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ABSTRACT

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES; 2016), contingent faculty comprise nearly half of the higher education teaching workforce. I was a contingent faculty member working in a music teacher preparation program at a small college in the Northeast U.S. Using Wenger’s communities of practice (1998) and Lave and Wenger’s legitimate peripheral participation (1991) as a theoretical lens, I conducted a self-study to understand: (a) how our group of two full-time and two part-time contingent faculty negotiated our work, and (b) how my contingent faculty identity was shaped through participating in the group.

I analyzed transcriptions of group meetings, email messages sent among the group members, and brief interviews to establish that our community of practice (CoP) was positioned relative to broader enterprises, such as accrediting bodies and the state department of education that regulated teacher licensure. We negotiated our practices in response to their standards and regulations, and we often felt that our practices were constrained. I learned that the members of our CoP had rich histories of membership in other CoPs, and knowledge and identity from those CoPs
were constantly reconciled with new understandings and identity. I learned that multimembership can be a hindrance for some, yet it can also be a benefit that helps propel the work of a CoP forward.

My identity was shaped through dialogue with other members of the community. I learned that it is common for contingent faculty to feel as I did: autonomous and competent in my teaching practices, yet detached from the department (Kezar & Sam, 2010; Levin & Hernandez, 2014; Shaker, 2008). Learning some of the history of the joint enterprise helped me feel more connected and empowered, and as my dialogue with the full-time tenure-track faculty continued, I was given additional responsibility for developing and subsequently teaching two new courses.

Very little research has been conducted from the perspective of contingent faculty in higher education. This self-study was therefore a timely addition to the literature, and it should be replicated, extended to other teacher education faculty, and also to collaborative self-studies between full-time and contingent faculty.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION ........................................................................................................................................ iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ......................................................................................................................... v
ABSTRACT ........................................................................................................................................ vi
LIST OF FIGURES .............................................................................................................................. xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS ................................................................................................................ xii

Chapter 1: My Induction into Music Education and Teacher Education .................. 1
  The Beginnings ................................................................................................................................. 1
  Was Music Education Really For Me? .......................................................................................... 1
  Graduate School: The Birth of a Music Teacher Educator ..................................................... 2
  My Return Home ........................................................................................................................... 4
  Using Wenger’s Communities of Practice to Analyze My Stories .................................... 5
  Rationale ......................................................................................................................................... 11

Chapter 2: Theoretical and Empirical Literature ......................................................... 16
  Theoretical Literature: Communities of Practice ................................................................. 16
    Practice as meaning .................................................................................................................... 17
    Practice as community ............................................................................................................... 19
    Mutual engagement ................................................................................................................... 19
    Joint enterprise ......................................................................................................................... 20
    Shared repertoire ....................................................................................................................... 21
    Practice as boundary and continuity ...................................................................................... 21
  Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation ..................................................... 23
  Practice and Identity ................................................................................................................... 26
    Identity in practice .................................................................................................................... 27
    Negotiated experience .............................................................................................................. 27
    Community membership ......................................................................................................... 28
    Trajectories ............................................................................................................................... 28
    Nexus of multimembership ...................................................................................................... 30
    Local-global interplay .............................................................................................................. 30
    Participation and non-participation ....................................................................................... 31
    Identities of non-participation ............................................................................................... 31
    Sources of participation and non-participation ................................................................... 31
  Empirical Literature ................................................................................................................... 33
    Multimembership and brokering .............................................................................................. 33
    Multimembership and identity ................................................................................................. 34
    Decontextualized nature of learning in school ...................................................................... 37
    Novices as experts ..................................................................................................................... 40
    Virtual communities ................................................................................................................ 42

Contingent Faculty in U.S. Higher Education ................................................................. 46
  Summary ......................................................................................................................................... 54

viii
Chapter 3: Self-Study Design and Methods ................................................................. 57
  Study Design ........................................................................................................ 57
  Site and Participants ............................................................................................ 57
  Generating Data about Practice ........................................................................ 58
  Data Analysis ....................................................................................................... 61
    Special attributes of self-study data analysis ................................................... 62
  Trustworthiness .................................................................................................... 65

Chapter 4: A Community of Practice in Relation to Outside Enterprises ........ 67
  Meet the Community of Practice ...................................................................... 67
  Situating the Joint Enterprise ............................................................................ 69
  Negotiating the Joint Enterprise ....................................................................... 70
  Shared Repertoire as Negotiation .................................................................... 74
    Formal entry to program ................................................................................. 74
    Evaluation of practicum .................................................................................. 76
    Expectations for professional practice ......................................................... 78
  Boundaries and Boundary Objects ................................................................ 80
    Music performance ......................................................................................... 80
    Local school music teachers .......................................................................... 81
    Music education alumni ............................................................................... 82
    Teacher education community of practice .................................................. 84
  Trajectories of Participation ............................................................................ 84
    Lex ................................................................................................................... 85
    Sharon ............................................................................................................. 87
    Erin ................................................................................................................ 88
    Lucy ............................................................................................................... 91
  Summary ............................................................................................................ 94

Chapter 5: The Development of my Clinical Faculty Identity in this Community of Practice ................................................................. 96
  History of the practice ....................................................................................... 97
  Student teacher placements ............................................................................ 98
  Course development ......................................................................................... 101
  External mandates and other CoPs ................................................................. 105
  Insights into my Clinical Faculty Identity ..................................................... 108
  Who I Am and Who I Want to Be ................................................................. 110

Chapter 6: Implications for Clinical Faculty and Other Communities of Practice ................................................................................................. 113
  Classification of faculty .................................................................................... 114
  Separate cohorts ............................................................................................... 115
  Autonomy within limits .................................................................................... 117
  Communities of Practice ................................................................................ 118
    Multimembership can benefit and constrain communities of practice ......... 119
    College students and multimembership ...................................................... 120
LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1  Guiding questions for the two-part self-study ......................................................... 14

Figure 2  Lex’s trajectories of participation ........................................................................... 87

Figure 3  Sharon’s trajectories of participation ....................................................................... 88

Figure 4  Erin’s trajectories of participation ............................................................................ 91

Figure 5  Lucy’s trajectories of participation .......................................................................... 93
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ACDA..........................................................American Choral Directors Association
CAEP ..........................................................Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation
CFA ........................................................................................Clinical Faculty Associates
COP ........................................................................................Community of Practice
InTASC ............................................................ Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium
LPP........................................................................................Legitimate Peripheral Participation
MENC................................................................................Music Educators National Conference
MTNA................................................................................Music Teachers National Association
NASM................................................................................National Association of Schools of Music
NAfME ..............................................................................National Association for Music Education
NCES................................................................................National Center for Education Statistics
TGfU ..................................................................................Teaching Games for Understanding
Chapter 1: My Induction into Music Education and Teacher Education

The Beginnings

As a small-town high school student who dabbled in sports, theatre, student government, and the arts, music most resonated with me as a passion I could continue. As a sophomore, I loved to sing in choir and be dramatic in stage productions, so at that age, continuing my passion for music simply meant I would be engaged in music for a really long time. It did not occur to me that music education would become a career path until my junior year, when my choral director suggested I look into music teacher education programs. When the suggestion was made, I didn’t challenge the notion—I couldn’t think of anything else I would be interested in pursuing.

My high school choral director was highly influential in my search for colleges. In fact, it was she who suggested I visit and take a tour of my undergraduate alma mater. She even helped organize a trip to the school for a weekend to stay with her niece (a music education major) to see if the school might be a good fit for me. I loved the school so much that I did not hesitate to send in my application.

Was Music Education Really For Me?

As an undergraduate, in addition to my classes and my involvement in the music department, I was involved in many other campus activities. I was in charge of planning the school’s social activities, a member of student government, and a Resident Assistant. My music classmates thought I was crazy to be taking on so
many other things in addition to our classes. The more I became involved on campus, the greater the distance I experienced between myself and other music education majors. I struggled to maintain relationships with people who were solely focused on music, and I identified most with others who were as involved in campus life as I was. I struggled with my identity, and I became confused about where my passions truly were—did I really like music enough to teach it for the rest of my life, or was I meant to do something else?

During my junior year in college, when thoughts of what lay ahead after college graduation became almost constant, I began to entertain the notion that I should look into graduate programs that would allow me to pursue higher education administration. To me, this seemed an obvious choice to maintain the college-wide involvement I enjoyed. After sharing this intention with one of my college music professors, the professor made an observation that, as I reflect now, changed my perspective (and, ultimately, my life's direction). She made the observation that clearly I loved music, and that I didn't necessarily have to choose between music education and my interactions with members of a college community. She suggested that I attend graduate school for music to see where it might lead me. So, that's exactly what I did.

**Graduate School: The Birth of a Music Teacher Educator**

I attended graduate school in Philadelphia, a city I had never visited and where I knew no one. In that sense, my years in Philadelphia served as an awakening for me—if I could survive here and make a life for myself on my own, I
could do anything! This sense of empowerment fueled the beginning of my transition into music teacher education. While in graduate school, I served in the music education department as a graduate teaching assistant. Working with undergraduate music education majors proved immensely enjoyable for me. I quickly found that my undergraduate professor was right. I loved surrounding myself with college-aged students, and began to find that I could easily marry this with my love for music and music education.

As much as I enjoyed being a graduate teaching assistant, I could not help but notice that certain practices of music teacher preparation did not result in undergraduates’ preparation for the real world. I noticed that most undergraduates experienced the same difficulties that I had experienced. For instance, many lacked classroom management skills, they were not prepared for the administrative tasks involved with being a teacher, and they had no opportunities to become involved in a school community in ways that would be expected once they were employed. I began to daydream about what the “perfect” music teacher education program might look like, for surely there had to be a way to better prepare music teachers for their future roles. Student teaching seemed crammed into a single semester, with little opportunity to become fully engaged with the life of a school. Pre-service teachers did not see an accurate portrayal of the “rhythms” of an entire school year. They had few opportunities to meet, much less work with, teachers other than their cooperating music teacher. It was during my two years as a graduate teaching assistant that I decided to become a music teacher educator. I wanted to enact
change within music programs that would benefit student teachers. I wanted to influence music education through the development and practice of future music educators. And, because I was a small-town girl now living and thriving in the big city, why couldn’t I? I could do anything.

**My Return Home**

As with many things in life, events transpired that directly influenced my career path into higher education. After six years in Philadelphia, marriage led me back to small-town New England. I had been teaching K–8 general, instrumental, and vocal music in a small school outside Philadelphia, and upon my return, I continued to teach elementary general, choral and instrumental music. I recognized though these experiences that it was important to develop confidence teaching outside my specialty area of vocal music—and I considered the extent to which my bachelor’s degree and master’s degree had pushed me beyond my comfort zone. After four years of teaching in New England, having my first child caused me to reconsider my priorities, and I chose to leave the music education profession to stay home and raise our children. Although I knew it was the better decision for our children, I was terrified that I would become bored with the everyday life of a “stay-at-home mom.” Three weeks after I made a decision not to return to the classroom, I received an email from the coordinator of music education at my alma mater. Would I be interested in teaching an elementary general music methods class the following semester? Of course!

My high level of excitement was quickly replaced with feelings of dread. I
hadn’t been back to my undergraduate college more than twice since graduation. Also, I had doubts that I was really prepared for the job. Originally, I had planned to try my hand at higher education at least twenty years after my own undergraduate education. It didn’t feel as if much time had passed since I was an undergraduate—would these students take me seriously? Did I look too young to be teaching at the college level? Would other professors in the department (many of whom were my professors from my undergraduate days) welcome me and treat me as another faculty member? Or would I always be just a student to them?

My first day of class was filled with so much anxiety that I rushed through everything I had planned. My fears were confirmed when one student told me I looked too young to teach college students and others nodded in agreement. The enthusiastic wind in my sails quickly vanished. To build my own confidence, I decided that if I didn’t feel the part that I could at least look the part and act the part. After two semesters as a clinical faculty member, at the beginning of my second full year, I took on more responsibilities within the program observing and assessing student teachers in the field. I began to feel confident within my position, but I still had much to learn about the program and my place in it.

**Using Wenger’s Communities of Practice to Analyze My Stories**

To provide a more nuanced understanding of these stories, I intend to analyze them in terms of Wenger’s *communities of practice* (1998) and Lave and Wenger’s *legitimate peripheral participation* (1991). Before proceeding to the actual analysis, however, it is important to clarify several concepts from the literature.
Wenger (1998) conceived a community of practice as a group of people who are *mutually engaged* in negotiating a *joint enterprise* and developing a *shared repertoire* (Wenger, 1998). By mutual engagement, Wenger did not imply homogeneity; instead, he suggested that a diversity of identities and competencies became “interlocked and articulated with one another...but they do not fuse” (p. 76). Each community of practice was situated, which meant that the negotiated joint enterprise was local, even though the enterprise was part of a broader system. A joint enterprise also was situated: It was the community’s “negotiated response to their situation and thus belong[ed] to them in a profound sense, in spite of all the forces and influences... beyond their control” (p. 77). Wenger explained that the enterprise was always being negotiated in some way: “It is a process, not a static agreement” (p. 82). The shared repertoire of a given community included “routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, genres, actions, or concepts that the community has produced or adopted during the course of its existence” (p. 83). Wenger theorized that two communities could be part of the same broad system, yet the shared repertoire within each community distinguished each community. For example, two communities of music teacher preparation might hold a comprehensive examination at the end of students’ sophomore year, but the content of the examination, the procedures for administration, and the history of the examination would be unique to each community.

Adding nuance to the definition of community is the concept of *legitimate peripheral participation*. According to Lave and Wenger (1991), legitimate
peripheral participation was a way to “speak about the relationships between newcomers and old-timers... and the process by which newcomers become part of a community of practice” (p. 12). *Legitimate* participation, in this case, meant that newcomers belonged—their participation was a “constitutive element” of the community (Lave & Wenger, 1991, p. 35). Lave and Wenger suggested that *peripheral* participation was complex. From the periphery, one might move towards more intense participation in a community of practice, which was an empowering position, or one might be “kept from participating more fully” (p. 36), which was a disempowering position. A third possibility for peripherality was to serve in “a position at the articulation of related communities” (p. 36).

Lave and Wenger (1991) contended that legitimate peripheral participation was not the best way to understand students’ learning in schools, and they offered a two-part rationale for their claim. First, schooling typically focused on teaching rather than on learning, and second, contemporary education was “predicated on claims that knowledge can be decontextualized” (p. 40) or removed from sociocultural practices. In spite of Lave and Wenger’s advice, I use the concept of legitimate peripheral participation as a framework for understanding the process of learning to teach music teachers. More specifically, I use legitimate peripheral participation in this study to explain my changing engagement over time in the sociocultural practice of music teacher education.

