College (undergraduate and graduate): American Indian/Alaska Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Black or African American, Hispanic, white, unknown or other, and non-resident aliens (international students). The ethnic diversity of the Music Education program may not reflect the same diversity, however. Anecdotal evidence suggests the large majority of music education majors are white, with very few people of other ethnicities represented. As of fall 2009, the number of undergraduate music education majors enrolled in the college was 139. Most music education students complete their teaching internship in their final semester of study before graduating, so it may be safe to assume that the student teachers in spring 2010 will be seniors or high seniors (>120 credit hours). These students are typically 20 or 21 years old, with age ranging between 20 and 50. The number of male and female students, and the number of students in each music education concentration (vocal, instrumental, jazz) enrolled in Mued 4668 in spring 2010 are unknown at this time. Economic status is unknown.

No one will be excluded on the basis of ethnic group, age, gender, academic concentration, or economic status.
C. Indicate any special subject characteristics, such as persons with mental handicaps, prisoners, pregnant women, etc.

There are no known special subject characteristics of this type.

D. What is the general state of health of the subjects (physical and mental)?

All potential participants are presumed to be healthy.

E. Describe how you will gain access to these potential subjects?

The Music Education and Therapy Department Chair and the instructor of Mued 4668 have granted access to potential participants, who will be students enrolled in spring 2010 (Appendix A).

Upon approval from the Temple University Institutional Review Board Committee B and my dissertation advisory committee, I will visit a meeting of Mued 4668 to describe the project and invite student teachers to participate (see Script to Invite Student Teachers to Participate, Appendix D). The visit will occur during the first or second week of the semester, at a time and on a day agreed upon by the Mued 4668 instructor, as is convenient for the class schedule.

F. How will subjects be selected or excluded from the study?

Potential participants will be students enrolled in Senior Student Teaching Seminar in the spring 2010 semester. All potential participants responding in the affirmative will be accepted for participation in the study. No students will be excluded from the study unless they initially decline consent, or if they initially consent and then request to withdraw from the study. Participants are free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

G. If subjects are from an institution other than Temple University, please indicate the name of the office responsible for granting access to the subjects.

H. If the subjects are children, anyone suffering from a known psychiatric condition, or legally restricted, please explain why it is necessary to use these persons as subjects.

There are no known special subject characteristics of this type.

**Part II. Experimental or Research Procedure**

A. Describe the objectives and/or goals of your research.
Researchers who have examined teaching expertise have identified several factors that differentiate between novices and experts (Berliner, 2001; Borich, 2007; Bromme, 2004; Danielson, 1996; Dunn & Shriner, 1999; Hendel, 1995; Krull, Oras, & Sisask, 2007; Reynolds, 1992, 1995). Amount of experience, context (specific schools, students, subject taught), types of knowledge (content, pedagogical, and pedagogical content knowledge), and the performance of teacher tasks (pre-, inter-, and postactive tasks) are important factors in developing teacher expertise. However, no one factor accounts for the development of expertise. Deliberate practice and reflective practice help connect all of these factors. The combination of factors forms the basis for the development of teacher expertise.

Research on teaching expertise has revealed several characteristics related to reflective practice. For example, the National Board of Professional Teacher Standards (NBPTS) developed a list of prototypical features of teacher expertise that states (among other things) expert teachers are better at using knowledge, solving problems, adapting and modifying goals, making decisions, perceiving classroom events, and monitoring student learning; and test hypotheses more frequently than average or good teachers (Berliner, 2001). All of these features represent reflective practice as described in the three stages of Mackinnon’s reflective cycle (1987): framing problems or concerns (representing problems, imposing meaning on ambiguous stimuli); reframing problems or concerns, or considering alternative definitions and solutions (recognizing meaningful patterns, imposing meaning); and resolving problems or concerns by forming better understandings and taking action (flexibility in action, developing automaticity). In addition to the list of prototypical features, the NBPTS lists five propositions essential to accomplished teaching, one of which is reflective practice: “Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience” (Borich, 2007, p. 31). The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC) provides ten principles for evaluating teachers. Principle 9 states, “The teacher is a reflective practitioner who continually evaluates the effects of his or her choices and actions on others...and who actively seeks out opportunities to grow professionally” (Borich, 2007, p. 32).

The student teaching internship may be the first in-depth experience preservice teachers have to gather experiences with authentic students. In the classroom, student teachers begin to apply the knowledge and skills they have acquired in classes, and reflective practice is an important factor in this process (Conway & Hodgman, 2006; Reynolds, 1992, 1995; Webster, 1999). For example, an important component of effective teaching is the ability to plan lessons with a combination of knowledge about child development and an understanding of the individual needs of one’s students (Borich, 2007; Miranda, 2004; Reynolds, 1992, 1995). Accurate reflection on past interactions with students is crucial to understanding the developmental and individual needs of one’s students; and
using that knowledge to plan and adapt future lessons (Danielson, 2006; Conway & Hodgman, 2006; Hendel, 1995; Standley & Madsen, 1991; Sheldon & DeNardo, 2005; Reynolds, 1992, 1995.) Therefore, reflective practice is an essential skill (and habit) for student teachers to cultivate.

Student teachers are typically required to use specific tools to reflect on their internship experiences. Important tools for reflection seem to be those that elicit an objective view of oneself and deepen reflection, such as answering reflective prompts in journals, viewing videos of teaching, and collaborating with other educators (Bailey, 2000; Hughes, 2005; Husu, Toom, & Patrikainen, 2008; Sumision, 2000; Welsch & Devlin, 2006; Wiggins & Bodoin, 1998). Prompted or guided reflection seems to be more effective than open or free reflection, especially for novice and preservice teachers, who may not have had the experience necessary to focus on pedagogically important events or interpret them accurately (Aten, 2003; Hughes, 2005; Reynolds, 1992, 1995). Viewing videotapes of oneself teaching for the purpose of reflecting is a recommended practice for both preservice and novice teachers (Borich, 2007; Conway and Hodgman, 2006, 2009; Danielson, 1996). It can help teachers to see themselves as others see them, and recognize the impact of their pedagogical decisions on individual students, which may improve the accuracy of reflections (Aten, 2003; Hughes, 2005; Husu, Toom & Patrikainen, 2008; Lee & Loughran, 2000; Wang & Sogin, 1997; Welsch & Devlin, 2006). Ideally, these tools help establish habits of effective reflective practice in student teachers that they will continue when they enter the profession.

Researchers have noted a need for documenting the process of learning to teach and for examining established practices in music teacher education (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Conkling, 2003; Dunn & Shriner, 1998; Nierman, Zeichner, & Hobbel, 2002; Reynolds, 1992; Standley & Madsen, 1995; Welsch & Devlin, 2006). The structure of music education programs makes them well suited to examining the reflective cycle in learning to plan, teach, and evaluate lessons. Typical practice is to plan one lesson for each grade or elective, to be taught to all groups or sections, resulting in repeated opportunities to refine the teaching of the lesson. This recursive cycle of planning, teaching, and evaluating the same lesson several times within a short span of time (usually one or two weeks) is a characteristic of music education (and other arts education). Because of this structure, music teachers are rapidly afforded many opportunities to identify teaching and learning problems, attempt to understand them, and formulate and test hypotheses for resolving them. Because of this structure, learning to teach through reflective practice may be qualitatively different for music teachers and general education teachers. Perhaps music student teachers attend to different aspects of teaching and learning than general education student teachers. Much of the research literature about reflective practice in learning to teach comes from the field of general education. More research is needed to explore the characteristics of music student teachers’ reflective thinking as evidenced in existing music
teacher education practices. The present study is designed to examine one established practice in music teacher education, a reflective assignment during the student teaching internship, and how it operates in the process of learning to teach music. The focus of this study is to examine various levels and types of thinking and reflection between teaching episodes and placements of the same music student teacher.

