Field-based experiences in music teacher education may actually impede the professional development of music teachers. Deconstructing the conceptual and structural frames surrounding field-based music teacher education reveals the limitations of these experiences in developing the professional practices of music educators, particularly with regard to understanding relationships between theory and practice, and relationships between school music programs and the larger social context in which they reside. The organization and values inherent in the Professional Development School hold promise for overcoming many of the conceptual and structural obstacles embedded in more traditional field-based music teacher preparation. Stories from a professional development site for music education demonstrate its potential to promote reciprocal influence between university and school faculty; uphold praxis as the essence of the work of pre-service teachers, in-service teachers and teacher educators; and account for the place of the music program in larger institutional and community contexts.

Teacher education programs that depart from the traditional four-year bachelor's degree are now in place in more than three hundred U.S. universities and colleges. All of these programs integrate subject-matter course work with clinical training in schools; many support robust collaborations with local school districts in order to facilitate field-based teacher preparation (Darling-Hammond, 1998). Levine points out that the development of professional teaching practice "as in all professions (including medicine, law, and architecture), requires extensive clinical
education and a deliberately structured induction into practice" (1997, p. 4).

Music teacher preparation, too, increasingly relies on supervised, field-based experiences to develop the professional practices of prospective music teachers. But what is the nature of the learning that takes place for pre-service teachers in field based experiences? Does learning familiarize pre-service teachers with the real lives of students and teachers in a school community? Does the field-based experience significantly enhance music teacher knowledge, practice and identity? Does it empower the pre-service teacher to take responsibility for continued professional development?

I argue here that field-based experiences in music teacher education may actually impede the professional development of music teachers. Deconstructing the conceptual and structural frames surrounding field-based music teacher education reveals the limitations of these experiences in developing the professional practices of music educators, particularly with regard to understanding relationships between theory and practice, and relationships between school music programs and the larger social context in which they reside. The misinformation and illusion perpetuated by field-based music teacher education maintains the traditionally privileged position of universities in relation to schools, marginalizes school-based practitioners and renders teachers powerless to confront and transform the conditions for music teaching practice.

**RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THEORY AND PRACTICE**

A common expectation in music teacher education is to reduce the field experience to applied science. That is, the student teacher is required to apply in a public school setting what he has learned in the university. Invariably, a mismatch will occur between the theories learned in the university and the practices of a particular school music teacher (Conkling & Henry, 1999). When this happens, the public school cooperating teacher may blame the university supervisor for being out of touch with contemporary schooling, or the university supervisor may blame the cooperating teacher for not being up-to-date on educational research. The student teacher is likely to be blamed by both the cooperating teacher and the university supervisor for being less than effective in the music classroom.

This commonplace scenario illustrates how the dynamic relationship between the theories and the practices of music teaching can be neg-
lected in field-based education. Even where the pre-service teacher can manage both to memorize the theories of the university and conform to the practices of the music classroom, this conceptual framework prevents him from understanding that "theories are generated by practices and... practices reflect theoretical commitments" (Zeichner, 1992, p. 298). This conceptual framework reinforces the privilege of the university in relation to the public school because theory is seen as the exclusive property of the university while practice belongs exclusively in elementary and secondary schools. The source of the knowledge most important to teaching is seen as external to the acts of teaching. Not surprisingly, the conceptual and structural frameworks of this field-based experience exacerbate the mutual skepticism between school and university faculty.

A related expectation in field-based education is for the student teacher to be evaluated exclusively on her conformity to the practices modeled by the master teacher. Case studies at Michigan State University, however, indicate that pre-service teachers may be denied access to their cooperating teachers' ways of thinking and reasoning (Fieman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1987). In this case, student teachers may be able to observe the cooperating teachers' practices, but they never have the opportunity to examine the theories that underlie those practices. Many theories that form important bases for music teaching may not be available to the pre-service teacher in textbooks or reports of research because master teachers are likely to base their day-to-day teaching decisions on living theory, as Lomax explains:

A living theory is one that is continuously created and recreated through the validated explanation that individual managers [teachers] offer of their own practices as they pursue their educational goals. These explanations are stimulated by intentional, committed action that stems from practical concerns (1996, p. 16).

If the structural framework of the field experience encourages the pre-service teacher to passively imitate the cooperating teacher, music teaching is then limited to simplistic means-end thinking about teaching techniques or rehearsal organization. If the conceptual framework of the field experience denies the importance of teachers' living theories, then praxis, the notion that knowledge should be used for purposeful action, is lost in field-based teacher education.