Having explained key concepts, I can now begin analyzing my stories. When I enrolled in a baccalaureate degree as a music education major, I became a
newcomer to a community of music education practice along with my undergraduate peers. From my perspective, the community also included my professors and several public school teachers near the university who supported music education by offering spaces for undergraduates to observe and practice music teaching. I learned my craft from these professors and teachers, who Lave and Wenger (1991) referred to as old-timers with a history of participation in the community of practice I began my learning on the periphery of this community, and I was rightly kept at the periphery because I was not yet a licensed music teacher.

In hindsight, I realize that, at the time, I became aware of a shared repertoire within the community, such as lesson plan templates, use and integration of several approaches in general music, such as Orff, Kodály and Dalcroze, and classroom management routines within schools. Teachers in local elementary schools taught social skills such as empathy, cooperation, and self-control alongside academic skills, so their repertoire included such activities as creating classroom rules with students and allowing students to come up with appropriate, logical consequences for misbehavior. My fellow pre-service teachers and I were supposed to be familiar with such social learning strategies, and the values underlying them, before we observed and taught in elementary music.

As time passed within the program, I began to question my membership in the music education community because I failed to consistently identify with most other music teacher education students. Pearce (2010) indicated that identification, or feeling comfortable around other members of the community, was a
characteristic of mutual engagement, and I felt a lack of mutual engagement. Still, I
found renewed hope for my membership when reflecting on my relationships with
my professors. Interestingly, I identified with them rather than with my peers. They
provided exemplars of mature practice that helped me stay the course in music
education.

As I entered graduate school, I entered a related community of practice, and
once again, I entered on the periphery. In my role as a student, the joint enterprise
seemed similar to that at my undergraduate institution. However, I was not only
engaged in this community to study and improve my own teaching, but also I was a
teaching assistant, responsible for helping professors with the preparation of
undergraduate music teachers.

The shared repertoire in this community included a strong emphasis on
for teaching students how to teach music, and undergraduate students in general
music classes were expected to write detailed scripts for each lesson taught in
surrounding public schools. As a graduate student, along with my professors, I was
expected to keep abreast of recent research in music education and to use such
research as a primary tool for making decisions about pedagogy. The repertoire of
teaching teachers was new to me, but as I observed my professors, they were using
the methods and embodying the values that they expected pre-service teachers to
employ. For example, professors wanted pre-service teachers to encourage musical
risk-taking in their future classrooms, so they took great care to foster a college
classroom environment where students felt safe to take risks. Students were allowed several opportunities to revise lesson plans and to try out songs, chants, and movement activities with their peers.

I operated at the periphery of this music teacher preparation community. Through opportunities to observe professors, I became aware of the shared repertoire of a community of music teacher preparation. Although I was never responsible for the entire content of an undergraduate course, I had several opportunities to preparing the content of my own classroom lectures, and I also observed and provided feedback to undergraduate student teachers. These interactions with undergraduate pre-service music teachers allowed me to engage legitimately with the shared repertoire of this community—in a useful way that contributed to the on-going, situated work of this community of music teacher education practice. As I observed undergraduate students, I witnessed some shy, soft-spoken students become confident teachers in the classroom, and I watched others develop in their understanding of school age children and their planning and sequencing of musical activities. Post-observation conversations with pre-service teachers regarding their developing practice helped me remember to celebrate their growth as teachers. I had begun to identify as a music teacher educator.

Now, I am a clinical faculty member of a community of practice preparing music teachers for state licensure and careers in public schools. I am not a complete newcomer to this community; my initial training as a music educator took place at this institution. Still, I am a relative newcomer in my current position. Currently,
there are four members of our community of music teacher preparation practice:
Two full-time, university-based music teacher educators have been working
 colaboratively for several years. They are comfortable with each other as
 colleagues, and they often share stories and experiences, signs of their mutual
 engagement (Pearce, 2010). In addition, one clinical faculty member also is a local
 public school music teacher. I am the fourth member of the community, and I am
 also a clinical faculty member, although I do not have a full-time job in public
 schools. I choose to participate on the periphery of this community because I want
to devote attention to my young family. Nevertheless, my experience and identity as
a teacher of teachers continues to be shaped in this community of practice.

Rationale

This is a self-study in which I share experiences through personal narrative,
and it is closely related to narrative inquiry. In their reflections on quality in
narrative inquiry, Clandinin and Caine (2012) suggested that studies ought to be
justified in three ways: “personally, practically, and socially” (p. 174). The personal
justification for this self-study is to better understand myself in a situated
community of practice, where I am in the midst of negotiating a joint enterprise,
how I am contributing, and might contribute in the future, to the community’s
shared repertoire, and how the community is contributing to my identity as a
clinical faculty member who prepares music educators. As Clandinin and Caine
indicated, the “personal justification for this work often fuels the passion and
dedication to our work” (p. 174). The practical justification for the study is to
provide a first-person, in-depth description of a community of practice, where the practice is preparing music teachers for employment in contemporary public schools. By describing the relationships between full-time faculty and part-time, clinical faculty as well as their various trajectories of participation in a community of practice, I hope to provide a model by which other similar communities might gauge their practice.

When Clandinin and Caine referred to social justification, they meant that studies make contributions to theory and method as well as to practice. While the concepts of legitimate peripheral participation and communities of practice are found in teacher education and music education scholarship, they rarely have been used to explain clinical faculty’s roles in preparing teachers. In one of few such studies, Bullough et al. (2004) witnessed clinical faculty form a separate community of practice from university faculty. Full-time, university faculty reportedly valued the practical knowledge of the clinical faculty, and clinical faculty found their relationships with pre-service teachers rewarding; nevertheless, tensions existed between theoretical and practical knowledge, and a collaborative community comprising university and clinical faculty could not be formed.

In the context of this study, the small size of the institution necessitates that full-time, university-based faculty and part-time, clinical faculty participate jointly in the community of practice, unlike Bullough et al. (2004) found. This presents a contradiction worthy of study, especially if clinical faculty can be said to work on the periphery of a community of practice, and if practical knowledge often exists in
tension with theoretical knowledge in teacher education communities of practice.

Therefore, to further explore the relationships between clinical faculty and university-based faculty in a community of teacher education practice, I have designed a self-study in two parts. The purpose of the first part is to understand from my perspective as a clinical faculty member in a community of music teacher education practice, how the joint enterprise is negotiated; and the purpose of the second part is to understand how my identity as a clinical faculty member is shaped through my participation within this community of practice. The first part is focused on understanding context, and second part is focused on self-in-context. All guiding questions related to the two-part inquiry are organized in Figure 1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONTEXT</th>
<th>SELF-IN-CONTEXT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions</strong></td>
<td><strong>Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How is our community of practice positioned in relationship to the broader systems and institutions of teacher education and higher education?</td>
<td>How does the context of this community of practice, and the dialogue with other members of the community, lead to moments of instability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What shared repertoire has our community of practice developed and how did this shared repertoire represent negotiation with a broader system or institution?</td>
<td>What insights about my identity as a clinical faculty member are derived from those moments of instability?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the boundaries of our community of practice, what are the boundary objects and boundary practices, and who are boundary spanners or brokers?</td>
<td>What does the context and dialogue reveal about “the gap between who I am and who I would like to be in my practice” (Pinnegar &amp; Hamilton, 2009, p. 12)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How are members’ identities formed as trajectories of participation through more than one community of practice?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 1. Guiding questions for the two-part self-study.*

I have sought an equilibrium between addressing questions about context and questions about the self-in-context throughout this document. For instance, in this chapter, I have shared personal narratives of my experience as a member of music teacher education communities of practice, to introduce myself as a clinical faculty member. I have balanced those stories by introducing concepts from Wenger’s communities of practice framework (1998), along with Lave and Wenger’s
situated learning and legitimate peripheral participation (1991) that were useful for explaining my stories. In the following chapter, I review Wenger’s community of practice concepts and Lave and Wenger’s legitimate peripheral participation more in depth, but then I turned toward studies in teacher education and music education that have relied on similar concepts to frame the narratives of participants. In Chapter 3, I provide a detailed explanation of self-study methods, and I suggest that they are primarily used to improve practice; however, the key to self-study is maintaining a balance between an analysis of the self, and an analysis of the self in relation to practice (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001).

These first three chapters set the stage for the two main chapters of the study. In Chapter 4, I address the joint enterprise of the community of practice from my privileged position as a member of the community, and in Chapter 5, I show how my interactions in a community of music teacher preparation helped me gain insight into my role and identity as a clinical faculty member. Finally, in Chapter 6, I bring understanding about the community of practice, and myself as a member of that practice, together with literature that helped situate this study. I make recommendations from this self-study for clinical faculty engaged in their own communities of practice, and for future research about clinical faculty engaged as teacher educators.
Chapter 2: Theoretical and Empirical Literature

This study is about the negotiation of a joint enterprise of music teacher preparation, as well as my participation and identity as a clinical faculty member in a music teacher education community-of-practice. Therefore, in the first section of this chapter, I have reviewed theoretical literature to help clarify concepts from Wenger's communities of practice (1998) and Lave and Wenger’s legitimate peripheral participation (1991), which I have used to frame the questions and findings of this study. I also searched the empirical literature in music education and teacher education for studies that employed one or more of these theoretical concepts. Within the fields of music education and teacher education, I was selective in the studies I chose to review for this chapter, selecting studies that employed communities of practice concepts in a critical manner. In addition, I sought studies highlighting the experiences of contingent faculty in U.S. higher education. Although such studies came from outside music education and teacher education, I chose to include them because their findings and conclusions helped paint a picture of the identities and experiences of contingent faculty members. This information was potentially pertinent to my self-study.

Theoretical Literature: Communities of Practice

Wenger (1998) asserted that *communities of practice* was a concept used as an entry point to a social theory of learning (p. 5), and he described the main constructs of his theory as *meaning, practice, identity, and community*. Wenger suggested that communities of practice were everywhere, and an individual
belonged to several communities of practice at one time. They were “so informal and so pervasive that they rarely [came] into explicit focus” (p. 7), and their familiarity led most people to overlook them. By rethinking learning in terms of communities of practice, Wenger hoped to “sharpen” his theory, and “make it more useful as a thinking tool” (p. 7). In the following section, I have reviewed Wenger’s conceptions of practice as negotiated meaning, as community, and as boundary and continuity. I have left out his conception of practice as learning, mainly because it is subsumed in Lave’s work with Wenger (1991) on situated peripheral participation, reviewed later in this chapter.

**Practice as meaning.** Wenger (1998) used the concept, *negotiation of meaning*, to write about how an individual experienced his or her activities in the world as meaningful. Wenger (1998) proposed that engagement in practice had patterns, and that these patterns often became routine. For instance, teachers might eat lunch every day in the teachers’ lounge at a public school. Still, any given teacher’s most recent experience with the lunch routine caused him or her to rethink the history of the meanings associated with lunch in the teachers’ lounge, and to confirm, reinterpret, extend, or elaborate on the patterns. For instance, on some days, teachers might celebrate a birthday, while on others, a fire drill might occur during the lunch period. Wenger argued that negotiation of meaning occurred all the time in any “human engagement in the world” (p. 53), where members of a community both interpreted what was happening around them and responded to it.

Wenger called the process of negotiating meaning in a social community
participation, and he elaborated on the meaning of participation. It did not necessarily mean that everyone in a social community collaborated; communities could also be characterized by resistance and competition. Furthermore, while it was accurate to say that participation in a community influenced members’ experience, it was also true that the community took shape through participation. In addition, participation was intimately connected with identity, so being a participant in a community was not something to be “turned off” (p. 57) at the end of a work day.

Wenger claimed that, while engaged in practice, members of a community “congealed” their work into “tools, symbols, stories, terms, and concepts” (p. 58) in a process called reification. He clarified that he would use the term to refer to both the process and its resulting product. Sometimes the objects or symbols of reification were not intentionally designed; for instance, fingerprints could be a reification of detective work, although the detectives did not produce them (p. 60). Although reification could take many forms, these were often fleeting and subtle reminders of practice. The power of reification, according to Wenger, lay in “its succinctness, its portability, its potential physical persistence, its focusing effect” (p. 60). Still, the power of reification was also its danger; the thing could become a kind of shorthand or substitute for the process. One example of reification as shorthand is a musical score; it preserves musical ideas, yet it is always an incomplete representation of music because it cannot generate sound. Nonetheless, individuals often refer to the score as, “the music.”
Wenger asserted that participation and reification were complementary and "seamlessly woven into practice" (p. 63). Participation made up for the shortcomings of reification, and Wenger offered the following example: customer service numbers were offered to interpret documentation. This form of participation prevented potential misalignment or misinterpretation of the document. Similarly, reification was necessary to make up for the limits of participation, and Wenger offered this example: organizational meeting time typically referred to clocks and calendars (pp. 63–64). According to Wenger, in the negotiation of meaning, communities of practice always considered the trade-offs and interplay between participation and reification.

**Practice as community.** Wenger (1998) associated practice with community, separating it from other similar concepts such as culture or structure (p. 72). He noted three dimensions of relation in every community of practice: (a) mutual engagement, (b) a joint enterprise, and (c) a shared repertoire, which I have described in the passage that follows.

**Mutual engagement.** Action was necessary to create practice, and the related actions of individuals made up a community and defined its membership. Wenger did not define a community of practice as simply a network or a geography; mutual engagement was defined as “being included in what matters” (p. 74). Because communities of practice relied on many members’ competence, mutual engagement was as much a matter of diversity as of homogeneity. “It draws on what we do and what we know, as well as our ability to connect meaningfully to what we
don’t do and what we don’t know—that is, to the contributions and knowledge of others” (p. 76). Wenger underscored that mutuality of relationship was not always characterized by “peace, happiness, and harmony” but could also be characterized by tensions and conflicts” (p. 77).

**Joint enterprise.** Wenger described a second dimension of a community of practice as a joint enterprise that reflected “the full complexity of mutual engagement,” and was defined by those within the community “in the very process of pursuing it” (p. 77). It created “relationships of mutual accountability that [became] an integral part of the practice” (pp. 77–78). Having a joint enterprise did not mean that everyone was doing the same thing, that they had the same working conditions, or that they were in full agreement. Members of a community could be said to have a joint enterprise when their actions were interconnected and dependent. According to Wenger, communities of practice were not self-contained, so the joint enterprise often was shaped profoundly by the position of the practice in a broader institution or system. Nonetheless, the joint enterprise responded to that system, and the system did not control it (pp. 79–80). Wenger suggested:

> Negotiating a joint enterprise gives rise to relationships of mutual accountability among those involved. These relations of accountability include what matters and what does not, what is important and why it is important, what to do and not to do, what to pay attention to and what to ignore...when actions and artifacts are good enough and when they need improvement or refinement. (p. 81)

Furthermore, Wenger claimed that a joint enterprise was never static, but it was continually renegotiated.
**Shared repertoire.** The shared repertoire among members of a community of practice included routines, ways of completing tasks, symbols, concepts, actions, and so forth. Repertoire also included the discourse of the community. Repertoire reflected “a history of mutual engagement,” but “remain[ed] inherently ambiguous”; therefore artifacts and actions could be reappropriated and new meaning could be created. Repertoire was, therefore, a “resource for the negotiation of meaning” (p. 83).