The purpose of this study is to examine one approach to how music student teachers learn to teach in the context of their student teaching internship placements. The questions of this study are

1) To what extent do music student teachers employ discrimination and inferential thinking when writing reflections on video recordings of their own teaching in response to written prompts focusing on critical incidents observed in the videos?

2) What is revealed in music student teachers’ written reflections on video recordings of their own teaching in regard to sources of help in learning to plan, teach, and evaluate lessons?

B. Please describe the intended experimental or research procedure. This should include a description of what the subject will experience or be required to do. Please attach a copy of all questionnaires or instruments to be used.

Upon approval from the Temple University Institutional Review Board Committee B and my dissertation advisory committee, I will visit a meeting of [Mued 4668] in the first or second week of the semester, to describe the project and invite student teachers to consider consenting to participate (see Script to Invite Student Teachers to Participate, Appendix D). All consent forms will be collected prior to the first Video Reflection Assignment due date.

All Music Education students participate in one semester of student teaching before graduating. Students enroll in three courses during the semester, Mued [Mued 4689]: Student Teaching-Elementary (elementary placement); Mued [Mued 4789]: Student Teaching-Secondary (secondary placement); and Mued [Mued 4668]: Senior Student Teaching Seminar (seminar). The semester is divided into approximately equal halves (in weeks), which delineate the elementary and secondary placements. Approximately half of the student teachers complete their elementary placement first followed by the secondary placement, half complete their secondary placement first followed by the elementary placement. In the spring 2010 semester, twenty-three students will complete their student teaching internships and weekly seminar course by May 7, 2010 and may graduate on May 13, 2010.

Student teachers are required to complete several assignments for the seminar (see Syllabus, Appendix B). These assignments include lesson plans for every class
they teach, written daily journal entries, and weekly reflection sheets. Student teachers are encouraged to routinely video record themselves teaching, and are provided digital video cameras and tripods for this purpose. One diagnostic assignment requires student teachers to videotape themselves, and is the focus of the current study. Following is a description of that assignment.

Student teachers are required to videotape themselves teaching several times in the penultimate week of each placement. (DV cassettes for this assignment are provided by the Music Education Department.) The number of times videotapes are recorded will depend on individual class schedules. They record every lesson they teach that week to a grade level, class or ensemble of their choice. For the elementary placement, the directions are to record a single lesson with as many classes in one grade level as the student teacher taught. If the structure of the secondary placement includes several sections of the same class, the directions are the same. If the secondary placement does not include several sections of the same class, directions are to record every lesson taught that week to a single class or ensemble. Student teachers are to complete one Video Reflection Worksheet (VRW, Appendix C) in response to each videotape (teaching episode). VRWs are intended to focus student teachers’ reflection on critical incidents on the video and promote deep and meaningful reflection. While VRWs must be used for this assignment, student teachers receive a copy of the VRW at the beginning of the semester and may use it at any time. For each placement, student teachers are required turn in only two videotapes and VRWs, and lesson plans associated with those two videotapes. One videotape/VRW/lesson plan must be the first teaching episode of the week, the other may be chosen by each student teacher. The criteria for choosing the second videotape/VRW/lesson plan are at each student teacher’s discretion. The assignments will be turned in to the seminar teacher, who will grade them as pass or fail. The assignment will be discussed in the seminar class. After semester grades have been turned in to the university by the instructors of the internship courses (May 2010), data from any student consenting to participate will be collected from the seminar instructor.

The number of videotapes student teachers will record for each placement and the length of each teaching episode will vary depending on individual placements and the choice of which class to record. For each placement, student teachers are required to turn in only two videotapes and VRWs, and lesson plans associated with them; one must be the first videotape, the second will be chosen by each student from the total number of videotapes made. If all students complete the assignment for both placements, they will submit 92 videotaped teaching episodes and VRWs, and at least 46 lesson plans (23 student teachers x two placements = 46; 2 videotapes x 46=92). Videotaped teaching episodes will vary in length depending on individual school schedules, but may be 25 to 75 minutes.
If as few as ten (10) students participate in this study, the number of videotaped teaching episodes and VRWs included as data will be 40, and at least 20 lesson plans (10 student teachers x two placements = 20; 2 videotapes x 20 = 40).

**Data Collection.** After grades have been turned in for the semester, I will obtain copies of participants’ assignment materials from the seminar instructor. (See section I.E for consent procedures.) The following types of data will be collected from participants:
- videotapes
- Video Reflection Worksheets
- lesson plans

As an additional source of data, I (Student-Investigator) will keep a research journal as I collect and analyze data (Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Patton, 1987). The research journal will include notes on all phases of data collection and analysis, including emergent categories and themes, working with auditors, and drawing conclusions.

**Analysis.** Data analyses will rely heavily on my interpretations, as the researcher, through interaction with the data (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Analysis will primarily focus on participants’ perceptions of their own teaching and the process of learning to teach. While initial categories for analysis have been established (inference and discrimination thinking, types of changes made), the qualitative paradigm allows for flexibility in interpreting additional, emergent categories during analysis (Creswell, 2007; Marshall & Rossman, 2006; Patton, 1987).

An important characteristic of qualitative data analysis is constant comparison, the process of systematically searching and arranging the accumulated data to increase understanding of it (Husu, Toom, & Patrikainen, 2008). Analysis occurs in the midst of data collection. This points to the importance of the researcher’s journal. Keeping notes on analysis throughout the process of collecting and analyzing data will illuminate the cycle of constant comparison by recording the ideas, codes, and themes that seem to be emerging and reveal how my prior knowledge and assumptions as a music teacher and teacher educator influence and interact with the data.

**Auditors.** Auditors will be used two times in analysis for triangulation (Patton, 1987). First, to review coded changes between lesson plans and videotapes; second, to review accurate versus inaccurate designation of comments on VRWs. Auditors will be teacher educators who are Ph.D. candidates or Professors of Music Education and are available during summer and fall 2010. Additionally, they will have five or more years experience teaching elementary or secondary music and possess CITI certification to work with human subjects.

**Lesson plans and videotapes.** To determine whether participants deviated from or adapted the lesson plan or plans while teaching, I will watch videotapes and
compare them to written lesson plans, noting any differences between them. If one lesson plan is used for multiple recordings, I will compare it with each recording. If a different lesson plan is used for each videotape, I will compare each with the corresponding video. To determine the degree to which participants varied the lesson between teaching episodes and the type of variation, I will compare noted differences between teaching episodes for each participant. While types of changes will emerge during analysis, examples of anticipated types of changes are listed in Table 1.

Table 1  
Examples of Types of Changes That May Be Observed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Change</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>order of activities, order within an activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>song, activity, instrument, piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Techniques</td>
<td>questioning, modeling, verbal or non-verbal instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation (for students’ individual needs)</td>
<td>student sits rather than stands, works with a partner, receives individualized attention from teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistical</td>
<td>room change, fire drill, many students absent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An auditor will review the coded changes and videotapes. The auditor and I will discuss the codes, look for evidence of types of changes in video reflection worksheets, and negotiate a final list of types of changes made by student teachers. The number of changes between the lesson plan and each teaching episode, the number of changes between videotapes, and the number of each type of change will be tallied for each participant.