Perhaps most importantly, both of the scenarios described above fail to honor the theorizing of the pre-service music teacher. I have
argued elsewhere that, unlike many other students, music majors enter the college or university already deeply engaged in professional practices and thus, already developing professional identities (Conkling, in press). This is corroborated by Cox who suggests that "the most significant processes of professional role development occur before the college years" (1997, p. 117). If this is so, then the real work of music teacher educators is not in filling "empty vessels" with music teaching knowledge, nor in re-acculturating students into new music teaching behaviors, but rather in uncovering pre-service teachers' novice theories about music teaching. Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann support this argument:

In becoming a teacher, very little...can be trusted to come about without instruction that takes the preconceptions of future teachers into account - preconceptions that are warranted by common sense and the conventional practice that future teachers are already steeped in (1985, p. 29).

If prospective teachers are to become better at their teaching over time, the conceptual and structural orientations of field-based education must empower them as educational theorists. Encouraging a disposition toward continuing inquiry means allowing pre-service teachers to problematize teaching and learning situations, reflect on those situations in light of theory, propose solutions and examine the effects of those solutions.

TEACHING IN ISOLATION

In his 1990 study of pre-service teacher education in the United States, Goodlad concluded "it was rare to find students whose student teaching exposed them to aspects of school life beyond the classroom to which they were assigned." Field-based experiences in teacher education have traditionally been structured so that one or more pre-service teachers work for extended periods of time in the classroom of a master teacher. As has already been noted, the primary emphasis of field-based experience has traditionally been placed on developing the subject area teaching practices of the pre-service teacher. If the structural framework of a field-based experience keeps the pre-service teacher inside the music classroom, without experiencing the life of the school and the community in which the music program resides, notions that music teachers and music programs can exist, and even thrive, in isolation may be perpetuat-
ed. Pre-service teachers will discern little about how the music curriculum can be integrated with other subject area curricula, about the sometimes competing demands for students' time and attention that exist within the school, or about how to communicate with faculty peers.

But there are even more profound consequences of this isolationist tendency in music teacher preparation. Music education in the United States is no longer solely under the purview of the public school. Sources for music education include community music school programs, church and temple programs, children's choirs, youth orchestras, private studio teachers, and the Internet. Mark suggests:

Music education of the future could be more community based than school based. If so, it will require the leadership of people who are informed of the musical tastes of their own communities and who are familiar with the various developmental stages of life. They will be concerned with helping people be involved in music throughout their lifetime. Music educators might not be able to do all of these things by themselves, but if not, they might find support roles in maintaining the richness of the musical lives of their communities. In this way, they can broaden their views of music education and can strengthen the role of music education in communities (2000, p. 200).

If Mark's view is at all accurate, then school-based music educators can ill afford to restrict their attention only to their classrooms, ignoring the social context in which music instruction takes place. Their very livelihood may depend on creating points of articulation between the community and the school music program. Similarly, if pre-service teachers are to be equipped to take active responsibility for the continuing transformation of music education, they cannot afford to restrict their attention solely to the development of music teaching behaviors in a music classroom.

The field experience that promotes teaching in isolation may have a further consequence in the professional life of a prospective music teacher. If the music teacher sees her problems unrelated to the problems of other teachers or to the social structures of schooling, she may become absorbed in her own inadequacies, and may ultimately leave the teaching profession. As Zeichner suggests:
Teacher burnout and stress has diverted teachers' attention from critical analysis of schools as institutions to a preoccupation with their own individual failures. If we are to foster genuine teacher development during the practicum, then we must induct student teachers into a community of teachers that plays a major role in the shaping of school environments (1992, p. 299).

REFRAMING FIELD-BASED EDUCATION

Even though the field-based experience is fraught with conceptual and structural obstacles that may undermine the development of pre-service teachers' effective music teaching practices, it cannot be abandoned entirely in music teacher education. It is this extensive clinical preparation, after all, which helps to define music teaching as a professional endeavor. For field-based music teacher education to realize its potential, reformed conceptual and structural frames are necessary. These frameworks should promote reciprocal influence between university and school faculty; uphold praxis as the essence of the work of pre-service teachers, in-service teachers and teacher educators; and account for the place of the music program in larger institutional and community contexts.