**Practice as boundary and continuity.** Wenger acknowledged that, just as individuals were always members of more than one community of practice, communities existed in relationship to one another. Boundaries between communities, however, were discontinuous or continuous. Discontinuous boundaries were those that prohibited access, such as when a teenager was prevented from participating in a clique, or when an individual failed to earn a degree from an appropriate institution and was prevented from obtaining a particular job (p. 104). In contrast, continuous boundaries enabled access between one community and another. Continuous boundaries were evident because of *boundary objects*, which were reified tools used in more than one community, and also individuals who existed at the periphery of two communities of practice called *boundary spanners* or *brokers*.

Any specific artifact or tool that was useful to members of multiple communities of practice was considered a boundary object. For Wenger, examples of boundary objects included a newspaper that contained many articles that were
useful to different readers or an office building that could house many different
types of tenants (p. 107). Because boundary objects were objects used for a
multitude of purposes, their meaning was not self-contained; instead, a nexus of
perspectives from the communities that used the objects defined them (p. 107).

Wenger defined brokers as individuals who are members of more than one
community of practice; thus, while nearly any individual could engage in brokering,
Wenger indicated that some individuals thrived on it. Because brokering involved
translating and connecting one practice to another, it was complex work (p. 109).
According to Wenger, ideas about competent practice were most common at the
core of communities of practice, and brokers or boundary spanners often felt
inadequate because they worked on the periphery. Still, the feeling of
“uprootedness” was considered an “occupational hazard” of brokering:

Brokers must often avoid two opposite tendencies: Being pulled in to become
full members and being rejected as intruders. Indeed their contributions lie
precisely in being neither in nor out . . . yielding enough distance to bring a
different perspective, but also enough legitimacy to be listened to. (p. 109)

Along with boundary objects and brokering, Wenger (1998) discussed
boundary encounters, and he described three basic types of connection: boundary
practices, overlaps, and peripheries. A boundary practice exists at the intersection of
multiple communities of practice, and becomes a setting for mutual engagement,
such as resolving conflicts between communities. A common example of a boundary
practice is a university-wide curriculum committee consisting of departmental
representatives. Overlapping categories occurred when a group of people were
engaged in the same practice, but they were outsourced to various communities. For example, every summer my college provides special training on supporting undergraduate research. These basic practices are then implemented within each department in undergraduate research projects. In this instance, the practices being taught to different faculty members would be considered overlapping work, because the skills learned during the summer are being used in many different departments within the college. A third type of connection was the opening of a periphery. This simply meant that there was the possibility of participation in a community without moving toward full membership. For example, a school concerned about low scores on standardized testing could hire an outside consultant to help improve students’ scores. The consultant would, at least temporarily, become a member of the school community, working at the periphery with no intention of becoming a full member.

**Situated Learning: Legitimate Peripheral Participation**

Lave and Wenger (1991) originally believed they were investigating learning as apprenticeship, but they soon recognized that each form of apprenticeship they studied was historically and culturally situated. This notion of situatedness, however, applied to every activity. How could learning be conceived as situated without placing limitations on learning? They began to conceive the notion of situated learning as “a bridge” (p. 34) between learning in which cognition was foregrounded and learning in which social practice was primary. For Lave and Wenger, legitimate peripheral participation became “a descriptor of engagement in social practice that entail[ed] learning as a primary characteristic” (p. 34). Thus,
they arrived at the following definition:

Legitimate peripheral participation provides a way to speak about the relations between newcomers and old-timers, and about activities, identities, artifacts and communities of knowledge and practice. It concerns the process by which newcomers become part of a community of practice. A person’s intentions to learn are engaged and the meaning of learning is configured through the process of becoming a full participant in a sociocultural practice. (p. 29)

Learning meant not only that one mastered new tasks, but also that one became a new person with respect to the community of practice. Legitimate peripheral participation in communities of practice was not defined simply by membership in a community, but rather, it was characterized by how membership evolved over time (p. 51). Consequently, Lave and Wenger pointed out a fundamental contradiction of legitimate peripheral participation: as newcomers increased their participation, old-timers eventually were replaced. So communities of practice naturally involved “conflict between the forces that support[ed] processes of learning and those that work[ed] against them” (p. 57).

Lave and Wenger drew on Hutchins (1993), who conducted ethnographic research with U.S. Navy quartermasters aboard a helicopter transport, to illustrate legitimate peripheral participation. Hutchins reported that some quartermasters went to a specialized school before their first tour, but most learned on the job. Before they were capable of standing watch, new quartermasters became skilled at a series of six positions, each one a little more difficult than the previous. They began with the fathometer, then progressed taking bearings at sea, and finally moved to anchor detail. The progression through the six positions also represented
the information flow on the ship, so that “movement through the system with increasing expertise result[ed] in a pattern of overlapping expertise” (pp. 73–74).

Lave and Wenger argued that newcomers never merely observed. Assuming individuals had access to the practice (like the quartermasters), peripheral participation meant working at “less intense, less complex, less vital tasks” (p. 95) before moving on to tasks that were more central. For newcomers to become more centrally involved within the community, access to the practice, its old-timers, information and resources, and artifacts of practice had to be secured (pp. 101–102). Furthermore, Lave and Wenger observed that newcomers must have access to the discourse of a community: “Learning to become a legitimate participant involves learning how to talk (and be silent) in the manner of full participants” (p. 104). They referred to two kinds of discourse in a community: talk that was necessary to carry out the activities of the community, and stories that contained the lore of the community. Although access to both kinds of talk was necessary for newcomers, Lave and Wenger claimed that learning to talk as a member of the community was key to legitimate peripheral participation (p. 109).

Lave and Wenger (1991) contended that legitimate peripheral participation required broad access to mature practice, but at the same time, working on the periphery was less demanding and the “costs of errors [were] small” (p. 110). Reflections on one’s activity at the periphery allowed a newcomer to become more adept at the practice and to gradually develop an identity as a “masterful practitioner” (p. 111). Lave and Wenger argued, however, that as newcomers
acquired new identities as master practitioners, the practice itself changed:

Newcomers are caught in a dilemma. On the one hand, they need to engage in the existing practice, which has developed over time: to understand it, to participate in it and to become full members of the community in which it exists. On the other hand, they have a stake in its development as they begin to establish their own identity in its future. (p. 114)

Although a community of practice typically maintained continuity with its history and traditions, newcomers moving to fuller participation discovered new practices. Because their identities were staked to the community's future, old ways of doing things became displaced. This then, was the central paradox of legitimate peripheral participation: as the learner changed, so too, did the practice.

**Practice and Identity**

Wenger (1998) acknowledged that the concept of identity was “inseparable from issues of practice, community, and meaning” (p. 145). A discussion of identity extended Wenger’s social theory of learning in two ways: (a) it emphasized the place of the individual, yet maintained a social lens; and (b) it “called attention to broader processes of identification and social structures” (p. 145). Wenger conceptualized identity as a “pivot between the social and the individual” (p. 145). Wenger cautioned that his discussion of identity should not cause readers to infer that the individual and collective were in conflict, or that the individual and the collective were always engaged in compromise. Furthermore, Wenger cautioned readers not to assume that either the individual or the collective were inherently a source of goodness or problems. Wenger explained that tensions did occur between “the resources and demands of groups and aspirations of individuals” (p. 147), and
that both individuals and communities could be sources of problems or solutions.

Wenger framed the concept of identity not only in relationship to communities of practice, but also to “broader social structures” (p. 148) in which communities of practice were positioned. He introduced four themes: identity in practice, identities of participation and nonparticipation, modes of belonging, and identification and negotiability. I will review only the first two themes because they are most relevant to the present study and the related literature.

**Identity in practice.** For Wenger, practice and identity were inextricably linked because a community was essential to the individual’s engagement with others. At the same time, individuals acknowledged one another as participants in a community (p. 149). Wenger wrote, “practice entails the negotiation of ways of being a person...In this sense, the formation of a community of practice is also a negotiation of identities” (p. 149). He characterized identity in relation to practice in five ways:

- as a negotiated experience,
- as community membership,
- as a learning trajectory,
- as nexus of multimembership, and
- as a relation between the local and the global. (p. 149)

**Negotiated experience.** Wenger asserted that the “experience of identity in practice [was] a way of being in the world” (p. 151). In Wenger’s theory, identity was neither solely self-image, nor solely what others said about us. Instead,
identities were “layering of events of participation and reification” (p. 151). Identity thus was equivalent to meaning: a constant negotiation.

**Community membership.** According to Wenger, because identities were formed through participation and reification, membership in communities of practice helped constitute identity. Nevertheless, displaying competence and being recognized as engaging competently in a community of practice was more fundamental to identity. Wenger contended that this occurred in three ways. First, individuals became themselves “by being able to play a part in the relations of engagement that constitute our community” (p. 152). This meant that identities had particular meaning with respect to specific communities of practice. Second, identities were accountable to an enterprise, meaning that an identity manifested “as a tendency to come up with certain interpretations, to engage in certain actions, to make certain choices, to value certain experiences—all by virtue of participating in certain enterprises” (p. 153). Finally, because identity manifested in the form of sustained competence in a community of practice, individuals recognized the history of the practice and utilized its shared repertoire in terms of “artifacts, actions, and language of the community” (p. 153). Similarly, individuals immediately recognized their own incompetence, inability to engage, and inability to utilize artifacts and language when they ventured into other communities of practice.

**Trajectories.** Because identity relied on participation and reification, it could not be conceived as an object or trait; rather, it was a “constant becoming” (p. 154). Consequently, Wenger conceived identity as “a succession of forms of participation”
(p. 154), or a trajectory. He wrote, “To me, the term trajectory suggests not a path that can be foreseen or charted but a continuous motion—one that has a momentum of its own in addition to a field of influences” (p. 154). Wenger suggested that there were five types of trajectories: (a) peripheral, (b) inbound, (c) insider, (d) boundary and (e) outbound. He imagined that a participant often chose a peripheral trajectory, understanding it would never led to full participation in a CoP (p. 154); however, inbound trajectories occurred when a newcomer entered on the periphery and intended to become a full participant. Individuals on boundary trajectories had identities that spanned more than one community of practice, and an outbound trajectory of participation occurred when a member was preparing to leave a CoP. The very act of preparation involved “seeing the world and oneself in new ways” (p. 155). Wenger clarified that an individual’s sense of his or her own trajectory provided a context in which to determine what constituted significant learning in a CoP.

Furthermore, Wenger asserted that each CoP had a number of different models, or “paradigmatic trajectories” (p. 156) toward which members could aspire. These models were not like the milestones of salary or rank on a career ladder, but instead the models existed in stories of real members of the community. Wenger described it as “a field of possible pasts and possible futures that are all there for participants not only to witness, hear about, and contemplate, but also to engage with” (p. 156). Wenger cautioned that newcomers did not necessarily adhere to
paradigmatic trajectories; instead they adapted and modified what was presented to them.

*Nexus of multimembership.* Wenger noted that individuals were not members of just one community of practice; they derived their identities through participation in and connections to several practices. Because trajectories of participation might vary from practice to practice, Wenger viewed identity “as a nexus of multimembership” (p. 159). Whereas an individual might be an insider in one community of practice, he or she could be a peripheral member in another community. Identity was not a unified trajectory through several communities; neither was it completely fragmented and different in each community. However, Wenger pointed out that “different forms of accountability” called “for different responses to the same circumstances” and “elements of one repertoire” were completely inappropriate in another (p. 160). Therefore, negotiation of identity was a process of reconciling different trajectories. Wenger suggested that when individuals reconciled their identity in practice, they found “ways to make...various forms of membership coexist” (p. 160). Although some reconciliations were successful, others were a source of “constant struggle.” (p. 160).

*Local-global interplay.* Much in the way that practice was related to "broader constellations" (Wenger, 1998, p. 162), identities also were connected to communities beyond a local practice. Wenger illustrated the point by citing professional associations, fandom, high school graduates, and BMW drivers as examples of broader communities to which individuals have a relationship. He
summarized, “Identity in practice is therefore always an interplay between the local and the global” (p. 162).

**Participation and non-participation.** Wenger argued that combinations of participation and non-participation in various communities of practice shaped identity. He had defined and described identity relative to trajectories of participation, so he provided complementary definitions of identity relative to non-participation.

**Identities of non-participation.** Wenger defined non-participation in two ways. First, some degree of non-participation was implicated in peripheral participation. It was common, for example, for a newcomer not to understand a conversation between two old-timers. In such an instance, however, participation was the aim, and therefore participation dominated non-participation. Even in cases where a peripheral trajectory was constant, “non-participation [was] enabling because full participation was not a goal to start with” (p. 166). Wenger also defined non-participation as marginality, which restricted full participation in practice. He illustrated with the example of women who attempted to participate fully in a profession, but were shoved to the margins. In such an instance, non-participation dominated participation. Wenger summarized: “Whether non-participation becomes peripherality or marginality depends on relations of participation that render non-participation either enabling or problematic” (p. 167).

**Sources of participation and non-participation.** According to Wenger, participation and non-participation influenced how an individual interacted with
the world, and he cited three sources for participation or non-participation: 

*trajectories, boundary relationships,* and the positioning of CoPs in relationship to broader constellations of practice. Trajectories of participation were encapsulated in relationships of peripherality or marginality. Regarding boundary relationships, Wenger argued that CoPs often were defined in opposition to one another. To use a common example from education, teachers have been defined in opposition to administrators. Although teachers become administrators, they often are marginalized among their former teacher peers as well as their new administrator peer group. Finally, Wenger explained that, just as individuals were positioned on the periphery or at the margins of a practice, so too were CoPs positioned on the periphery or at the margins of broader constellations of practice. Wenger used the example that claims processors were marginalized in the insurance industry, which was the largest factor in determining their ability to affect practice (p. 169).

In the next section, I turn toward the ways in which theoretical concepts from Wenger (1998) and Lave and Wenger (1991) have been used to inform empirical literature in music education and teacher education. Whereas as some researchers have attempted to view novice musicians and teachers as legitimate peripheral participants in mature practice, others have attempted to create communities, in both real and virtual worlds, to improve teaching practice. A third strand of studies has critiqued the relationship between communities of teaching and communities of mature practice.
Empirical Literature

**Multimembership and brokering.** Although the body of empirical music education research relying on theoretical concepts from communities of practice is small, several studies rely on the concepts of multimembership and brokering to describe musicians’ movement between identities as composers, performers, and producers, or movement between music-making and music teaching. Partti (2014) conducted one such study about digital musicians, noting the influence of technological advancements on the widespread creation and dissemination for music. Partti was interested not only in discovering digital “musicians’ self-definitions, but also the parameters of the culture of digital music making, as well as the characteristics and the development of musicianship within it” (pp. 4–5). The author designed a case study of four digital musicians attending a music school in London and recorded four interactions between the students and a teacher while students were working to complete assignments for their final course in the program (p. 5). In addition, the researcher interviewed each of the students individually to allow students to share personal narratives of their experiences with music and technologies (p. 6).