Video Reflection Worksheets (VRWs) and videotapes. VRWs will be examined for evidence of the types of thinking and reflection participants used when evaluating and re-planning the lesson or lessons. A scoring system created by Standley and Madsen (1991) and used by Sheldon and DeNardo (2005) will be used to assess statements made on VRWs (illustrated in Table 2). Statements will be initially categorized as discrimination or inference statements. A statement will be considered a discrimination statement if it is an observation made without interpretation. A statement will be considered an inference statement if it is an observation made with some level of interpretation.

Accurate discrimination statements will receive one point each, and one point will be subtracted for each inaccurate discrimination statement. Accurate inferential statements will receive five points each, while inaccurate inferential statements will result in a loss of five points. Observation analysis scores (OS) will be tabulated for each student teacher by tallying points for each videotaped teaching episode. A mean observation analysis score will be calculated for each student.
teacher by elementary placement (EOS), secondary placement (SOS), and overall (OOS).

The researcher will examine videotapes to assess the accuracy of the statements made on VRWs. An auditor will examine a sample of videotapes and statements and discuss any disagreements regarding accurate or inaccurate statements with the researcher. Examples of accurate and inaccurate discrimination and inference statements are listed in Table 2.

Table 2
Examples of Discrimination and Inference Statements and Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Discrimination</th>
<th>Accurate (+1)</th>
<th>Inaccurate (-1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement: “the children are playing hand drums”</td>
<td>Observation: children playing hand drums</td>
<td>Statement: “the saxes are in-tune”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Inference</th>
<th>Accurate (+5)</th>
<th>Inaccurate (-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Statement: “Jeremy doesn’t know where we are in the piece because he is distracted”</td>
<td>Observation: Jeremy was staring out the window while the trumpets worked on their part, then appeared surprised and confused when asked to play his part</td>
<td>Statement: “Jane is embarrassed that she made a mistake”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Video Reflection Worksheets. I will examine VRWs for clues to sources or causes of changes to lessons within or between teaching episodes. Statements written on VRWs likely will contain elements of storytelling, or narrative (Husu, Toom, & Patrikainen, 2008). I will examine this narrative data for surface-level clues to deeper meaning, learning, conflict, or resolution (Connelly & Clandinin, 1999). These clues may include reasons given for changing the lesson, anecdotes about incidents that occurred while teaching, or mentioning specific people who helped or hindered in planning, teaching, or learning from teaching the lesson. Themes or codes for sources of change and learning to teach will emerge from the data.

Themes. I will examine the data (types and number of changes, observation analysis scores, and sources of change) for common themes or trends. These will emerge from the data as they are examined, but may include connections between
- observation analysis scores and number of changes made,
observation analysis scores and types of changes made,
observation analysis scores and perceived sources or causes of change,
number or type of changes made and perceived sources or causes of change.
Emergent themes or trends may also include differences
  • in the number or type of changes made, or
  • observation analysis scores between placements or student teachers.
Other themes may emerge that are unknown at present.

C. Will the subjects be deceived in any way? If yes, please describe below.

Participants will be told that the focus of the project is to investigate the efficacy of using videotape and video reflection worksheets to reflect on and learn from student teaching experiences (See Script to Invite Students to Participate, Appendix D), but not that I will examine and quantify the types of reflective thinking and accuracy of descriptive and inferential comments they write. I will describe the focus of the project in broad terms, so as not to influence participants’ thoughts and comments about their teaching. I am interested in evidence of reflective thinking in students comments such as descriptive and inferential statements and the accuracy of statements as elicited by the Video Reflection Assignment and any instruction students may receive in the seminar class regarding reflection in general or in regard to the assignment.

D. To what extent will the routine activities of the subject be interrupted during the course of the study?

Videotaping and reflecting on teaching are routine activities of student teachers.

E. Indicate any compensation for the subjects.

There will be no compensation for participation.

Part III. Data Confidentiality

A. What procedure(s) will you use to insure confidentiality of the data? How will you preserve subject anonymity?

All data will be held by the student-investigator. The primary investigator is the only other person who will have access to these materials.

Every effort will be made to obscure the identity of participants prior to sharing any data with auditors and in writing the report, including the use of pseudonyms for student teachers, schools, school districts, students, cooperating teachers,
university supervisors, and the seminar instructor. Videotapes will not be used in the report or in any presentations of the report.

**Part IV. Consent Procedures**

A. Attach a copy of consent form to be used. If non-written consent is to be used, attach a statement describing exactly what the subjects will be told.

Consent to Participate and Permission to Use Videotapes forms, Appendices E and F.

B. Describe how you will handle consent procedure for minors, mentally challenged persons, and persons with significant emotional disturbances.

n/a

**Part V. Benefits of the Study**

A. How will any one subject benefit from participation in this study?

There are no guaranteed benefits for participants. Potential benefits of the Video Reflection Assignment for music student teachers include increased awareness and insight into the process of teaching and reflecting on teaching, and enhanced teaching skills, which may better prepare them to enter the profession.

B. How will society, in general benefit from the conduct of this study?

There are no guaranteed benefits for society in general. However, potential benefits may include the following.

1) Examining the process of developing and applying inferential thinking skills in music education through the use of videotapes and guided written reflection could provide insight about the effectiveness of established music teacher education practices, which could be of interest to those in higher education.

2) Examining the recursive process of planning, teaching, and evaluating the same or related lessons in music through guided reflection could provide further insight into the reflective cycle as applied to music teaching, which could benefit music education in general by providing ideas for future study and the development of effective music education programs.

3) Examining the ways preservice music teachers reflect in different music teaching contexts (elementary and secondary student teaching placements), with several weeks of experience between measures, could provide insight into the
development of effective teaching skills in those contexts and the combination of contexts, which could be of interest to music teacher educators.

4) Identifying important aspects of the student teacher-cooperating teacher relationship or other sources of learning about the process of planning, teaching, and evaluating lessons could inform music teacher educators about the types of interactions or relationships that encourage reflective practice in future music educators.

**Part VI. Risks/Discomforts to Subjects**

A. Describe any aspect of the research project that might cause discomfort, inconvenience, or physical danger to the subjects.

There are no aspects of the project that will cause foreseeable discomfort, inconvenience, or physical danger to participants.

B. Describe any long range risks to the subjects.

There are no foreseeable risks to participants, either in the short or long term.

C. What is the rationale for exposing the subjects to these risks?

n/a
APPENDIX E

SCRIPT TO INVITE PARTICIPANTS

Title: An Investigation of the Use of a Videotape Reflection Assignment with Music Student Teachers.

Primary Investigator: Alison Reynolds, Ph.D., Department of Music Education and Therapy,

Student-Investigator: Heather A. Russell, Ph.D. Candidate in Music Education,

Script to Invite Student Teachers to Participate in the Research Project

Hello! My name is Heather A. Russell. As a part of my doctoral studies in Music Education at Temple University, I have developed a dissertation research project that focuses on the experiences of music student teachers. [Principals’ Names] have agreed to allow me to describe my project to you and ask you to participate.