The Holmes Group's call for a new institution, the Professional Development School (PDS), "a school for the development of novice professionals, for continuing development of experienced professionals and for the research and development of the teaching profession" (1990, p. 1) holds promise. Among the guiding conceptual principles and values of the PDS are: creating a collaborative learning community; fostering continuous learning by pre-service teachers, in-service teachers and teacher educators; and maintaining parity between university faculty and public school faculty (Abdal-Haqq, 1998).

Though program features and practices vary widely, where a PDS exists, the structural frames for teacher education are "more likely to be site based, collaboratively developed and taught by school-college faculty teams" (1998, p. 14). Pre-service teachers are commonly "immersed in the day-to-day life of the schools to which they are assigned, their fieldwork involves them in noninstructional activities, and they routinely interact with members of the school community besides their assigned cooperating teacher" (p. 14). Furthermore, the pre-service teachers are "typically placed in clusters or cohorts, and they may be assigned to a classroom in teams" (p. 14). According to Darling-Hammond:
Beginning teachers get a more coherent learning experience when they are organized in teams with these [veteran] faculty and with one another. Senior teachers deepen their knowledge by serving as mentors, adjunct faculty, co-researchers, and teacher leaders. Thus these [professional development] schools can help create the rub between theory and practice, while creating more professional roles for teachers and constructing knowledge that is more useful for both practice and ongoing theory building (1998, p. 7).

THE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL IN MUSIC TEACHER PREPARATION

Can the PDS be an effective model for the preparation of music teachers? What is its potential for overcoming the misconceptions of the field-based experience? I have been the university faculty partner in Professional Development Sites for Music Education since 1995. These sites were established between a public school and an institution of higher education for the purposes of immersing pre-service music teachers in the day-to-day life of schools and students, encouraging exemplary practices in music teaching, and creating a collaborative culture of continuing inquiry into music teaching and learning.

The PDS for Music Education of which I have been a part have been organized so that a cohort group of 3-7 pre-service teachers, a university faculty member and a veteran music teacher meet together in a public school music classroom for two extended periods per week during a 15-week semester. Time spent in the school includes joint planning for instruction and actual teaching of a choral performance class. About one month before the school year begins, pre-service teachers enrolled in the PDS are asked to obtain a packet of choral music and a voice physiology and pedagogy text. They are also asked to arrive at the school site "prepared to teach."

The specific practices of the PDS get pre-service teachers involved immediately with the university faculty member and the master teacher in administering pre-tests of musical knowledge to the high school students and in individual "voice checks" to determine comfortable singing range and tessitura for each student. Joint planning during the first week of school involves sharing information about individual students and creating a seating chart for the choir. Also during the first weeks of class, the pre-service teachers observe the master teacher's
instruction in vocal development, in sight-reading, and in direction of choral repertoire. By the third week of class, joint planning sessions include the pre-service teachers' plans for continuing vocal development, sight-reading, and sectional rehearsals. During joint planning time, each pre-service teacher receives feedback on his or her plans not only from the master teacher and the university faculty member, but from other pre-service teachers in the cohort group.

All teaching incidents are recorded on videotape, and pre-service teachers use the videotapes to critique their own and others' teaching in a written journal. The journal is a dialogue journal, where the university faculty member responds to each pre-service teacher with questions and suggestions at least 7 times during the semester. Each pre-service teacher also uses the videotapes to produce a video portfolio by the end of the semester. In order to compile this portfolio, the pre-service teacher has to examine the videotapes, searching for critical teaching incidents, and then sequences those critical incidents in order to tell a meaningful story of his or her own professional development.

Other practices of the PDS include each pre-service teacher's development of a case study of one student throughout the semester. In their development of the case studies, the pre-service teachers are brought into contact with the students' other teachers, coaches, counselors, and administrators. They may even meet some of the students' family members and visit with them in their community activities. In addition, all members of the PDS cohort attend school district music faculty meetings and in-service workshops, accompany students to all-state festivals and solo competitions, and implement a service-learning project for high school choir students.

The organization and practices of this PDS for Music Education do not, in and of themselves, ensure that the conceptual and structural obstacles of more traditional field-based experiences have been removed. Recent stories from this PDS may demonstrate its potential.