The researcher learned that neither the digital musicians in the study nor their teacher had formal courses in music technology, yet they were accomplished musicians whose musicianship had developed through their use of computers and other music technologies, such as software, in informal ways. Partti noted that these tools were an essential part of their identity and musical practice. They had a high
level of aural awareness, due to their familiarity with electro-acoustical instruments. Use of such instruments blurred boundaries between the roles of performer, composer, arranger, and engineer. Presenting a case study of one digital musician, Partti observed that he moved between various styles and genres, playing multiple instruments and recording music: “Brian’s multifarious musicianship is thus in contrast to that of classical musicians” (p. 10). This multimembership in various communities of practice was an essential aspect of Brian’s identity formation. In addition, Partti noticed that, for Brian, the process of music-making was as energizing as the eventual product. This led her to conclude that digital musicianship was “expeditionary” in that the technology and the musician generated musical ideas in a kind of partnership.

She also concluded that brokering was a central aspect of a digital musician’s identity, and noted Wenger’s admonition that brokers could not “extend their roots too deeply into one community” (p. 13). Therefore, Partti recommended that the concept of legitimate peripheral participation should be expanded beyond moving from periphery to center. She suggested that music education should provide opportunities for music-making where “brokering is tolerated, embraced, and even requisite” (p. 14).

**Multimembership and identity.** Pellegrino (2010) also highlighted the brokering that took place when individuals are members of more than one community of practice. Specifically, the researcher used Wenger’s (1998) notions of “identity as multimembership” and “identity as reconciliation” (pp. 158–161) to
frame string teachers’ membership in communities of musical practice and communities of teaching practice, and she used her own experiences as a violinist and strings teacher as a touchstone. Pellegrino was interested in learning the meanings that strings teachers constructed about their past and present music-making, as well learning how their music-making experiences intersected with music teaching at various points in their careers (p. 24).

In a multiple case study, Pellegrino investigated the performance and teaching experiences of four public school string teachers who were active in their state music organizations and had served as cooperating teachers for student teachers (p. 79). The researcher administered background surveys to the teachers, obtained video-recordings of one class taught by each teacher in his or her school, conducted three individual interviews with each teacher and one focus group interview with all the teachers. She kept her own journal highlighting her experiences performing her instrument and teaching, and conducted an interview of herself, so that the “tone” (p. 88) of her responses would match that of the other teachers in the study. Pellegrino conducted both within-case and cross-case analyses.

Of particular interest to the present study were Pellegrino’s findings in relationship to Wenger’s communities of practice. First, the teachers expressed that they and their students were always judged by their competence as musicians. Pellegrino noted that feeling competent in practice was related to Wenger’s concept of identity formation. Second, the teachers all noted in some way that, when they
were younger, they found their greatest sense of belonging in a school orchestra. Thus, they identified strongly with making music and teaching music in that situation. As they became teachers, most were able to replicate a similar sense of community in their school orchestras. Pellegrino noted that one teacher felt unable to create a sense of community, and this teacher also had a negative relationship with playing her violin. Nonetheless, the string teachers all wanted to be included in—to belong to—a community of string players. They all “imagined having lives that would allow for more music making” (p. 284).

These findings led Pellegrino to Wenger’s (1998) concept of “complex dualities” (p. 66). She proposed that, for these teachers, an identity as a musician and an identity as a music teacher were such a duality—inseparable and mutually constitutive. Therefore, the researcher concluded, making music both inside and outside the classroom was important not only to sustaining identity, but also to enriching string programs (p. 286).

Pellegrino used the concept of identity as multimembership to illustrate that string teachers might have formed identities as musicians and as teachers when they were enrolled in undergraduate pre-service education, but the two identities might not have integrated at that time. Pellegrino proposed that, once removed from pre-service teaching, it was the individual’s sole responsibility to maintain two identities—and maintaining a string teacher identity often took priority over maintaining a musician identity. Whereas Partti (2014) referred to digital musicians’ multimembership as a sign of their resilience, Pellegrino described the
fragility of reconciliation: it may lead to “successful resolution or constant struggle” (Wenger, 1998, p. 161).

**Decontextualized nature of learning in school.** Mantie and Tucker (2008) used concepts of legitimate peripheral participation to critique music education. They were interested in a “gap” (p. 217) between music teaching and learning in schools and “lifelong engagement with active music making” (p. 217). The researchers argued that music education often militated against engagement with music after formal schooling ended. Along with Lave and Wenger, they claimed that becoming a member of a community involved engagement in “actual, in-the-world social practices” (p. 219), as well as viewing one’s own identity in relationship to a mature field. If the individual did not have access to the practices of the field, his or her view became distorted: “Students turn their attention to such things as test marks, grades, or the next festival or performance” (p. 221). These assumptions were borne out through Mantie and Tucker’s interviews with community ensemble participants.

A related problem was that music teachers often did not view the field in the same way that mature musicians viewed it. Lave and Wenger (1991) also frequently mentioned this problem: schools are “predicated on claims that knowledge can be decontextualized” (p. 39), students may be participating in the practice of schooling, rather than the practices of music, physics, mathematics, or history. Mantie and Tucker gave the example of a teacher who admitted never speaking about playing music for enjoyment, but merely spoke about becoming a music major or playing
professionally. Mantie and Tucker concluded that if music learning in schools were conceptualized as legitimate peripheral participation then “the connections between life in and out of school would be more obvious” (p. 225).

Like Mantie and Tucker (2008), Cook and Buck (2014) heeded Lave and Wenger’s caution that practices of schooling often were decontextualized from a mature field. Where Mantie and Tucker were interested in the relationships between music in school and lifelong music participation, Cook and Buck were interested in how elementary-level science education was differentiated from science as a community of practice. The researchers brought 24 elementary education pre-service teachers (PSTs) and 6 campus scientists together to engage in science inquiry projects on a Midwestern university campus. The projects were about the science of sustainability, and the PSTs were required to conduct background research. They were also expected to attend a special event called Green Drinks (p. 116), which gathered scientists and business people from the community to discuss sustainability issues. After the special event the PSTs planned an inquiry project with the help of the campus scientists.

First, the researchers found that the dialogue at Green Drinks was especially helpful to the PSTs in terms of understanding a shared repertoire of the science of sustainability. PSTs expressed that some of their ideas were received favorably at the event, and they became more confident sharing their opinions. PSTs also expressed that their images of scientists changed, because many scientists who attended Green Drinks were younger and dressed casually. Second, the researchers
found that engaging with the expert scientists on campus was helpful to the PSTs. Most of the PSTs believed that the scientists took extra steps to ensure the relevance of the PSTs’ projects and contributed resources from their labs. Nevertheless, at least one of the PSTs felt marginalized from the science CoP because she was supposed to do “the gruntwork” for a scientist’s project (p. 121), rather than engage collaboratively on the project.

Next, the researchers found that the campus scientists viewed PSTs as helpful sources of information about the most relevant sustainability projects on campus. The scientists had some concerns, however, that working with the PSTs would “take away from limited staff time” (p. 121). One scientist even questioned scientists’ capacity to effectively induct PSTs into scientific practice, because scientists tended “to be an insular community” (p. 122).

Cook and Buck referred to the PSTs as legitimate peripheral participants in the science CoP, because they actively gathered and analyzed data, like scientists, yet they presented the outcomes of their research in a practical way (such as a blog or podcast), like educators. The PSTs came to care about their projects and perceived that they gained a unique understanding of science from being included in the CoP. They expressed that they “felt like scientists,” and felt “valued by the scientific community” (p. 126). The researchers limited this study to a semester-long methods course; thus, they were not concerned with whether the elementary educators’ science teaching practices changed as a result of their experience.
Novices as experts. Like Cook and Buck (2014), Wang and Ha (2012) explored the interactions of pre-service teachers with more knowledgeable and experienced members of a community of practice. They studied interactions among pre-service teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors who were using the Teaching Games for Understanding (TGfU; Bunker & Thorpe, 1982) approach to physical education. In TGfU, rather than teaching drill of isolated skills, school-age students learn sports in the context of playing the actual game, thus making the learning more student-centered (p. 49). In this study, Wang and Ha investigated the support of cooperating teachers and university supervisors during the student teaching practicum, but they also sought to learn more about how pre-service teachers influenced cooperating teachers and university supervisors in their learning about TGfU.

Ten pre-service teachers and nine cooperating teachers participated in the study, along with four university supervisors. Prior to this study, all pre-service teachers were trained in the TGfU approach, which had become a form of shared repertoire among them, and they had agreed to use this specific approach throughout the eight-week practicum. Unlike the findings of Cook and Buck (2014), this shared repertoire did not extend to all members of the community. Three of the university supervisors were familiar with TGfU, although only one cooperating teacher had training in TGfU.

The researchers learned that university supervisors and cooperating teachers extended their knowledge toward pre-service teachers in traditional ways
through observation and post-lesson conferences. Pre-service teachers felt supported by their cooperating teachers, but the cooperating teachers attended mainly to general issues of teaching and not to TGfU. The researchers surmised that this was a result of the lack of the extension of shared repertoire among all members of the community. In contrast, pre-service teachers believed that university supervisors were more attentive to TGfU, and they were able to comment on specific issues, such as the modification of games. The pre-service teachers suggested, however, that their university supervisors were idealistic, and many of their recommendations could not be implemented. Finally, the researchers noted that cooperating teachers and university supervisors alike commented on the TGfU expertise of pre-service teachers, and they were inspired to update their own understandings of the approach.

In their discussion, the researchers suggested that a CoP was formed around the TGfU approach, with the pre-service teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors all sharing their experiences. Although pre-service teachers were moving in a more general way from periphery to center, researchers observed a great deal of mutual engagement among all participants. In contrast to the pre-service teachers’ experiences in Cook and Buck’s (2014) study, the student teachers in Wang and Ha’s study challenged Lave and Wenger’s (1991) notion of legitimate peripheral participation. Wang and Ha observed that the pre-service teachers (newcomers) had more knowledge of the TGfU approach than did their cooperating teacher mentors (old-timers). As a result, the cooperating teachers were limited in
the kind of mentoring they could do. The researchers suggested that the collaborative model of situated learning that they observed in this study would better serve pre-service teachers, cooperating teachers, and university supervisors than a traditional model: “Both mentors and pre-service teachers can examine, share and generate new knowledge in their teaching” (Wang & Ha, 2012, p. 59).

Virtual communities. Both in music education and in teacher education, there exists a growing body of research about communities of practice in a virtual world. Goos and Bennison (2008) noted that one difficulty presented by such research was defining exactly when a virtual community had been formed. Nonetheless, Goos and Bennison conducted a study of pre-service math teachers to investigate the maintenance of virtual communities of practice and to examine tensions between intentionally designing such communities and allowing them to emerge.

The researchers established a website in Yahoo Groups to encourage professional dialogue and asked the pre-service math teachers to continue discussions from their capstone course in the web-based environment. Nonetheless, Goos and Bennison assured the pre-service teachers that they could post about anything they wished, even topics not entirely related to learning to teach math. The researchers noted that the pre-service teachers were not graded on the number of posts they made to the website; neither were they obligated to continue posting after the capstone course ended, although most pre-service teachers chose to do so. Archived messages became part of the data corpus for the
Goos and Bennison (2008) drew on Wenger (1998) to analyze the pre-service teachers’ web-based interactions in terms of mutual engagement between participants, how the joint enterprise was negotiated, and the shared repertoire developed among the pre-service teachers. Mutual engagement was judged by the total number of posts, the number of posts per pre-service teacher, and the proportion of lecturer-initiated interactions to student-initiated interactions. The researchers admitted that these counts were a “crude measure of engagement” (p. 49), so they also looked at message content, and specifically noted the “generational encounters” (Wenger, 1998, p. 99) between the 2003 cohort and the subsequent 2004 cohort of pre-service teachers. These messages included advice about navigating the student teaching internship as well as core mathematical concepts.

The joint enterprise was analyzed in terms of becoming a math teacher in the “university context,” involving coursework and other aspects of the preparation program. In this context, message content was mostly administrative. In the “professional context,” however, exchanges were about teaching mathematics content, although they also were about the social and cultural characteristics of students served by the school and the professional obligation of math teachers to reach all students.

Similar to Wang and Ha (2012), the researchers noted the development of a shared repertoire among the participants. In this case, the shared repertoire included an internship debriefing that was organized through the website “for the
benefit of both old timers and newcomers” (p. 55). The researchers viewed this debriefing as an example of a professional routine. Social outings also were organized through the website, “as a means of expression community membership and negotiating professional identity” (p. 56). Because of the mutual engagement of a cohort of math teachers, during a capstone course and continuing into their first year of employment, along with the negotiation of a joint enterprise and development of a shared repertoire, Goos and Bennison were able to argue that an online CoP had been created.

The researchers believed they facilitated the organization of a CoP through: (a) forwarding messages from other discussion boards as models of professional exchange; (b) encouraging pre-service teachers to share resources via the learning management system for the capstone course; (c) inviting pre-service teachers to share stories during the practicum (p. 56). From their discussions with study participants the researchers found three factors influencing the construction of a CoP: (a) lack of requirement to post; (b) having in-person interactions with one another in a relatively small class that built trust; and (c) and the convenience of having forum messages automatically delivered to their personal emails (p. 58). The researchers noted that, although they tried to have little involvement in the discussion board unless otherwise requested by a student through a direct question or concern, they regularly grappled with the decision to “join in a discussion” (p. 58), or to simply remain as observers: “Our uncertainty reflects the dilemma of acknowledging Wenger’s (1998) argument that a community cannot be fully
designed, while fulfilling our responsibilities as teacher educators who deliberately set out to ensure that successful learning occurs” (p. 58).

Similar to Goos and Bennison, Fitzpatrick (2014) used a web-based platform with music teachers who were enrolled in a student teaching seminar. Specifically, the researcher wanted to know how a class blog helped provide a “shared domain of interest” (p. 92), facilitated interactions among the student teachers, and helped them share resources. In contrast to Goos and Bennison (2008), Fitzpatrick developed specific requirements for blog postings associated with a one-semester, weekly seminar: student teachers had to post weekly to a secured blog and respond to the blog posts of two other student teachers in the seminar, In addition to the blog postings, the student teachers completed a survey, and the researcher kept a journal, which were included in the data corpus.