A description of the Research Project:

The focus of my project is to investigate the efficacy of using videotape and video reflection worksheets to reflect on and learn from student teaching experiences. Reflective practice is considered essential to accomplished teaching, and reflective assignments are widely used in preservice teacher education. Reflective assignments are typically intended to focus student teachers’ reflections on the realities of their classroom practices, and help them form ideas to improve. However, there is a need for research examining the usefulness of specific reflective assignments in promoting and practicing reflection. In addition, much of the research on reflective practice in preservice teacher education is in the field of general education. More research is needed in the field of preservice music teacher education.

As you know, one requirement of your seminar class is a Video Reflection Assignment for each placement. I would like to examine the efficacy of this assignment. The results of the study may help [Principals’ Names] and other instructors of student teaching seminars better understand the usefulness of the assignment and allow them to make more informed choices about such assignments in the future.

What would participating in the project require you to do?

Again, as you know, your syllabus includes several reflective assignments, including journal writing, weekly reflections, and the Video Reflection Assignments. While each of these contribute to your overall preservice professional development, I am specifically interested in the Video Reflection Assignments. If you choose to participate in my project, you would complete the assignments as required for the seminar class and hand in assignment materials to [Principals’ Names] as usual. After grades have been turned in at the end of the semester, I would have your permission to make copies of the videotapes you made, and video reflection worksheets and lesson plans you completed for the assignment.

How will I use the videotapes, lesson plans, and Video Reflection Worksheets?

I will examine videotape reflection assignment materials to determine how they may help you focus your reflection, learn about teaching, and apply what you learn to
future teaching. During the examination, I will compare lesson plans, videotapes, and video reflection worksheets in three ways:

• within each participants’ placement (teaching episode to teaching episode of the same lesson),
• between each participants’ placements (elementary to secondary), and
• among participants (student teacher to student teacher).

When comparing the components of assignments, I will look for evidence that the assignment helps you learn about teaching and if so, how. I would also look for any commonalities and differences between placements and among participants.

Every effort will be made to obscure your identity by name and in descriptions. I will choose a pseudonym for you, Temple University, your placement schools, school districts, students, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and the seminar instructor, and refer to you by your pseudonyms throughout the project. Videotapes will not be used in the report or in any presentations of the report.

Should I need to share your lesson plans and video reflection worksheets with my faculty advisor, your name will be removed from the assignments. I will be sharing some videotapes, lesson plans, and video reflection worksheets with two music education professors or Ph.D. candidates, who will serve as auditors during data analysis for the purpose of confirming conclusions. These auditors will be certified in the protection of human research subjects as required by the Temple University Institutional Research Board Committee B. Again, your real name will not be revealed, and no data will be examined by anyone until after grades have been turned in.

Participation in the study is voluntary. Declining to participate will not affect your relationship with any of us at Temple University or personnel affiliated with your student teaching placements. No data will be examined until your grades for student teaching and the student teaching seminar class have been filed with the university, so your student teaching grades and evaluations will in no way be affected by your participation in this study.

As a result of the research project, I will be presenting this research at education conferences and publishing in music education research journals. Portions of your lesson plans and Video Reflection Worksheets may be used for this purpose, however, videotapes, will not be used for this purpose. Again, your real name will not be revealed.

What happens next?

If you are willing to participate, you will complete consent forms and return them to me. You may complete and return the forms today or by next week in seminar class. Then you would complete your student teaching internship and seminar class, including the Videotape Reflection Assignments, as required by the university. Nothing else would be required of you.

Many thanks to Dr. and for permitting me to speak to you about my project!

Thank you very much for your time! Please feel free to contact me with any questions you have.
**Consent Form to Participate**

**Title:** An Investigation of the Use of a Videotape Reflection Assignment with Music Student Teachers.

**Principle Investigator:** Alison Reynolds, Ph.D.
Department of Music Education and Therapy
Boyer College of Music and Dance
Temple University, 2001 N. 13th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19122
Contact Information: 

**Student-Investigator:** Heather A. Russell, Ph.D. Candidate in Music Education
Department of Music Education and Therapy
Boyer College of Music and Dance
Temple University, 2001 N. 13th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19122
Contact Information: 

As a part of my doctoral studies in Music Education at Temple University, I have developed a dissertation research project that focuses on the experiences of music student teachers. Dr. and have agreed to allow me to describe my project to you and ask you to participate.

**A description of the Research Project:**

The focus of my project is to investigate the efficacy of using videotape and video reflection worksheets to reflect on and learn from student teaching experiences. Reflective practice is considered essential to accomplished teaching, and reflective assignments are widely used in preservice teacher education. Reflective assignments are typically intended to focus student teachers’ reflections on the realities of their classroom practices, and help them form ideas to improve. However, there is a need for research examining the usefulness of specific reflective assignments in promoting and practicing reflection. In addition, much of the research on reflective practice in preservice teacher education is in the field of general education. More research is needed in the field of preservice music teacher education.

As you know, one requirement of your seminar class is a Video Reflection Assignment for each placement. I would like to examine the efficacy of this assignment. The results of the study may help and other instructors of student teaching seminars better understand the usefulness of the assignment and allow them to make more informed choices about such assignments in the future.

**What would participating in the project require you to do?**

Again, as you know, your syllabus includes several reflective assignments, including journal writing, weekly reflections, and the Video Reflection Assignments. While each of these contributes to your overall preservice professional development, I am specifically interested in the Video Reflection Assignments. If you choose to participate in my project, you would complete the assignments as required for the seminar class and hand in assignment materials to as usual. After grades have been turned in at the end of the semester, I would have your permission to make copies of the videotapes you made, and video reflection worksheets and lesson plans.
Title: An Investigation of the Use of a Videotape Reflection Assignment with Music Student Teachers.

How will I use the videotapes, lesson plans, and Video Reflection Worksheets?

I will examine videotape reflection assignment materials to determine how they may help you focus your reflection, learn about teaching, and apply what you learn to future teaching. During the examination, I will compare lesson plans, videotapes, and video reflection worksheets in three ways:

• within each participants’ placement (teaching episode to teaching episode of the same lesson),

• between each participants’ placements (elementary to secondary), and

• among participants (student teacher to student teacher).

When comparing the components of assignments, I will look for evidence that the assignment helps you learn about teaching and if so, how. I would also look for any commonalities and differences between placements and among participants.

Every effort will be made to obscure your identity by name and in descriptions. I will choose a pseudonym for you, your placement schools, school districts, students, cooperating teachers, university supervisors, and the seminar instructor, and refer to you by your pseudonyms throughout the project. Videotapes will not be used in the report or in any presentations of the report.

Should I need to share your lesson plans and video reflection worksheets with my faculty advisor, your name will be removed from the assignments. I will be sharing some videotapes, lesson plans, and video reflection worksheets with two music education professors or Ph.D. candidates, who will serve as auditors during data analysis for the purpose of confirming conclusions. These auditors will be certified in the protection of human research subjects as required by the Institutional Research Board Committee B. Again, your real name will not be revealed, and no data will be examined by anyone until after grades have been turned in.

My participation in this study is on a voluntary basis. I understand that I may withdraw from the study at any time without consequence or prejudice. Withdrawing from the study will not cause harm to my relationship with anyone at Temple University or personnel affiliated with my student teaching placements. Any data that has been collected from me up to that point will be destroyed.

Questions about your rights as a research subject may be directed to Mr. Richard Throm, Office of the Vice President for Research, Institutional Review Board, Temple University, 3400 N. Broad Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19140, 215-707-8757.