The following is the story of K's first teaching incident. K is a non-traditional pre-service teacher with substantial previous experience in vocal performance, but none in music teaching. She was recently responsible for directing vocal warm-ups in the choir rehearsal. Her teaching was well organized and the high school students were quite responsive. This is what she wrote in her journal after viewing her videotape:

I want to write before these feelings leave me. If I had to direct a vocal warm-up even three weeks ago, I would
have gone about it completely differently. Understanding the reasoning behind [master teacher's] warm-ups, especially her "concept of the week" allowed me to design a directed plan, one that emphasized and then re-emphasized the reasons for doing a vocal warm-up and the mechanics behind it. I think I got that across to the students. I know I did not get up there and run through a series of warm-ups just for the sake of proving what I know. I thought about what they needed. I have a long way to go before I am eloquent in my sharing with these students, but today was a "light bulb" day for me.

(emphasis in original source)

K's journal entry shows that her novice teaching did not draw so much on the master teacher's practices as on the master teacher's thinking and reasoning. As a result of having access to the master teacher's thinking and reasoning, K felt empowered to design her own vocal development exercises, and student learning became the focal point of K's teaching. K's teaching incident illustrates the extent to which honoring the master teacher's "living theory" in field-based education can effect the theorizing and the practices - that is, advance the praxis of the pre-service teacher.

The second story is one of a frantic search for choral literature. Initial observations of the freshman choir by pre-service teachers and master teacher alike indicated that many students had weak vocal production skills, and many were insecure in matching pitch. After only two joint planning sessions, we all concluded that the choral repertoire selected for these students was well beyond their capabilities and might lead to frustration of both students and teachers. Selecting entirely new repertoire for this ensemble, however, might be disruptive, so it had to be done swiftly. This recognition generated a discussion about the kinds of repertoire that students would need to perform in order to be successful. We generated a list of criteria for selecting that kind of repertoire, including pieces that: had many unison passages, allowed each voice part to sing the melody at some point, had narrow ranges for each voice part and contained voice parts that were clearly supported by piano accompaniment. Each of us, including the pre-service teachers, the master teacher and myself immediately searched for and brought back to the cohort group several choral works that met the criteria we had established. The master teacher then chose a program out of the many works we had collectively found.

This story illustrates the practical significance of the collabora-
tive culture adopted in the PDS. That collaborative culture provides the intellectual challenge and social support for teachers to clarify values and take active responsibility for the goals to which they are committed. The collaborative culture mitigates against teacher isolation and gives each participant a genuine stake in the learning that occurs day-to-day in the choral music classroom. This community of teachers then has the power to shape the music classroom and the school environment.

Also, there is the story of the case studies. Each of the pre-service teachers was assigned this year to a student in the choir who had unique needs. One was assigned to the only sophomore student in freshman choir. This student loves to sing, but has not developed enough musicianship skills to be placed in a more advanced choir. Another pre-service teacher was assigned to a special education student who has aural processing difficulties. A third pre-service teacher was assigned to a student who is at-risk for dropping out of school. Without exception, all of the pre-service teachers not only gathered extensive information from many sources in order to write fully developed case studies, but in the course of doing so, they developed caring relationships with the students who were their "cases." The pre-service teachers returned to the PDS site for many hours beyond their required hours to meet with counselors and other support staff, as well as to provide extra "help sessions" for the high school students. This not only helped the students to become more confident learners, but also regularly took the pre-service teachers beyond the boundaries of the choral classroom. By being more broadly involved in the institutional context in which the choral program takes place, the pre-service teachers can be more prepared for the full range of responsibilities they will eventually assume.

CONCLUSIONS

Professional Development Schools for Music Education may not be a panacea for all of the ills of music teacher preparation. An equitable partnership between university and school educators takes time to establish and to maintain. Extensive work, even high quality work, in a Professional Development School may not be rewarded in either the university culture or public school culture.

The establishment of a PDS requires a significant shift in the distribution of power between universities and schools, and therefore, the PDS has potential for overcoming many of the conceptual and structural obstacles embedded in more traditional field-based music teacher prepa-
ration. In organizing a PDS, many traditional assumptions about music teacher education are challenged, as we must ask: What music teaching knowledge is important? Who has this knowledge? And how can professional knowledge, practices, and identity best be developed? The PDS as a collaborative culture holds out the possibilities of allowing all of its participants to view themselves as learners and researchers, enabling all of its participants to clarify their values, and empowering all of its participants to transform music teaching practices.
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