Fitzpatrick noted that a community of practice must have a shared domain of interest, and for this group, the domain was music student teaching. Within that shared domain, the following themes arose: (a) identity, and specifically a shift in identity from student to teacher; (c) classroom management; (d) complex feelings about the cooperating teacher that ranged from awe to frustration; (e) challenges of balancing personal and professional lives, and more specifically balancing teaching with practicing music. The facilitation of students’ interactions was evident, particularly when the student teachers used the blog to offer advice, and the comment function to offer support. Unlike Goos and Bennison (2008), Fitzpatrick required blog posting, which became part of the student teacher’s grade in the
course. This requirement calls into question Fitzpatrick’s conclusion that the blog helped construct a community of practice.

The aforementioned music education and teacher education studies highlight how the concepts associated with communities of practice and legitimate peripheral participation have been used to explain interactions among musicians and teachers. Although there is little research that uses communities of practice to frame the relationships between clinical faculty and full-time faculty, there is a growing body of literature that examines contingent faculty in higher education, their identities, their relationships with students, and their relationships with full-time faculty.

**Contingent Faculty in U.S. Higher Education**

Between 1993 and 2013, the number of faculty in higher education institutions increased by 69%, with full-time faculty increasing by 45% and part-time faculty increasing by 104%. Approximately half of all faculty at public institutions were part-time, and more than 75% of faculty at private institutions were part-time (National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), 2016). Increasing numbers of contingent faculty work in higher education institutions; however, Kezar and Sam (2010) indicated that it was difficult to make generalizations about them. Some of the literature focuses on part-time faculty, while other studies conflate non-tenure-track faculty with part-time faculty. Furthermore, “the working conditions, policies, solutions, and experience of non-tenure-track faculty vary vastly by work status (part-time or full time), discipline, and institutional type” (p, 2).
Kezar and Sam (2010) conducted a review of the literature on non-tenure-track faculty not only because “sheer numbers” (p. 3) warranted greater understanding, but also because those numbers indicated that tenure-track faculty are no longer the main academic workforce. The researchers contended that most campuses needed to create better policies and conditions for contingent faculty.

About the working conditions for contingent faculty, Kezar and Sam synthesized the literature and found that most institutions had no systematic processes for hiring contingent faculty and were not willing to conduct national searches; thus, many contingent faculty were hired just days before a semester began (pp. 51–52). Institutions with collective bargaining were more likely to have systematic hiring processes; however, they were more likely to be regional than national in scope (p. 53). Reports on salary have indicated that full-time non-tenure-track faculty generally have salaries close to full-time tenure-track faculty, yet part-time faculty members’ compensation is highly variable among institutions. Reports also indicated that part-time faculty were unlikely to be eligible for benefits.

Although many higher education institutions are moving toward multi-year contracts for full-time non-tenure-track faculty, the standard contract length reported for both full-time and part-time contingent faculty members remained at one year; thus, job security was reported as a primary concern (p. 56). Teaching duties appeared well defined in contracts, but other duties such as office hours, and e-mailing with students often were not spelled out.

Kezar and Sam reported that full-time faculty often “expressed animosity” (p.
toward part-time faculty, and similarly tenure-track faculty expressed hostility toward non-tenure-track faculty (p. 62). This work climate was related to what many have perceived as a two-class system, but Kezar and Sam insisted that it was really a three-class system: part-time non-tenure-track, full-time non-tenure-track, and tenure-track faculty. Full-time non-tenure-track faculty often had heavy teaching loads, which allowed little time for research, and research was necessary to acquire a full-time tenure-track position. However, there were some full-time non-tenure-track and part-time non-tenure-track faculty who wanted time to pursue other interests or raise families. For them, part-time and non-tenure-track work is fitting. Kezar and Sam concluded from their review of the literature that many non-tenure-track faculty enjoy teaching and find it rewarding.

Nonetheless, across the literature, Kezar and Sam found that non-tenure-track faculty were concerned about lower salaries and job security. They were generally left out of faculty governance, which some non-tenure-track faculty appreciated while others felt excluded. Among other concerns were inconsistent policies for hiring, promotion, evaluation, and other working conditions. Also, some non-tenure-track faculty expressed concerns that they were left out of curricular decision-making.

Based on their review of the literature, Kezar and Sam made several recommendations to higher education institutions, including allowing faculty to convert from non-tenure-track to tenure-track over time, and set quotas for ratios of tenure-track to non-tenure-track faculty. They also recommended modifying tenure,
or eliminating tenure entirely and placing all faculty on long-term renewable contracts. This latter recommendation, they said, would help professionalize non-tenure-track faculty (p. 83).

Several studies have referred to Kezar and Sam’s review of the literature (2010). For example, Levin and Hernandez (2014) investigated the occupational identities of social science and science faculty at three higher education institutions in California: a research university, a community college, and a comprehensive university. They selected narratives of 14 part-time faculty that included such topics as organizational context, relationships with students, relationships with other part-time and full-time faculty.

The researchers found that part-time faculty navigated their classrooms, which were under their control, and their departments, over which they had no control. They generally reflected on their relationships with students in the classroom in positive terms, and they perceived themselves as able instructors. The participants acknowledged that graduate school did not provide training in teaching, but they found inspiration from their prior experience as teaching assistants. All of the participants felt a sense of autonomy choosing texts and writing their syllabi.

However, the part-time faculty participants felt excluded from departmental life, and they perceived a divide between part-time and full-time faculty. Although they viewed themselves as professionals, they expressed that they were not recognized as professionals in their departments. They were left out of faculty
meetings and the general decision-making process. Although they did not feel a sense of belonging to their department, some expressed a sense of belonging among the body of part-time faculty on their campus.

Some of the participants chose a part-time faculty status deliberately; therefore, detachment from the department did not affect their sense of professionalism. Examples included a woman with young children, and two men who had retired from full-time faculty responsibilities and wanted only to teach, and not to be responsible for research and service to the university.

Levin and Hernandez concluded that part-timers in this study experienced a “divided identity” (p. 552) in which they felt validated in their teaching, as well as demeaned in their roles. The researchers suggested that providing service opportunities for part-time faculty might improve their contributions to the higher education community. They also suggested that institutions should not prevent part-time faculty from participating in shared governance.

Shaker (2008) acknowledged the increasing number of contingent faculty in higher education, and she used the lens of dual labor market theory to study 18 full-time non-tenure-track (FTNT) English faculty in three public higher education institutions. Her primary research question was about the essential features of a FTNT position in English. Findings included: work histories of participants, the department and institutional context, the discipline of English and the position of composition within the discipline, workplace friendships, and the participants’ lack of power due to their lack of tenure.
Some of the research on contingent faculty suggests that they are not as likely as tenure-track faculty to participate in the life of the department, but most of Shaker’s participants were eager to be involved with their departments. A few, however, were not likely to take on service responsibilities in the department, which led to a sense of isolation. Similar to some of the participants in Levin and Hernandez’s (2014) study, several FTNT faculty in Shaker’s study were happy for the non-tenure-track option, and they often prioritized their personal responsibilities over those for work.

Shaker (2008) acknowledged that most of the research literature suggests that FTNT faculty engage primarily in teaching, which was true of the participants in her study. Because they taught in composition programs, and because improving undergraduate writing was a priority of their institutions, most of the participants felt a sense of job security. Nonetheless, they were disappointed with the lack of institutional procedures for promotion, and they were disillusioned with the relationship between the amount of work expected and the relatively low pay in comparison to tenure-track faculty.

Most participants perceived a divide between the composition faculty and other English faculty. This secondary status of composition faculty, coupled with FTNT status, sometimes undermined the participants’ sense of confidence. However, like faculty in Levin and Hernandez’s study (2014), faculty viewed themselves as valuable specialists in their area of expertise; they also indicated a desire to remain in their local communities and help students succeed. Regardless of
the daily hardships and drawbacks of their positions, the FTNT chose to remain within their positions because they enjoyed their work, and could choose their level of involvement within their department.

Only one extant study used the lens of communities of practice to explain interactions among clinical faculty and university faculty who were engaged in teacher preparation. In their study of one university’s partnership for teacher education, Bullough, Draper, Smith and Birrell (2004) noted that the Holmes Group (1995) had first promoted the idea of clinical faculty who would form a bridge between the university and public school classrooms. At the site of their investigation, clinical faculty were liaisons between the school district and the university, partnership facilitators who worked with pre-service teachers in early field experiences and practica, and Clinical Faculty Associates (CFAs) who served the university in a short-term appointment, taught methods courses, and engaged in some supervision activities. The researchers were specifically interested in how the role of CFAs changed over time, sources of clinical faculty members’ satisfaction and dissatisfaction, characteristics of the relationships between clinical faculty and the university’s teacher educators, and university faculty’s attitudes toward CFAs.

The researchers interviewed 32 CFAs, 14 university professors who worked collaboratively with the clinical faculty, the dean of education, and 2 department chairs. After transcribing and coding the interview data, the researchers reported their findings in two broad categories: as they were related to CFAs and as they were related to university-based faculty. The CFAs reported that, over the years,
their roles had expanded greatly. Nonetheless, similar to faculty in studies by Levin and Hernandez (2014) and Shaker (2008), they enjoyed their work and found their greatest rewards from the success of the pre-service teachers. Although there was no doubt that CFAs felt connected to schools, a majority reported feeling connected to some of the university faculty. One of the most interesting findings of this study was that the CFAs developed a strong connection to one another. This was demonstrated through their mutual values: giving pre-service teachers time in the field where they learned to manage a classroom (p. 510).

The university faculty believed that the major role of CFAs was to link theory with practice through supervision of field experiences and practica. They described the evolution of their relationship with CFAs from one where they worked closely to one where they had little contact. The relationship between clinical faculty and university professors was hierarchical, with university-based faculty suggesting that the CFAs should confirm what was taught on campus in field-based experiences. Kezar and Sam’s (2010) review of the literature on contingent faculty in higher education supports a similar three-class system of faculty. Although most university faculty expressed that CFAs were essential to teacher preparation because of their practical knowledge, a few university faculty reported their discomfort with the expansion of CFA roles. A majority of university faculty recognized the bonds that formed between CFAs and pre-service teachers, and they believed that a pre-service teacher would follow the advice of a CFA over a university faculty member.

In Wenger’s terms, creation of the CFA role was supposed to create a third,
collaborative CoP that spanned boundaries between teaching in schools and teacher preparation in the university. Although there were supposed to be many different identities and roles in that community, a detailed and complex understanding of practice should have arisen. Instead, a separatist model arose. Bullough et al. described the CFA community as powerful, with rich opportunities for learning, yet distinct from the university faculty (p. 516). This separation between CFAs and full-time faculty is reminiscent of the separation between composition faculty and other full-time English faculty in Shaker’s (2008) study. The researchers concluded that, in this institution, university faculty would have borne the burden of change, different ways of being, and new practices if a collaborative model was formed; consequently, the separatist model was enticing.

**Summary**

In this chapter, I outlined basic concepts from Wenger’s (1998) communities of practice and Lave and Wenger’s (1991) legitimate peripheral participation. In reference to communities of practice, Wenger proposed four concepts: meaning, practice, identity, and community. He characterized communities of practice as situated, having a joint enterprise, mutual engagement, and a shared repertoire. Of particular importance to Wenger was an individual’s membership in multiple communities of practice simultaneously; consequently, an individual’s identity arose from participation (or non-participation) in communities of practice.

Lave and Wenger (1991) conceived legitimate peripheral participation as a way to describe the relationship between newcomers and old-timers in a
community of practice. They proposed that, as newcomers had access to exemplars within the community, they learned what it means to be a mature practitioner in the community, and they took on identities of mature practitioners. As they continued to participate in the community, practitioners maintained ties to tradition but they also discovered new practices, and the community changed.

Although there is a relatively small body of empirical research in music education and teacher education employing theoretical concepts from Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998), researchers have discussed multimembership of musicians in communities of composers, performers, producers, and teachers. They have explained and critiqued the relationship between a field (e.g. music) and schooling in that field (e.g. music education). Furthermore, they have examined communities of practice as they exist in the real world and the virtual world. Many studies in teacher education examine relationships between pre-service teachers and in-service teachers.

Broadening the scope of literature to include studies pertaining to contingent faculty within higher education, I shared current statistics about the number of such faculty in our institutions, highlighting that contingent faculty comprise half of all faculty teaching at the higher education level in the United States. I shared Kezar and Sam’s (2010) review of the literature on contingent faculty, where the authors noted drawbacks and benefits for contingent faculty, and highlighted a three-class system of faculty within higher education. Although there was meager literature to review, the authors discussed the experiences of being contingent faculty from a
faculty perspective. Other literature on contingent faculty experience supports a claim that many faculty perceive themselves as valuable specialists in their fields, and effective teachers in the classroom (Levin & Hernandez, 2014; Shaker, 2008); however, outside the classroom, contingent faculty often feel undervalued because of low-compensation and lack of engagement in departmental decision-making. Consequently, it was common for part-time and full-time non-tenure-track faculty to perceive a divide between themselves and full-time tenure-track faculty. Although many faculty viewed their contingent status negatively, others enjoyed the autonomy afforded to them in their roles and their ability to put personal priorities before professional obligations.

Only one study (Bullough et al., 2004) was concerned with a community of teacher education practice that comprised clinical faculty. This study provided insights into clinical faculty’s perceptions of their roles in teacher preparation and their relationships with full-time university professors. Bullough et al. conducted their study at a much larger institution than the one in the present study, which made it possible for clinical faculty to form their own community of practice. Nonetheless, the study provides a point of departure for the present study. In the next chapter, I will discuss the study design, the methods of data collection and analysis selected to address the research questions.
Chapter 3: Self-Study Design and Methods

Study Design

The term *self-study* often is misinterpreted as describing research about an individual self. Instead, self-study is about a self who is engaged with others in some kind of practice. In this study, I am the self engaged in a music teacher education community of practice, and the study is designed in two parts. The purpose of the first part is to understand, from my perspective as a clinical faculty member in a community of music teacher education practice, how the joint enterprise is negotiated; and the purpose of the second part is to understand how my identity as a clinical faculty member is shaped through my participation within this community of practice. All guiding questions related to the two-part inquiry are organized in Figure 1 (see page 14).

Site and Participants

Self-study, along with other narrative and autobiographical inquiry practices, become unmanageable methodologies when they incorporate large numbers of participants. Therefore, this study was limited to the members of a music teacher preparation community of practice in a small public university in the Northeast. I was a part-time clinical faculty member of this community and I was joined by Lex and Lucy, two full-time, university-based, music education faculty members, and Sharon, another part-time clinical faculty member who also was employed full-time teaching music at a local elementary school. The three other members of the community of practice not only contributed emails and documents to help me
understand the context of our community of practice, but also their viewpoints, perspectives, and actions helped me formulate and understand my study of self.