Signing your name below indicates that you have read and understand the contents of this Consent Form. Please check below to indicate whether you agree to take part in this study or not.

__ Yes, I agree to take part in this study. __ No, I do not agree to take part in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant's Signature</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant’s Name (Please print)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator's Signature</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PERMISSION FORM FOR VIDEO RECORDING

Permission to Use Videotapes

Title: An Investigation of the Use of a Videotape Reflection Assignment with Music Student Teachers.

Principle Investigator: Alison Reynolds, Ph.D.
Department of Music Education and Therapy
Boyer College of Music and Dance
Temple University, 2001 N. 13th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19122
Contact Information: [Contact Information]

Student-Investigator: Heather A. Russell, Ph.D. Candidate in Music Education
Department of Music Education and Therapy
Boyer College of Music and Dance
Temple University, 2001 N. 13th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19122
Contact Information: [Contact Information]

I give Heather A. Russell permission to use videotapes that are assigned as part of my student teaching practicum seminar (Videotape Reflection Assignments). They will be used only for the following purposes:

The videotapes will be used as a part of a research project at Temple University. I have already given written consent to participate in this research project. As a result of the research project, Ms. Russell will be presenting her research at education conferences and publishing in music education research journals, however, videotapes, will not be used for this purpose.

HOW LONG WILL THE DATA BE USED?

I give my permission for videotapes to be used from: May 17, 2010 to May 2011.

All videotapes will be stored for three (3) years after completion of the study. In May 2014, the videotapes will be erased/destroyed.

WHAT IF I CHANGE MY MIND?

I understand that I can withdraw my permission at any time. Upon my request, my videotapes will be destroyed. This will not affect my relationship with anyone at Temple University or personnel affiliated with my student teaching placements in any way.

OTHER

I understand that I will not be paid for the use of the videotapes.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

If I want more information about the data, or if I have questions or concerns at any time, I can contact:
Title: An Investigation of the Use of a Videotape Reflection Assignment with Music Student Teachers.

Student-Investigator: Heather A. Russell
Department: Boyer College of Music and Dance, Music Education Dept.
Institution: Temple University
Street Address: 2001 N. 13th Street
City: Philadelphia State: PA
Zip Code: 19122
Phone: Office N/A Home 610-453-3669

A copy of this form will be given to me and Heather A. Russell will keep a copy.

Please print

Participant’s Name: ____________________________________________________________
Address: ____________________________________________________________________
Phone Number: __________________________
Participant’s Signature: __________________________ Date __________

Investigator’s Signature: __________________________ Date __________
APPENDIX F

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE AND IRB ADDENDUM

Title: An Investigation of the Use of a Videotape Reflection Assignment with Music Student Teachers.
Primary Investigator: Alison Reynolds, Ph.D., Department of Music Education and Therapy, 215-204-1660
Student-Investigator: Heather A. Russell, Ph.D. Candidate in Music Education, 610-453-3669
Protocol #: 12910

Addendum Requested

We request approval of an additional source of data: a Participant Questionnaire (attached).

Description of Research Procedure

Upon approval from the Institutional Review Board Committee B, I will contact the instructor of Mued 4668: Senior Student Teaching Seminar (seminar) and ask to visit the last class meeting of the semester in May. At that time, I will ask participants to remain after seminar class for a brief meeting. At the meeting, I will describe the objectives/goals of the questionnaire (see Script to Invite Participants to Complete Questionnaire, attached) and ask participants to complete it, and the Permission to Use Questionnaire Information Form (attached), at that time.

Participants are free to decline to complete the questionnaire without penalty. They are also free to decline to answer any question on the questionnaire without penalty. No one will be excluded from the study on the basis of questionnaire completion.

There will be no compensation for completion of the questionnaire.

The routine activities of participants will be interrupted in that they would normally leave the seminar class when it is over; I will ask them to remain for a short meeting. For any participants who are not able to stay but are interested in hearing about the questionnaire, I will offer to schedule a meeting with them at a time and place convenient for them.

Any personally identifying information provided on Participant Questionnaires may be reported in the aggregate or individually, however, every effort will be made to preserve participant anonymity and to use only that information that emerges as important during data analysis. Procedures for preserving participant anonymity may include, but are not restricted to: the use of pseudonyms for people and places; reporting ranges of ages instead of specific ages; and reporting instrument families instead of specific instruments.

All other aspects of the study remain as stated in the original protocol (attached), with the following additions.

Objectives/Goals of the Participant Questionnaire

The present study is qualitative in design. Several characteristics common among qualitative research methods or approaches support gathering the types of information we
would like to ask on the Participant Questionnaire (attached). Characteristics such as: emphasis being placed on context, participants’ meanings, and interaction with the researcher; the researcher as key instrument of data collection and analysis (interpretivist stance); and presenting a holistic account of the complexity of a phenomenon or case, including multiple perspectives, and considering the interaction of factors (Creswell, 2007; Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

Drawing on case study methodology, information about individuals (demographics, preferences, life-experiences) helps situate each participant within the context of the study; it „sets the case within its setting” (Creswell, 2007, p. 245). While the Music Education curriculum at [redacted] provides general information about participants’ common experiences and influences, questionnaire data will provide individual information.

Narrative researchers believe that people create meaning about present events by relating them to past experiences. Knowing something about participants’ past experiences may provide insight into how they story their present experiences. In other words, participants will view classroom events and learn from them through the lens of past experiences.

The interpretivist stance of qualitative research recognizes and includes the researcher’s prior knowledge and experience as an important part of data collection and analysis. The researcher’s understanding of her relationships with participants, and her understanding of participants’ prior knowledge and experiences may influence data analysis. Therefore, ascertaining participants’ meanings with regard to their relationships with the researcher and their prior knowledge and experiences is important as a way to enhance and enrich data analysis. It would be unethical, and possibly misrepresentative of participants’ meanings, if the researcher were to assume she knows this information without asking, or to share information in the context of this study that she learned about participants in other contexts (outside of this study).

In addition, participants’ prior experiences with the researcher may be important information for data analysis, particularly if those experiences include the researcher as instructor. Participants who had the researcher as an instructor may be influenced by what they understand, consciously or unconsciously, about her teaching preferences, methodology, or philosophy. If the data reveals differences between participants who knew the researcher as an instructor and those who did not, this influence may be a reason.

The following questions are intended to recognize participants’ prior knowledge and experiences and how these factors might interact with or influence their reflections on classroom events.

- What is your primary instrument?
- What other instruments do you play, if any?
- What is your concentration within the music education degree?
- In what level of education do you hope to teach?
- How would you classify your participation in the music education degree program?
- Before entering the music education degree program, did you hold any other degree(s) and/or work in a field outside of music education?
- Have you been married?
- Do you have children?
• Who would you consider your mentor(s) for teaching?
• What is your age?

The following questions are intended to account for the influence of the researcher and participation in the study on participants’ reflections on classroom events.

• Before participating in this study, to what degree were you acquainted with the researcher, Heather Russell?
• Did your participation in this study influence the way you completed the Video Reflection Assignment? If so, how?
Participant Questionnaire

I would like to ask you a few questions about information I think may be helpful when interpreting the results of the study. Please answer the questions below as you feel comfortable.