**Generating Data about Practice**

When teacher educators use the term “practice,” they may refer both to specific practices, such as the practice of mentoring student teachers in the practicum, as well as “the term to encompass all we do in our role as teacher educators” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 16). Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) contended that what can be known from practice was informed by Polanyi’s *tacit knowledge* (1967), Clandinin and Connelly’s *personal practical knowledge* (1986), and Stern’s *present moment* (2004). In previous research, tacit knowledge has explained why an experienced doctor might notice a combination of symptoms and immediately suggest treatment. Similarly, it has shown how veteran teachers notice two children about to interact inappropriately and intervene before their interaction can take place. According to Polanyi, such diagnoses and interventions have taken place outside of the actor’s consciousness. Bringing tacit knowledge into conscious reflection and analysis is a goal of self-study research was a goal of the meetings held among members of the CoP and subsequent emails exchanged.

Personal practical knowledge was a term that Clandinin and Connelly (1986) used to describe knowledge for teaching arising from our personal histories and experiences, which comes to feel intuitive. Teacher educators make judgments of all kinds based upon personal practical knowledge ranging from what textbook to choose for an elementary music methods course to how and when to intervene with
a student teacher who is struggling. Personal practical knowledge is most frequently presented as narrative or storytelling. Many stories were generated through the meetings of the CoP in this study, as well as subsequent emails between the CoP members, that served as a way to reflect on and interpret practice.

Just as exploring tacit knowledge and personal practical knowledge can help the self-study researcher develop a deep understanding of practice, so, too, can an awareness and understanding of the present moment. Stern (2004) brings to light the notion that changes occur within the immediate present moment, when decisions are made by reconciling past experiences and knowledge and reframing them within one’s total lived experience. By examining past experiences in light of the present moment, we can come to understandings that help shape our practice and inform our decisions that change our practice in the future. In short, Stern argues that practice-altering decisions are made in the present moment. Becoming aware of and interpreting present moments can bring to light the personal practical knowledge and tacit knowledge that have been shaped by past experiences, and reframe them in the present moment. At this time, previously held knowledge can be altered or reaffirmed, and decisions regarding future practice will be made. The idea of the present moment is reminiscent of Bakhtin’s zones of maximum contact (1981), where an individual comes into contact with others’ discourse through dialogue. Moments of instability may occur as an individual’s past understanding come into contact with present circumstances. An individual who was once certain about a particular belief or idea is challenged so that they feel less certain.
Tacit knowledge lends itself to uncovering “the intuitive understanding of the stimuli and the network of stimuli that lead to certain actions” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 26). Because personal practical knowledge accounts for past history and experience, it holds potential for self-study researchers not only to understand but also to reframe practice. Drawing attention to the present moment “reminds us that much of what we do and know is implicit and...nonconscious, and therefore, open to exploration” (p. 26).

In their self-study of music teacher education, Stanley and Grossman (2015) recommend choosing several naturally occurring data sources and examining them in depth, rather than superficially examining many sources. Similarly, I generated primary data for this study from communication with members of the community of practice. The other CoP members and I met three times between March 2015 and May 2015. I audio-recorded each meeting and then immediately transcribed the recording for analysis. Members of the CoP regularly interacted through email correspondence, and I saved the dated messages that were generated between meetings. I made notes in the margins of those messages in order to connect e-mail contents to the substance of the meeting transcripts. During the analysis process, whenever I found it necessary to seek clarification or additional information, I sent brief clarifying questions by email to the other professors, or I held short, informal interviews on campus. Like the formal meetings, I recorded informal interviews and transcribed them immediately. Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) indicated that informal interviews were intended to “help clarify issues and create a more
complete picture of what occurs in the setting.” (p. 116). Finally, the two part-time members of this community wrote fieldnotes while observing student teachers. Such notes recounted “a record of experiences, ideas, successes, mistakes, and problems” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 119) in the practicum experience. Consequently, fieldnotes revealed practices and values of the part-time members of the community of practice, and therefore were added to the data corpus.

In addition, content of several existing documents, specifically, artifacts from practice (Kitchen & Parker, 2009), were analyzed to help supplement and support the primary data collection and analysis. Those documents included: (a) formal job descriptions for full-time faculty and part-time adjunct and clinical faculty; (b) course syllabi for student teaching placements, student teaching seminar, (c) a student teaching clinical evaluation form; (d) a web-based student disposition assessment. Members of the community of practice specifically referred to these documents in our meetings. Many of these documents provided a basis for personal observations made by those within the community of practice, and served as specific examples of current shared repertoire within the community.

Data Analysis

Based on the theoretical framework already explicated, I created a coding scheme that can be found in Appendix A. As Samaras (2010) indicated, “Research is a recursive act that requires revisiting earlier steps, reexamining your data, and reassessing your preliminary interpretations based on incoming data” (p. 198). Consequently, data generation and data analysis were simultaneous and ongoing
throughout the March 2015 through May 2015 time period, and continued more intensely when the data collection period ended. I first read through the meeting transcripts to get a sense for their content; then, as I re-read them, I altered the text spacing so that only one idea exists on each line of text, and I numbered the lines of text sequentially (e.g. M11, M12, M13 for meeting 1 line 1, meeting 1 line 2, meeting 1 line 3 and so forth). Emails sent between members of the community of practice were also analyzed in this manner. Each line of text was assigned a code from the *a priori* coding scheme, but as coding progressed, additional codes were needed. For example, the code “METH” originally was designed to indicate any dialogue between members of the community of practice about pedagogical methods; however, the code “METHB” was added to identify the statements made about members’ beliefs about which pedagogical methods should be included in pre-service teacher education. Dialogue also included a number of incidents where members discussed music teacher preparation programs at other schools, and how those programs compared to ours. The code “CoPI” was created to account for those discussions. In a separate notebook, I kept researcher memos about existing codes that were modified and new codes that were added, and I amended my codebook after each data source was analyzed. In this way, data analysis was recursive and also cumulative.

**Special attributes of self-study data analysis.** Self-study is unique in that its primary purpose is to understand and improve practice (Samaras, 2010); however, as Bullough and Pinnegar (2001) argued:
There is always a tension between those two elements, self and the arena of practice, between self in relation to practice and the others who share the practice setting. Each self-study researcher must negotiate that balance, but it must be a balance—tipping too far toward the self side produces solipsism or a confessional, and tipping too far the other way turns self-study into traditional research. (p. 15)

Therefore, as primary data were coded, I also made memos in the margins in two ways: (a) as data were categorized theoretically, and (b) as data were categorized to understand and improve my teaching practices within this specific community of practice. Regarding the former, data categorization addressed research questions about the community of practice and the ways in which the joint enterprise of music teacher preparation was negotiated. Regarding the latter, data categorization addressed my trajectory of participation in the community, how I moved from periphery to center, how I felt empowered or disempowered, and how my values were reflected in the community’s shared repertoire. Although I aimed to categorize coded data in two distinct ways, I was conscious of Bullough and Pinnegar’s admonition that these two aspects of self-study existed in tension.

Once I coded the primary data, I used other data gathered from documents to confirm, refute, or modify categories and codes. Then, I moved on to thematic analysis of the codes and categories, seeking themes that not only drew categories together but also provided a dramatic arch to the story of the community of practice, as Bullough and Pinnegar (2001) recommended. I have listed the themes below, and I used these themes to construct Chapter 4.

- The positioning of our CoP in relation to broader enterprises
• The external mandates imposed by broader enterprises that influenced the joint enterprise, and the joint enterprise as negotiation of, and sometimes resistance to, those mandates;

• The shared repertoire of the CoP as a negotiation to the outside mandates, divided by subthemes of
  
  o formal entry into the music education program,
  o evaluation of the practicum, and
  o expectations for professional practice,

• Boundaries and boundary objects, divided by subthemes of
  
  o music performance CoP
  o local school music teachers CoP
  o music education alumni CoP, and
  o teacher education CoP

• CoP members’ identities as trajectories of participation across more than one CoP.

After this analysis of practice, I extracted four narratives, each of which featured dialogue among members of the CoP, and which could represent a zone of maximum contact (Bakhtin, 1981). Previous beliefs, assertions, and ideas came into contact with the present moment and created instability in each narrative. I experienced instability related to:

• My history in the practice,
• My contribution to student teacher placements,
• Development and adoption of new courses, and
• The complex intersections among communities of practice.
Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) drew on Bahktin’s notions of centrifugal and centripetal forces to show how, in a zone of maximum contact, ideas and assertions were subject to “alternative interpretation, negotiation, argumentation, and disagreement” which had “the potential to fragment and shatter them” (p. 88). The authors saw these centrifugal forces as a type of analysis, but centripetal forces as a way to bind “ideas together ... promot[ing] and uncover[ing] relationships” (p. 88).

Dissecting the four narratives offered me insights into my clinical faculty identity, and at the same time, helped these insights coalesce into a story of self in the context of the CoP.

**Trustworthiness**

Self-study is situated in an interpretivist tradition, but interpretation relies on the experience of the self. In other words, the researcher is also the researched. This circumstance might cause readers to become skeptical about the trustworthiness of research claims. Richardson (2000) suggests that interpretive researchers should move beyond the notion of triangulation toward crystallization, because analysis of the social world is complex and intricate, but always partial, dependent upon the facet of the crystal through which stories are perceived (p. 934). One means of crystallization is use of multiple data sources, and another is dialogue with critical friends who will help to trouble, or disturb, categories (Lather, 2001) and challenge interpretive processes. To enhance the trustworthiness of this study, I relied on multiple sources from the community of practice members, including transcriptions of dialogue, email, and existing documents. During the
early stages of data analysis, I sent coded data and categorization to my dissertation advisor, Dr. Susan Wharton Conkling, to help ascertain the plausibility of the coding scheme and its application to transcribed conversations and email messages. I also shared analysis and drafts of the fourth and fifth chapters of this study with the coordinator of music education, the most central member of the CoP, to inquire whether my analysis reflected a reasonable understanding of the context for the work of the CoP, and how the community of practice negotiated its joint enterprise (cf. Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001). I amended the chapters based on her recommendations.

Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) wrote, “The self-study scholar can do good work, present good information in a reasonable way, and offer a compelling interpretation, but the reader decides whether to accept it” (p. 154). So, in the final interpretations, presented in Chapters 4 and 5, I have offered rich and coherent descriptions of practice that may “ring true” (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001, p.16) for readers about the problems and issues of negotiating a joint enterprise in music teacher preparation, the trajectories of participation for members of the CoP, and the development of my identity as a clinical faculty member within this particular CoP. I have attempted to attend carefully to the context and setting of the community of practice at the same time I present the story of our community with dramatic tension that engages readers (Bullough & Pinnegar, 2001, p. 20).
Chapter 4: A Community of Practice in Relation to Outside Enterprises

This self-study has two aims: first is an examination of the joint enterprise of our music teacher preparation community of practice from my perspective as a clinical faculty member of that community, and second is an examination of how my identity as a clinical faculty member was shaped through interaction and dialogue with other members of the community. In this chapter, I focus on the first aim, where in short, I viewed the joint enterprise from the inside out. I set out to achieve this goal first by mapping our joint enterprise in relationship to broader enterprises of higher education and teacher education. Next, I looked at how we were negotiating the mandates from those broader enterprises, focusing particularly on how the shared repertoire developed in our CoP was a response to external mandates, yet it was unique to our community’s practice. Third, because communities of practice are everywhere, I wanted to investigate the relationships that existed between our CoP and several other communities in our college and geographic area. Finally, I looked at myself, as well as the other members of our CoP, trying to understand how we recognize one another in the joint enterprise—what are our identities? Because Wenger viewed identity as a trajectory of participation—never static, and always in motion—I tried to look at our identities relative to our participation.

Meet the Community of Practice

Before describing the joint enterprise, it is important to introduce the members of the community of music teacher preparation practice and learn a little
about their backgrounds. At the time of this study, Lex was in his eighth year as a full-time music education professor at the college. His responsibilities involved teaching conducting and brass methods, but he also taught low brass lessons and directed the concert band. Before joining the college to educate pre-service teachers, Lex had a twenty-six year career teaching band in public schools. Lucy was also a full-time professor of music education at the college, and she was the coordinator for music education. Hired not long after Lex, Lucy was in her sixth year of teaching choral music education methods and ensemble practicum. Outside of music education, Lucy directed the college's chamber singers. Prior to her appointment at the college, Lucy taught middle and high school choir, and she also served as an adjunct college professor. Sharon was relatively new to our community, in her second semester as a part-time clinical faculty member responsible for the department's general music education methods course. Sharon also was a full-time elementary music teacher at a local public school. She had previously served as a cooperating teacher for the college’s pre-service music teachers for many years. I was in my fifth semester of part-time clinical work at the college, and I was primarily responsible for teaching a class entitled *Teaching Music to Children*, a music education methods course for undergraduate non-music majors. In addition, I observed and mentored student teachers. Before beginning my work at the college, I had been employed in public and parochial schools teaching K–8 general music, beginning and intermediate band, jazz band, choirs, guitar ensemble, and hand bell choir.
Situating the Joint Enterprise

Wenger (1998) contended that a joint enterprise was “defined by the very process of pursuing it” (p. 77), and our community of practice pursued the preparation of music teachers. Still, Wenger noted that every enterprise was positioned within at least one broad system, and so I first set out to discover how our community was positioned within the systems of higher education and teacher education. As is typical for music education units in many higher education institutions, our joint enterprise was regulated by standards for regional accreditation, National Association of Schools of Music (NASM) standards, and Council for the Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) standards. In addition to those standards, our joint enterprise was influenced by state regulations for teacher licensure.

The standards for regional accreditation, for example, called for a strong general education program for all undergraduates, which at the college comprised 40 credits intended to lead toward a broad range of competencies in writing, critical reading, information literacy, critical and creative thinking, quantitative reasoning, critical dialogue, and media fluency. Adoption of this extensive general education program affected course scheduling and caused the college to shift toward four-credit blocks for scheduling.

The CAEP standards called for assessment of pre-service educators’ knowledge, skills, and dispositions. According to CAEP, the benchmarks for educator knowledge were reflected in the standards of the Interstate Teacher
Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC), and included understanding of: learner development; individual differences and diversity; creating safe and productive learning environments; music content knowledge, its application, and its assessment; planning for instruction and instructional strategies; and on-going professional responsibility. CAEP standards also highlighted the importance of effective partnerships between teacher education programs and P–12 schools.

The CAEP standards included language that teacher preparation programs should reflect the content and pedagogical knowledge deemed necessary by other program accreditation organizations. In our case, CAEP called for the college to implement NASM’s recommended music content standards. NASM content standards were reflected in our college requirements for second year music students to pass rigorous aural skills, music theory, and piano proficiency exams.

Finally, state teacher licensure regulations underscored many of the NASM standards, especially for fundamental aural skills, keyboard skills, and conducting. The regulations also stated that music teachers must be prepared to teach students in grades K–12, and across general music, vocal music, and instrumental music content areas.

**Negotiating the Joint Enterprise**

During the course of our conversations among the members of our CoP, it became clear that we often felt constrained by these external mandates. For instance, Lex viewed the college’s liberal arts credit requirements, along with its move toward a four-credit model, as prohibiting him from covering all of the
knowledge and skills necessary for instrumental music methods:

Lex: This one-size-fits all college scheduling sort of hurts us. So now, for a two-credit course in instrumental methods, having to deal with repertoire, classroom management, budgets, everything is dumped into 100 minutes a week for fourteen weeks. And that’s just not possible. I’ve been forced to acknowledge that students will not know everything when they graduate.

Sharon similarly spoke of her own experiences as the instructor for the general music methods course, explaining that there was not enough time to cover necessary information about teaching within her limited class meetings. When Lucy recommended that the “First Days of School” unit could be removed from the course, Sharon seemed relieved, and she mentioned that she could use the recovered time for teaching guitar or keyboard, two units that she had not been able to cover within the scope of a one-semester, four-credit course. The units would be useful to pre-service teachers in demonstrating their application of content knowledge.

During one conversation, we even debated whether it was possible to cover everything during undergraduate education:

Erin: I think you can go to school for ten years, and still, you will find a day where you will think to yourself, “I never learned that in my undergrad, they should have taught me this.” Realistically, we cannot teach everything. And because our state offers a K–12 licensure, you really can’t . . . . I explain to the student teachers. Your undergrad is like a buffet. Go to workshops, attend conferences, get Orff or Kodály certificates, go to grad school.

Lucy: You’re right, there is no way that our students are going to know everything going out the door, but if they know something exists, there is the hope that they have the foundational skills to ask questions and find the information.

Sharon was not eager to accept that continuing professional development was the
only remedy that we could invent to prepare music teachers:

Sharon: Sometimes I feel like we’re saying, "This is all we can give you, and if you really want to be successful you should really have more training. And that will cost you more time and money." Even though this is through no fault of our own, I feel that students don’t always know it’s a systemic issue.

She seemed to believe that, regardless of time constraints imposed by curricular mandates, we should be doing more for our students.

Although we often viewed the external mandates as constraints, it was also true that important aspects of our work were assisted by the regulations and standards. For instance, we all believed that musicianship was an essential facet of teacher preparation, and the NASM standards underscored our beliefs. Lucy expressed that musical knowledge and skills were foundational, and should be acquired first:

Lucy: Sophomore year is their assessment year: aural skills, piano proficiency, and mid-level review. So there is some value in saying, build your foundation skills, then we can learn to teach.

Lex similarly acknowledged his belief that our pre-service music teachers should develop musicianship first, and then add pedagogical skills later. Lex taught applied lessons in addition to music education courses, so he saw our students’ musicianship deployed in more than one setting, and he regularly expressed concerns about the music department’s performance standards:

Lex: The performance standards don’t seem to be assessed critically. As a first year student, no matter what your instrument is, you register for the 100-level applied lessons. At the end of the first year, having spent that time in there, you then register for the 200-level. We’re unlike some schools where you have to be approved to move to the next level. Here it’s automatic, so, there are times that I find myself looking at the department, some 300-level performers who are—
Erin: Not there.

Lex: Yes, not really 300-level.

Lex also spoke about our alumni, and how they wished for more emphasis on keyboard skills:

Lex: I think that one of the things that we continually seek feedback about from alum, “what do you know now that you wish you knew then?” They are always saying, “we wish there was more piano,” or “I wish I was forced to spend more time learning the piano before going into the classroom.”

Musicianship, as described not only in NASM standards, but also in state licensure regulations, clearly mattered to our joint enterprise.

In addition to underscoring the importance of musicianship, the members of our CoP also emphasized the practical pedagogical experience that pre-service music teachers should acquire before they entered the classroom. Lucy and I spoke about the benefits of pre-service teachers’ contact with in-service teachers and their everyday teaching practices.

Lucy: Our string methods teacher is perfect for our students because she can say, “This is really what happens for elementary string programs.” That’s also one of the benefits of having Sharon, who is in the field, teaching general methods.

Erin: Just the simple things, like teaching the students how to change guitar strings. Things that I do all the time, but I never learned during my undergraduate classes. All those little things that we learned the hard way after we got our first jobs.

During another conversation, Lex, Lucy, and I underscored how putting our students in touch with the real world of music teaching through early field experiences was important for their career decisions:
Lucy: I think what I’ve heard from our colleagues is not every program in music education starts with field experience the first year. And I think that’s a positive aspect of our program: students are going out to observe during their first year. Some students decide that teaching is not for them.

Lex: Right.

Lucy: And it’s better to find out early and move on to something else, like a BA in music or performance or whatever the passion is.

Although the practical aspects of music pedagogy did not appear specifically in external regulations, the CAEP standards emphasized the importance of effective relationships with P–12 schools and practitioners.

**Shared Repertoire as Negotiation**

Wenger (1998) wrote, “Over time, the joint enterprise creates resources for negotiating meaning” (p. 81), and the way in which our joint enterprise was situated in relationship to the broader enterprises of higher education and teacher education often was revealed through its shared repertoire, that is, through its “routines, words, tools, ways of doing things, stories, gestures, symbols, genres [and] actions” (Wenger, 1998, p. 82). Specifically, our proficiency exams, evaluation of the student teaching practicum, and expectations for developing professional practice reflected a negotiation with external mandates, and at the same time, development of shared repertoire that was meaningful to the members of our CoP.

**Formal entry to program.** There were established points of reckoning for our students, which were called proficiency exams. Lucy and Lex led the project to establish these exams, and they took great pride in the fact that the exams had become central not only to our practice, but to the entire department of music. To be
formally admitted into the music teacher preparation program, second year students were required to pass a piano proficiency exam and an extensive aural skills exam. In light of NASM standards and state teacher licensure regulations, as well as our alumni feedback, the content of these proficiency exams is not surprising. Nonetheless, they could be challenging for many students, so the college provided tutors to help students prepare, and students were allowed multiple attempts to pass the exams.

In addition, second-year students were required to submit their academic and career goals and transcripts, and participate in individual interviews with three full-time music professors and artists in residence. Finally, music faculty, including applied studio teachers were asked to rate each pre-service teacher on personal attributes that included:

- Communication skills,
- Respect for college professors and others,
- Punctuality,
- Preparedness,
- Commitment to academic and musical improvement,
- Enthusiasm for learning music, and
- Ability to work cooperatively.

The CAEP standards called for evaluation of dispositions, yet Lex and Lucy had crafted the dispositions assessment instrument to reflect their values. Lex spoke about the review:
Lex: The whole idea of music education, and education in general, has changed over the years. There was a time when people used to say, you can’t define good teaching, but you know it when you see it.

Lucy: And we know it when we don’t see it!

Lex: And the establishment of these dispositions has helped us to identify the characteristics that will create a good teacher. Not necessarily what a good teacher is.

Lex and Lucy took “dispositions” in its literal sense. They did not ask if the students were good teachers, but instead asked what were the signs that they were disposed toward teaching. The dispositions form was used not only in the second year, but during the student teaching practicum at the mid-point of each seven-week placement. The cooperating teacher completed the evaluation and shared it with the student teacher and the college supervisor. For the members of our CoP, this second assessment of dispositions not only reflected general CAEP standards, but it also reflected our beliefs that dispositions could change over time.

**Evaluation of practicum.** Much of our shared repertoire involved evaluations that took place during the student teaching practicum. I observed and assessed each student teacher at least three times during a placement, the cooperating teacher observed and assessed the student teacher twice during the placement, and the cooperating teacher and I completed a final evaluation together. Additionally, between the fourth and fifth week of each placement, the student teacher completed a self-evaluation. The assessment instrument contained rating scales and had room for comments. At the conclusion of a formal observation, during which I had rated the student teacher’s lesson and written comments, I held
a meeting with student teacher and the cooperating teacher to review the form and set new goals. If the student teacher were struggling, the three of us would work out an improvement plan.

The assessment instrument (Appendix B) was standardized so that a math teacher and a music teacher were evaluated using the same basic indicators, which were:

- Knowledge of content and pedagogy,
- Knowledge of students and school context,
- Instructional goals, learning activities, assessments and learning outcomes,
- Rapport and respect within the classroom,
- Managing routines and procedures,
- Managing student behavior,
- Flexibility and responsiveness to students’ needs,
- Activating and maintaining student engagement,
- Pacing of instruction and timing, and
- Instructional activities.

To these indicators, our CoP added “musicianship.” Some music teacher educators might think that this was a duplication of “knowledge of content and pedagogy,” but, according to Lex, it was important to our department that the word “musicianship” should appear specifically. In addition, a student teacher’s sense of professional responsibility was evaluated according to these indicators:
• Clear and accurate communication with students and co-workers,
• Reflective practice,
• Use of technology, and
• Professional interactions and pursuit of professional development.

Rather than evaluating student teachers once at the end of their student teaching placements, evaluations took place on multiple occasions to reflect our CoP’s belief that the student teacher experiences important professional growth throughout the practicum.

Although I was aware of how other shared repertoire originated and how the repertoire was related to broader enterprises, I was unable to locate a source for the clinical evaluation form. Some of the language on the form looked as if it was influenced by CAEP standards, yet other parts resembled the Danielson teacher evaluation model (Danielson, 2013). When I asked Lucy about how the form came into use, she could only tell me that it was used for all student teachers from the college.

**Expectations for professional practice.** All of us in the CoP encouraged music education students to attend professional conferences in the state, and the college often provided funding for them to attend national professional development conferences. Lucy spoke of how she was pleased with students’ high level of participation and engagement within the college’s NAfME, MTNA and ACDA chapters.
Lucy: I think our students are more than jumping into their professional role. And I think the faculty models some of that but I think they’re seeing what their peers are doing. So I think there’s this inherent sense of, “well, that’s just what we do.”

She further noted the expectation that students not only attend conferences, but become professionally involved by presiding over presentations and volunteering to host events when they become in-serve educators. Lex concurred with the importance of students’ professional involvement within organizations, and noted that students were taking their professional roles more seriously than they had in the past.

Lex: When I arrived, MENC was more like a social organization. Now it’s more professional. This year at the Eastern division conference, one of our students presented along with collegiate members from other chapters about how to run a student chapter. The students are taking advantage of national professional development opportunities. We’ve had students from ACDA attend the national professional development conference in Utah this past year.

Lucy: On scholarship, that they got from ACDA.

Lex: I’m trying to get people to go to the leadership summit.

Erin: Oh, the summer leadership institute.

Lex: Yeah. Some students have participated in that over the past two summers.

Lucy: And they’re talking to people in congress, their staffers, about music education. Can you imagine? I don’t know how I would have, at age twenty, talked about music and arts education to congressmen, and these students are speaking articulately.

Lucy, Lex, and I further emphasized the value we placed on professionalism by attending many of the conferences with students, as well as leading or facilitating many of state and national conference sessions. Although there were CAEP
standards that addressed pre-service teachers’ development of professional practice, those were written generally and broadly. These expectations were specifically aimed at pre-service music teachers and belonged uniquely to our CoP.

**Boundaries and Boundary Objects**

In addition to situating our joint enterprise in relationship to the broader enterprises of teacher education and higher education, it was important for me to understand our relationship to other communities of practice. Wenger wrote, “Communities of practice cannot be considered in isolation, or understood independently of other practices. Their various enterprises are closely interconnected” (p. 103). Wenger also noted that, when considering the relationships between enterprises, boundary objects and boundary spanners helped to organize the connectedness between communities. With Wenger’s advice in mind, I examined several enterprises that were closely connected to our music teacher preparation CoP.

**Music performance.** Considering the small size of the college, the boundary between music teacher preparation and music performance was the most obvious one to consider. Lucy and Lex participated fully in each CoP because they both directed performing ensembles at the college, and Lex also taught low brass lessons. Lucy’s and Lex’s development of the piano proficiency and aural skills examinations required for all second-year music students further illustrated the centrality of their participation.

As I thought about Lex’s and Lucy’s work, a number of boundary objects that
connected these two CoPs came to mind: The college’s recital hall functioned as a space for choral and instrumental ensemble performances as well as students’ solo recitals, but it also was the space where many of the workshops for the music education guest lecture series were held. Students’ musical instruments were also boundary objects. Students used their primary instruments while rehearsing and performing in solo recitals and ensemble concerts; however, music education students would use other instruments, their secondary instruments, while enrolled in instrumental methods courses. Lucy and Lex facilitated conducting practicum for the department, and gestural repertoire they used and conveyed to all students might be considered a boundary practice between music performance and music education.

**Local school music teachers.** Our college is located in a rural area, where there are not many public schools, and we relied greatly on local music teachers for student teacher placements. This is the main reason I considered music teachers as a CoP with which our music teacher preparation CoP shared a boundary. Although the local music teachers all had the opportunity to become affiliated with our state professional organization, I did not examine the extent of their active participation for purposes of this chapter.

Sharon was a clinical faculty member in our CoP, teaching the general music methods course, but she was also a full-time elementary music teacher. There were a large number of boundary objects used by both communities. As a certified Orff-Schulwerk practitioner, Sharon used Orff instruments and recorders in her
elementary classroom daily, and she also modeled their use when she taught pre-service music teachers. Scarves, parachutes, and beanbags were also boundary objects that Sharon used in both communities. Furthermore, Sharon acknowledged the value of the guitar as an accompanying instrument that music teachers should learn how to use, but also as a classroom instrument that could bring students lifelong enjoyment. In addition to the instruments and props, Sharon’s pedagogical methods and repertoire choices for her elementary students also were boundary objects. She integrated Curwen hand signs, singing games and play parties, folk dances, and children’s books in her work with both CoPs.

Some local music teachers learned to use the college’s clinical evaluation form, as well as the student teacher dispositions assessment. These, too, could be considered boundary objects, but only for those local music teachers who served as cooperating teachers.

**Music education alumni.** Lucy recruited many of the college’s local music education alumni to serve as cooperating teachers for our undergraduate practicum students, and she also has invited them to be guest lecturers in classes. This has provided some continuity to our CoP because the alumni are familiar with the musicianship standards as well as the content of the undergraduate music classes. For purposes of this chapter, I am considering our alumni as a CoP, although they may not have practices that are distinct from local music teachers.

Lucy and Lex hosted yearly meetings to gather opinions from our music education alumni on how to better prepare our pre-service music teachers.
These discussions might be considered boundary objects, because they reinforced existing practices of our music teacher preparation CoP, but also brought to light other views that caused us to make changes to our practice, particularly adding the Adaptive Music and Music Curriculum and Assessment courses.

As a music education alumna, I took on a special project of creating a social media group page where alumni could share their experiences, give each other assistance, and support one another. The current music student teachers have access to this group page and have opportunities to seek advice and support as they seek employment:

_Erin: I'll figure out how to get the alums involved, because I think they would be really into it._

_Lucy: Maybe invite people who graduated within the last four or five years into the discussion group._

_Erin: That would be great. They're always posting online about their thoughts anyway, so this could be a forum for them to formally organize their thoughts, reflect, and share with others. And I think that the student teachers will have ideas for the others who are in-service._

So, this social media connection functions as a boundary object. It has also proven to be a useful way for Lucy and me to observe how alumni interact with each other. Over its brief existence, Lucy and I have participated in the group somewhat like cheerleaders who encourage further interactions among its members. Lucy, who has a history with all of members of the group as their former professor of music education, was particularly proud of how often her former students use the group as a professional resource for ideas in the classroom, as well as a social support group
to lean on during challenging times.