1. What is your primary instrument?

2. Do you play other instruments or sing? If so, what instruments?

3. What is your concentration within the music education degree? (Circle all that apply)
   - Classical
   - Jazz
   - Vocal/General
   - Instrumental

4. In what level of education do you hope to teach? (Circle all that apply)
   - Elementary
   - Middle school
   - High school

5. Who would you consider your mentor(s) for teaching?

6. Before participating in this study, to what degree were you acquainted with the researcher, Heather Russell? (Circle all that apply)
   - We took a class together
   - She was my teaching assistant (TA)
   - She was my professor
   - I only knew who she was
   - I did not know her at all
   - Other ______________________________
Title: An Investigation of the Use of a Videotape Reflection Assignment with Music Student Teachers.

7. Did your participation in this study influence the way you completed the Video Reflection Assignment? If so, how?

________________________________________________________________________

8. How would you classify your participation in the music education degree program? (Circle all that apply)

   Traditional Undergraduate                Post-Baccalaureate

   Masters Completion                        Other _____________________________

   Transfer Student (In what year did you transfer? ________)

9. Before entering the music education degree program, did you hold any other degree(s) and/or work in a field outside of music education? If so, what degree(s) and/or what field?

________________________________________________________________________

10. Have you been married?   Yes   No

11. Do you have children?   Yes   No

12. What is your age?   ______

Thank you very much for your answers and for participating in my research study,
I wish you the best in your future careers!
Permission to Use Information on Participant Questionnaire

Title: An Investigation of the Use of a Videotape Reflection Assignment with Music Student Teachers. (Protocol #: 12910)

Principle Investigator: Alison Reynolds, Ph.D.
Department of Music Education and Therapy
Boyer College of Music and Dance
Temple University, 2001 N. 13th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19122
Contact Information: 215-204-1660   alison.reynolds@temple.edu

Student-Investigator: Heather A. Russell, Ph.D. Candidate in Music Education
Department of Music Education and Therapy
Boyer College of Music and Dance
Temple University, 2001 N. 13th Street, Philadelphia, PA 19122
Contact Information: 610-453-3669   russellh@temple.edu

I give Heather A. Russell permission to use any personally identifying information I provide on the Participant Questionnaire. I understand that completion of the questionnaire is voluntary. I may decline to complete the questionnaire without consequence or prejudice. Declining to complete the questionnaire will not cause harm to my relationship with anyone at Temple University or personnel affiliated with my student teaching placements.

The information I provide on the Participant Questionnaire will be used only for the following purposes:

The information will be used as a part of a research project at Temple University. I have already given written consent to participate in this research project. As a result of the research project, Ms. Russell may be presenting her research at education conferences and publishing in music education research journals.

The information I provide may be reported in the aggregate or individually. Every effort will be made to obscure my identity whenever questionnaire information is used in data analysis or in reporting results. Techniques for obscuring my identity may include, but are not restricted to: the use of pseudonyms for people and places; reporting ranges of ages or instead of specific ages; and instrument families instead of specific instruments.
Title: An Investigation of the Use of a Videotape Reflection Assignment with Music Student Teachers.

WHAT IF I CHANGE MY MIND?

I understand that I can withdraw my permission at any time. Upon my request, my Participant Questionnaire will be destroyed. This will not affect my relationship with anyone at Temple University or personnel affiliated with my student teaching placements in any way.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION

If I want more information about the data, or if I have questions or concerns at any time, I can contact:

Student-Investigator: Heather A. Russell
Department: Boyer College of Music and Dance, Music Education Dept.
Institution: Temple University
Street Address: 2001 N. 13th Street
City: Philadelphia State: PA
Zip Code: 19122
Phone: Office N/A Home 610-453-3669

If I have any questions about my rights as a research subject, I can contact Mr. Richard Throm, Office of the Vice President for Research, Institutional Review Board, Temple University, 3400 N. Broad Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19140, 215-707-8757.

A copy of this form will be given to me and Heather A. Russell will keep a copy.

________________________________________
Participant's Name (please print)

________________________________________  Date________
Participant’s Signature

________________________________________  Date________
Investigator’s Signature
Title: An Investigation of the Use of a Videotape Reflection Assignment with Music Student Teachers.
Primary Investigator: Alison Reynolds, Ph.D., Department of Music Education and Therapy, 215-204-1660
Student-Investigator: Heather A. Russell, Ph.D. Candidate in Music Education, 610-453-3669
Protocol #: 12910

Script to Invite Participants to Complete Questionnaire

Thank you for staying to hear about the Participant Questionnaire!

As you know, the focus of my research project is to investigate the efficacy of using videotape and video reflection worksheets to reflect on and learn from student teaching experiences.

I would like to ask you a few questions that I think may be helpful when interpreting the results of the study.
APPENDIX G

PARTICIPANT QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

Table G1

*Participant Questionnaire: Demographic and Background Information*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White, non-Hispanic</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Instrument</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brass</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodwind</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percussion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocal/General</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor for Teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperating</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Person</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Cooperating = music teacher with whom the participant student taught.*

*a One participant in this age group has a child.*
APPENDIX H

ANALYTIC MONOLOGUES

1. Coding Inference and Discrimination Statements: “What about . . . ?”

What about inference statements connected to discrimination statements (e.g., using “because”)? The accuracy of the inference is dependent on accurate discrimination. Should I group the inference and discrimination statements that are clearly connected or code them separately?

What about hyperbole? Some participants thought their students learned “a life-lesson” about working hard or respecting authority. Should I code it as discrimination or inference? Should I code it at all? I consider such statements hyperbole, but clearly participants did not, as they believed their students learned those lessons from the Moment.

What about time references? If a participant lists minutes and seconds for a Moment, it is probably in reference to the video rather than what the participant perceived while teaching. If they state the ordinal timing of a Moment relative to lesson activities (e.g., first, before, at measure 45), it could be something participants perceived in relation to the video or while teaching. Should I try to code either type of timing statement as accurate or inaccurate?

What about “I” or “we” statements in which the participant includes him or herself in a group with students? For example, “I worked on the percussion part,” rather than, “I had worked with the percussionists on their part.” Can I say the statement is inaccurate if it is inclusive? Is it a matter of self-perception as a teacher in regard to the
teacher’s role? Is it a matter of straddling the line between musician and teacher? If it is related to self-perception or identity, does it belong in this analysis?

What about mixed discrimination and inference statements? For example, Bob wrote, “one of the children . . . said quite rudely . . . that she couldn’t hear me.” It seems Bob might be unaware of making an inference here because he did not explain why she was rude apart from describing the words she said. Would I code the statement as inference or discrimination?

What about statements of intent (e.g., “I wanted the students to sing the song”)? Participants’ intentions are internal, and as their own thoughts, are accurate. They are not making an inference about their intent; rather I would have to infer their intent from what I observe on the video. I believe it would be equally likely for me to see behavioral evidence of participants’ intentions as it would to see no behavioral evidence. Would it be ethical to try to infer accuracy when there is a good chance I could be wrong?

What about statements participants made based on their observations of themselves (in videos)? They might assume a third-person stance on their own teaching, notice that they were trying to get the students to sing, then write on the VRW that they wanted the students to sing. In this instance, the participant would be stating a simple observation (i.e., “I tried to get them to sing”). Would it be ethical for me to second-guess participants’ memories of events triggered by viewing themselves teach?

What about musical observations that sound like inferences? For example, “the section suffered,” which I take to mean that the students did not perform well. Do I code it as discrimination or inference?
2. Taken-for-Grantedness

I grew up singing songs around the house with my mother and siblings. We sang many folk songs: dusting and vacuuming to Someone’s in the Kitchen with Dinah, and passing time in the car with This Old Man. In my first teaching job, I used a you-know-how-it-is reference to my experiences of singing with my family around my house. Rather than nod in appreciation of my reference (what I expected), my elementary students looked at me with blank faces. Incredulous, I questioned them, “You mean you never sing songs at home?” Only then I realized we did not share those experiences. They did not have fond memories—or any memories—of singing with their families. Lacking affinity with my experience, they did not recognize my reference, thus the blank faces. My understanding of music and family was turned on its ear. I had taken for granted that my experiences were common experiences. Thus I had also taken for granted that my students knew what I knew about music as a child.

3. Zeb, James, and Jenny

Zeb’s first elementary Video Reflection Worksheet Moment is all about how his students were confused by the way he phrased his question. It’s no wonder—look at the way he writes on the VRW! (I had to look up a word.) Does he use the same vocabulary and tone with his students? I wonder how his use of language went over with his cooperating teacher.

I advocate using proper terms and correct grammar with students of all ages, even advanced vocabulary, because it is one way students expand their vocabularies. However, there is a point at which good grammar and vocabulary cross into “academically inflated” speech. It becomes less about helping people or teaching
students, and more about who is the one who knows. It could be a way to keep others ignorant—speaking above them. I wouldn’t go so far as assuming that is the case with Zeb and his students at this point, but I wonder.

Another thing—Zeb is using this tone with middle school students (7th grade)—who, in my experience, are quick to recognize, and resent, haughtiness when they hear it. I wonder if that affected his students’ willingness to answer his questions, since only one student had his hand up.

And what is up with him choosing a seventh-grade class for his elementary Video Reflection Assignment? Does he not know that seventh grade is considered secondary? I doubt it, knowing him, but maybe he figured it was his elementary placement, so it would be okay to choose any grade he was teaching.

Wow. James is really emotional throughout his VRWs! He is using all caps and exclamation points all over the place. His expectations of students are really being challenged (“this should be easy”) and he does not like it at all. He also makes a lot of judgmental statements about students—he calls one student “fragile.”

James is unwilling to believe what happened is real. He doesn’t believe the dance he tried to teach is anything other than simple; that his cooperating teacher used to do movement with her classes (or that the students difficulty could be because she doesn’t anymore?); that the class “really” could not understand the dance. James’ language of judgment is really harsh! He says the student was fragile (meaning: delicate, vulnerable, “can’t take it”); that he took it, apparently, as an insult (apparently is used to avoid
committing to truth of what one is saying—in other words, that James did insult the student!)

I’m really struck by one statement Jenny made that I almost missed. She says, a few students chickened out (i.e., they were cowardly, scared, weak!). Why not courage instead? If she thinks students were scared to try and fail, but they tried anyway—isn’t that courage? On the flip side, Jenny says several students thought it was a game. She separates their failure from the “chickens” because these students chose to misbehave. Somehow this is better than chickening out?

4. Surprise!

I am surprised I did find evidence of reframing activity in James’ first elementary VRW! When I initially read and coded James’ VRWs, I focused on his incredulous negativity. It seems that my bias is that negativity of that sort precludes reflection, but now my bias is exposed. Couple this surprise with my finding that Nick engaged in no reframing activity. Because I read Nick’s VRWs as positive about students (or at least not negative about them), I believed on some level that he was able to see their perspectives. Maybe he is be able to see their perspectives, but he did not show it in this assignment! Nick saw his students, but only though his own perspective; James saw the students and the incongruity of what he saw with his preconceived notions. I can’t wait to look at the rest of James’ VRWs; I hope I find more of the same!
# APPENDIX I

## EVIDENCE TABLES

### Table I

*Inferences and supporting evidence by participant and VRW (secondary placement first)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>VRW</th>
<th>Inference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>“the band’s articulations still weren’t together and crisp” and “they don’t understand how their playing sounds”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>“I had really let the kids have too much freedom to talk and goof off”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students “react to” musical changes and “express those differences . . . through movement”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drew</td>
<td></td>
<td>“the student could sing on pitch and with confidence”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>“I needed to start with larger groups of the class before moving to individual students”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>“a note” was “being held too long”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td></td>
<td>Markus “decided he wasn’t going to participate much during the rest of the period”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>“he took [my comment] as, apparently an insult”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>my snapping all the time “had to be annoying for the students”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“on the video, it sounds like” they “aren’t putting enough pop on the front of their notes”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I took a few minutes after I had announced the run of the piece to even get the piece started”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“several of the kids got out of their seats to move to the music”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The student complied” (he sang on pitch)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“The class sung the response . . . at the correct time”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I was lucky that the student answered without resistance”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Students consistently did not get off the note”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“you can plainly not hear him singing on most of the rest of the tape”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“I knew precisely when we began again that he did not find it humorous”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“It was annoying for me to watch”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“The word ‘accent’ seemed to not mean anything to the students”

“reminding the students of the warm-up gave them another clue as to what the accents needed to sound like”

“all of a sudden, everything flowed together without a problem”

“This class just DIDN’T GET IT AT ALL”

“The children were not comfortable playing” a glissando

“I was able to get this new idea across to them”

“the student becomes very upset for not being able to understand a part of an exercise which he thought he had mastered”

“they became aware of what they should be listening for and how it should sound”; “The students were instantly able to play the glissando with greater accuracy”

“The warm-up portion was successful...there was a strong Dee_____Dee-Dee followed by a softer Eee_____Eee-eee”; “As soon as we got to . . . the accents in the pre-chorus, the students sang it as they always had . . . with no change in sound”

“we sang the accents in the first verse”; “a more accented sound stuck with the chorus during the second verse”

“They [were] having fun” and “dancing to the beat, clapping to the beat, and being musical at the same time”; “they were able to work as a team, with partners, and correctly do what was asked”

“when the students went through the bridge . . . they kept going back to the top of the line rather than filling in at the end of the line” and “one set of students messed it up”

“After a few times of playing it incorrectly, the student becomes discouraged and chooses to walk away from the drum pad”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Randy</th>
<th>“The student learned that music is challenging, but with focus and motivation, as with all things in life, challenges can be beaten”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>The students “were more comfortable and open to suggesting what they heard, and they were much more accurate in regards to the instruments in the recording”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>“I was able to learn which students in the class were open-minded and which students were more reserved”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2</td>
<td>“The dance was not very hard to learn, but I was happy with how easy I made it to understand”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the students [did] the dance with accuracy . . . walking and moving on beat”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“a lot of them were still not audiating the beat”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“because 7/8 feels awkward and they didn’t feel it yet, or if they just weren’t focusing”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“they lack . . . focus and . . . familiarity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“they were able to focus and latch on to the beat”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>“These students do not read music; they learn everything by rote”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“Their eventual success”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.2</td>
<td>“they are not learning what I’m trying to teach to the class”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.2</td>
<td>“some of the students feel as if they have free reign in the music wing, and they are disrespecting me as an authority”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.2</td>
<td>“they are either talking while I am instructing and rehearsing, or leaving the room and therefore unable to hear anything I would be saying”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Students will chatter in the back of the classroom or walk in and out while [my cooperating teacher] is teaching as well”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“one of the activities I used... was not well thought out ahead of time”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>“most students were unsure of themselves”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenny</td>
<td>students were “not taking the activity seriously”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>“many students... clearly are getting the point of the activity and are successful with it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>students can “recognize the notation of rhythms they’ve heard before”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2</td>
<td>students “are either not listening to the music, or speaking too [sic] loudly that they can’t even hear it”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2</td>
<td>“they were missing the point and not hearing or listening for the music”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>“they put the new chord they learned and the strum patterns... to good use” and “the lesson went smoothly and efficiently”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“the class was both together and enjoying themselves”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>VRW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Participants with videos.

Table I2

**Inferences and supporting evidence by participant and VRW (elementary placement first)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>VRW</th>
<th>Inference</th>
<th>Supporting Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students “were confused about what to do” because they “did not know when to freeze”</td>
<td>“they were walking around the room in a circle”; “were looking at me the whole time,” and “watching me to see what they should do”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students were “not at the level [she] wanted them to be at”</td>
<td>they “continued asking me questions” about what to do, “that I thought she had addressed”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deena</td>
<td></td>
<td>Antony made a “big scene”</td>
<td>he “stood up”; “announced that he just couldn’t do solfege and had to right [sic] it in”; “stormed up to the front”; and “grabbed a pencil”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>The students “didn’t know how their parts fit together and this messed them up”</td>
<td>“the snare drummer insisted on trying to make [the piece] in 4/4,” even though he had played it correctly when she “had worked on each percussionist’s part individually”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“the lesson was going well in that a student was interested”</td>
<td>“a girl in the front row said, ‘Can we hear that again?’’, ‘I smile at her and we both laugh’”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>“I can get distracted” from “my goal”</td>
<td>“I don’t immediately play the song again. I go on to address another issue in the class”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>“the students were clearly checked out of the lesson”</td>
<td>“the student’s shoulders slump and the excitement drain[s] from the lesson”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“I was not achieving my teaching goals”</td>
<td>“the students didn’t improve and that their body language expressed boredom”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.2</td>
<td>“I cultivated interest and helped the students advance”</td>
<td>“The students stayed focused and . . . improved significantly”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>“Mrs. Jones had said something to the group as she was walking them in”</td>
<td>“They came in unusually calm and collected”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“things began to fall apart”</td>
<td>“the students began talking to each other (perhaps questioning what they should be doing!)”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“there was a moment of chaos”</td>
<td>Students were “Talking and not writing. Many students were just sitting like bumps on a log not attempting the activity”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>the students were confused the “activity was ineffective and hard to manage”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td>Students “comprehend[ded] . . . the concept of B.C.E. and the year 0 . . . [the] addition concept (180+2010)=2190 . . . [the] concept of time (how old the dizi flute is)”</td>
<td>“they got the correct answer (rather quickly)”; they “[did] the math in their head”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2</td>
<td>students “were actively engaged in the lesson . . . [and] thinking critically”</td>
<td>“many hands were raised” to answer the question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2</td>
<td>other students “were thinking the same thing” (they also knew the answer)</td>
<td>they “lowered their hand (somewhat frustrated) after the answer was given”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Comment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“the first time I tried to push the tempo” the ensemble “could not handle [it]”</td>
<td>“some rushed because they were trying to play with energy, and others couldn’t keep up with the beat”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tricia</td>
<td>“a defined lesson plan . . . is not really the most efficient tool in a rehearsal based ensemble group”</td>
<td>“I originally had ideas and a plan of action, but I got side tracked by more important musical items that needed to be addressed”; “I made more musical connections by ‘winging it’”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.2</td>
<td>“I did not phrase the question well”</td>
<td>“only one student (the one with all the answers) raised his hand”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>“These students are bemused by all but the plainest presentation of information.” They are “slow and lazy,” and unmotivated</td>
<td>“their lethargy”; “most students start to mentally drift”; “both the students and myself were slightly sub-par”; students did not “focus their attention on me”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>“the whole class was engaged” and “excited about what they are learning and its relevance in their world”</td>
<td>they were “tell[ing] me how they knew the clip” and “singing along”; “the song was meaningful to them”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2</td>
<td>“most students were able to take something practical from a lesson”; they are “connect[ing] rules and notation with real-life every-day music”</td>
<td>“Brianna took off improvising on the blues scale”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeb</td>
<td>“The majority of the class ‘got it’ the first time, but not everyone”</td>
<td>I “had to re-explain myself several times”; “all of the other students” were “studying the problem to figure out how the 2 methods . . . fit together”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“the students who already understand the concepts I was presenting are paying close attention”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>“the attention of the class was fixed on my . . . taking role”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>“their engagement lessened”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>“I think probably prevented them from audiating”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nick</td>
<td>E.2</td>
<td>“they were a bit shell-shocked when I finally got around to pattern work. My enthusiasm got in my way!”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.2</td>
<td>“They loved it”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“I seemed exhausted”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“They were already awake”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“They were ready to do more”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“my cues for singing stank”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“I think [the warm-up] failed”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“I felt I had betrayed them”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“it seemed like a chore”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“one of the students was wondering if they were being videoed”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“they behave more self-consciously and I think I do too”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>“my teaching is very solid”</td>
<td>“My eye contact was fantastic and the energy was great”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I skipped crucial steps”</td>
<td>“notes or rhythms may be incorrect even if the students know the song”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“The students learned the song”; “the students are able to catch on quickly and piece together songs”</td>
<td>“it sounded pretty good”; “Their singing was right on pitch and the rhythm was very solid”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>David and Robert “felt it was ok to talk through the lesson”</td>
<td>“because it did not pertain to them directly”; “They were talking amongst themselves because they decided they did not care”; “I could hear them talking behind me the entire time”; “these two boys are ALWAYS interrupting class”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“they learned that while they do not need to love the music they do need to respect their classmates and also myself”</td>
<td>“they seemed to understand that I was not messing around”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sue</td>
<td>“the majority of my class is not ok when students are rude and talk throughout the lesson”</td>
<td>“based on their body language and also how they speak to the classmates that are talking”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>students are able “to harness their energy and play the instruments only in the way that they were asked, at the time that they were asked.”  They can “recognize same and different in the song”</td>
<td>“At first, the students tap random rhythms with the sticks . . . . [then] they tapped the correct rhythm”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>“students also recognized . . . . when they were supposed to play” the drums</td>
<td>“students “connect[ed] how the words and instruments match[ed] up in our song”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>Students “play ‘ti-ti ta’ while singing the song”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Comments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.1</td>
<td>“it is hard for students to clap rhythms in kindergarten”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Beyond coordination problems, students were not focused.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“many students trying to clap back while I was giving an individual pattern”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“students were zoning out”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“This was at the end of the class period”; “It was also in the afternoon”; “they weren’t looking and listening”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neeta</td>
<td>“My gestures were not terribly clear and neither were the directions”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Students that heard and tried to follow the directions still had trouble because they had not seen the difference between the two”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the activity was inefficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“When I tried to clarify directions, I noticed that many more students were following and catching on, but still not enough”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.1</td>
<td>“many students missed parts of my explanations at the headset and at the keyboard”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I was speaking too fast and not clear enough”; “students answered my questions correctly”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy</td>
<td>“I was much less clear than I had been”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“I spoke way too fast, and trailed off often at the end of my sentences and directions”; “I don’t think I would be completely clear if I were a student in my class”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Participants with videos.*