**Teacher education community of practice.** I thought there might be a greater connection between the broader teacher education CoP and our CoP. After all, there were many boundary objects. There was an educator preparation office, and its staff served all teacher education programs at the college. This office was in charge of making student teacher placements, with input from program coordinators, and the staff ensured that our programs complied with state licensure requirements. That office also produced a student teaching handbook, posted online, which outlined the responsibilities for all student teachers, cooperating teachers, and supervising professors. The building where all student teaching seminars took place was also a boundary object. The clinical evaluation form was used for all student teaching practica, so it too was a boundary object. However, Lucy was the only member of our CoP who had contact with the teacher education CoP, so she was the only one who brought these boundary objects for our CoP to use.

**Trajectories of Participation**

Wenger (1998) described identities as constructed socially and over time; therefore, he recommended that participation in a community of practice should be examined in relationship to identity, as a “succession of forms of participation” or “trajectories” (p. 154). Wenger proposed several trajectories of participation, including the *peripheral trajectories* of those who never enter into full membership; *inbound trajectories*, where newcomers intended to fully participate in the CoP; the
*insider trajectories* of those full participants whose identities were still being reshaped by changes in practice; the *boundary trajectories* of those whose work primarily linked communities of practice; and *outbound trajectories*, where an old-timer was moving or perhaps retiring (pp. 154–155).

However, Wenger (1998) observed that individuals were not members of only one CoP, and trajectories of participation were not the same in all CoPs. Whereas an individual might be an insider in one community of practice, he or she could be a peripheral member in another community. Therefore, Wenger came to view identity as “a nexus of multimembership” (p. 159). Multiple trajectories always came together, but not necessarily in a unified way. They either clashed or “reinforced each other” (p. 159). Individuals were always trying to make “various forms of membership co-exist” (p. 160), a process Wenger called reconciliation.

After examining boundaries and seeing how I identified each of the members of our CoP with a specific boundary, I turned my attention to the members themselves. I considered how each individual was recognized in our community. However, as Wenger implied, I did not see the individual just in relationship to our CoP, but also to other CoPs, and I thought about whether each person's trajectories were clashing or reinforcing each other.

**Lex.** With identity shaped through insider trajectories in both our music teacher education CoP and the music performance CoP, the pre-service teachers’ musicianship was very important to Lex—he believed it was key to their professional success. It was easy to see how Lex had observed weaknesses in the
pre-service teachers’ musicianship—he taught low brass applied lessons, and he conducted an instrumental ensemble, in addition to his music education responsibilities. He had observed the pre-service teachers in a variety of contexts. His pride was obvious when he saw that the aural skills and piano proficiency exams, which he and Lucy had created, were having an impact:

 Lex: The thing that I’ve seen in my conducting classes, and I would imagine it’s the same in other classes, is that the students are stronger in both piano and aural skills than they had before they instituted the barrier exams, the decision points.

Lex also developed an elective ensemble practicum, in which pre-service music teachers could hone their conducting skills. This was another sign of how he had attempted to reconcile his membership in the music teacher preparation CoP with his membership in the music performance CoP. Lex informed me of the history of the ensemble practicum, and what the experience entailed:

 Lex: To me, the reason we resurrected this was, no matter what we do, there is never enough time to be prepared for that first day of student teaching, the first time you step up on the podium in front of a group. The students select pieces, they figure out the rehearsal schedule, where it goes in the program. I meet with them between one and two hours a week outside of rehearsals to talk about specific things. We also do not have enough time in the program to deal with repertoire issues. So now, sometimes I use this course for remedial repertoire studies, where I finally get to talk about, in concert band, what are the standards for the repertoire and where do they come from.

Wenger observed that boundary spanners often felt as if they lacked roots in a community of practice, but that was not the case with Lex. He was an insider to both CoPs, and he had been engaged in the process of integrating his performer identity with his educator identity for more than 20 years. For Lex, considering the small
size of our music department, multimembership seemed like a necessity. Lex's trajectories of participation are illustrated in Figure 2.
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*Figure 2. Lex's trajectories of participation.*

**Sharon.** Sharon had a boundary trajectory in our CoP, and her full-time, insider trajectory was at a local elementary school where she taught music. She seemed to be a boundary spanner between these two CoPs, although her membership in the elementary school was not peripheral, as in most boundary spanning relationships. During one of our conversations, Sharon shared her opinion that pre-service teachers enrolled in her general music methods course lacked an understanding of sequence:

*Sharon: One of the big problems I'm noticing is that students have trouble developing a sense of the big picture. They think, "Oh, this is a fun song. I'll do it this year" rather than thinking of grade level expectations. If you're teaching second grade and you're looking down to fifth grade, is this song or activity going to get you there? It's great to have fun activities, but you need to be picking the right materials. If you really want to use that song, I'll let you do it but show me how this is actually contributing to learning.*

It would have been impossible for her to share such an informed opinion without a deep understanding of elementary schools and students, knowledge available only
at the core of a CoP, according to Wenger (1998). But as a result of her observations about pre-service teachers’ lack of understanding, Sharon introduced grade level expectations assignments into the general music methods course, and she helped our CoP improve its preparation of music teachers. No other member of our CoP could have achieved the result in the way that Sharon did.

Nevertheless, at the periphery, Sharon often showed impatience with our music teacher preparation CoP, as she did when we discussed whether we could fit everything into a four-year curriculum. Sharon was a relative newcomer to our CoP, and it seemed likely that she was struggling to make her two forms of membership co-exist. Sharon’s trajectories of participation are illustrated in Figure 3.
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**Figure 3.** Sharon’s trajectories of participation.

**Erin.** I had an interesting experience with membership in our CoP during the course of this study. My initial induction into teaching at the college occurred when I became the instructor for *Teaching Music to Children*, a music education methods course for pre-service elementary teachers and other non-music majors. I became a peripheral member of the teacher education program as well as the broader
institution though teaching this course over several years. This involvement in the
changed when I became a member of the music teacher preparation CoP, which was
peripheral by choice—my young family is very important to me, and I want to spend
as much time with them as I can. But during Lucy’s sabbatical, in addition to my
responsibilities for *Teaching Music to Children* and supervising student teachers, I
also taught student teaching seminar and general music practicum, and I took on a
brokering role with our educator preparation office. The exchange below with a
staff member was a typical encounter while brokering:

   From: Sarah  
   Date: October 15, 2015  
   To: Erin  
   Subject: Cooperating Teacher Compensation

   Erin, Is everything all set with Cindy at Webster School? Has she been paid for
   the extra student? I indicated to her that I would leave the remaining
   communication between the two of you. Let me know if you need anything else
   from me.

   Sarah

   From: Erin  
   Date: October 15, 2015  
   To: Sarah  
   Subject: Re: Cooperating Teacher Compensation
   Yes, she said she’s all set. Thanks for checking in.

   Erin

   In addition, Lucy had asked me to develop two new courses for pre-service
music teachers: Adaptive Music and Curriculum and Assessment. As I was engaged
in this task, Lucy indicated her desire to re-work the course sequence for pre-
service music teachers so that I could teach both new courses.

From: Lucy  
Date: December 6, 2015  
To: Erin  
Subject: Curriculum and Assessment

Hi, Erin,

I'm trying to move Curriculum & Assessment to a fall semester. Adaptive Music would stay in the spring concurrent with General Music Methods and General Music Practicum. If the department chair approves this for next year, you could teach both of these courses you have designed.

Lucy

From: Erin  
Date: December 6, 2015  
To: Lucy  
Subject: Curriculum and Assessment

Hi,

Thanks for this update. I believe I’m scheduled for Teaching Music to Children on Tuesdays from 6:00 – 9:30 p.m., so Curriculum and Assessment could be scheduled later in the afternoon. If it's a Tuesday, this might not work at all, though, with the music majors’ schedule.

Erin

The additional responsibilities, the brokering role, and the development of two new courses put me on an inbound trajectory in our CoP, although I viewed this trajectory as temporary. However, I was simultaneously enrolled in a doctoral program, and I viewed this program as preparation for an eventual full-time position in higher education. My identity in the doctoral program reinforced the
temporary insider identity I experienced as Lucy was on her sabbatical. My trajectories of participation are further illustrated in Figure 4.

**Figure 4.** Erin’s trajectories of participation.

**Lucy.** Like Lex, Lucy was an insider to our CoP, as well as to the music performance CoP. As the conductor of a choral ensemble, Lucy saw pre-service music teachers in several contexts, and she had a broad perspective on their preparation. Lucy showed no signs of struggling to reconcile her identities, and like Lex, she appeared to view multimembership as a necessity in our small college.

Because Lucy was the coordinator of music education, she also had a role as a broker with the broader teacher preparation CoP. Most of the interaction between Lucy and the teacher education CoP involved requests for student teacher placements like this one:
From: Lucy  
Date: October 14, 2015  
To: Sarah  
Subject: Next semester’s student teacher placements  

Hi, Sarah:  

I hope you are well. While I’m off this semester, I am working on the placements for next term. I believe I sent you my wish list of cooperating teachers for the four music student teachers (8 1/2 semester placements). I’ll get to work on possible placements for general music practicum and send them to you.

Lucy  

These types of interactions caused me to wonder about Lucy’s identity in the teacher preparation CoP. She had always admitted participating more on the periphery of this CoP, and her dual roles in the department of music kept her very busy. But was Lucy’s relationship to the teacher preparation CoP marginal rather than peripheral?  

Wenger referred to identity as formed from both participation and non-participation. Forms of non-participation included peripherality, which eventually enabled full participation, and marginality, which restricted access to mature practice. Although Lucy was encouraged to make suggestions for student teacher placements, contact with cooperating teachers and arrangements for student teaching were activities reserved for the educator preparation office. It might be argued that mature practice included building and maintaining professional relationships with surrounding public schools. Furthermore, because cooperating teachers played a large role in the evaluation of student teachers, mature practice
involved an assessment of their content knowledge and capacity to evaluate. Lucy’s access to such mature practice seemed as if it was restricted, but her marginality could not be confirmed until a placement was made with a cooperating teacher who lacked content knowledge or was a poor match for the student teacher.

Still, there was another occasion on which I questioned Lucy’s relationship with the teacher preparation CoP: She had no knowledge about the history and adoption of the clinical evaluation form. The form was used to make decisions about whether a student teacher would pass the practicum, and it contained criteria by which teaching was judged satisfactory. Although Lucy was aware that the form was used throughout the college, she was unaware of who created the form—whether it originated within the college or at the level of the state education department—so she was unaware of how the criteria had been rationalized. Were criteria connected to CAEP and InTASC standards, or to a contemporary model of teacher evaluation such as Danielson? Had they been developed by a committee at the college, in which she was not invited to participate? Lucy was unaware of whose mature practice was represented on the form. Lucy’s trajectories of participation are illustrated in figure five below.

*Figure 5. Lucy’s trajectories of participation.*
Summary

My goal in this part of the self-study was to understand the joint enterprise of our music teacher preparation CoP, looking at it from the inside out. I did this first by examining how our joint enterprise was positioned in relationship to the broader systems of higher education and teacher education. I discovered that there were several sets of standards and regulations that influenced our practice, including standard for regional accreditation, CAEP and NASM program standards, and state regulations for teacher licensure. Second, I examined how the members of the CoP negotiated the joint enterprise, particularly in light of those external mandates. My conversations with other members of our CoP led me to conclude that we found the external mandates constrained our curriculum; however, some of the regulations supported our beliefs that musicianship and practical knowledge were paramount in preparing our student teachers. The shared repertoire of our CoP offered evidence of how the joint enterprise was negotiated in relationship to external mandates, yet the repertoire became unique to our practice. Specifically, I examined ways in which we formally admitted to the music education program, how we evaluated their practicum experiences, and how we expressed our expectations for development of professional practice.

In addition to mapping out the joint enterprise in relationship to broader enterprises, I mapped the boundaries of our CoP in relationship to other CoPs. I discovered our overlapping relationship with the music performance CoP at the college, and a close relationship to local school music teachers. In the process of
examining our relationship to music teachers, I found out that many of them were music education alumni, and although that group did not fit the definition of a CoP precisely, it was useful to see the overlap and to consider the close, advisory relationship between alumni and our CoP. I was somewhat surprised to find that, although our CoP shared several boundary objects with the college’s teacher education CoP, Lucy was the only one who brought those objects into our CoP.

Finally, I examined the joint enterprise by considering members’ identities, that is, their trajectories of participation not only through our CoP, but also through other related CoPs. Lex seemed to easily reconcile his performer and teacher identities—his insider trajectories in our CoP and the music performance CoP were mutually reinforcing. Sharon’s insider trajectory in her elementary school was very helpful in light of her boundary trajectory in our CoP. She brought important pedagogical insights to us and our students. However, Sharon seemed to struggle with reconciling her memberships in dual communities. Lucy was an insider in both our CoP and the music performance CoP, and like Lex, she reconciled these identities easily. She admittedly participated on the periphery of the teacher education CoP, but her lack of access to mature practice in that CoP caused me to consider whether her relationship to the teacher education CoP was one of marginality rather than peripherality.
Chapter 5: The Development of my Clinical Faculty Identity in this Community of Practice

In this chapter, I address the second purpose of this study by thoroughly examining my identity as a part-time clinical faculty member in the context of the CoP. I look to how my identity was shaped through my participation within the community through both my trajectory of participation as well as through moments of instability that led to insights about my identity.

Lucy and Lex were the full-time faculty, and each had a considerable teaching load. There seemed to be greater need than two full-time music education faculty could accommodate. I had chosen a peripheral trajectory of participation in this CoP, initially supervising some student teachers. My participation in the practice increased during Lucy’s sabbatical as I took over some of her responsibilities and assisted with the needs of the CoP. Furthermore, I agreed to create two additional courses that I would teach in the future. Adaptive Music and Curriculum and Assessment. I suddenly found myself temporarily on an inbound trajectory of participation.

My temporary inbound trajectory was reified through the creation of course syllabi for Adaptive Music and Curriculum and Assessment, as well as the online alumni and student teacher support network I initiated. I knew I was making real and beneficial contributions to our joint enterprise, but at the same time, I was always reminded of the participation on the periphery I had chosen for myself.

Throughout the study, I gained insight into my clinical faculty member
identity through moments of instability in the dialogue of the community of practice. Pinnegar and Hamilton (2009) cite Bakhtin's (1981) *zone of inconclusivity* to describe that such moments of instability may “destabilize or regenerate a theory, assertion, or idea” (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, pp. 87–88). In self-study, these moments are important because they can help provide greater clarity about the self-in-context (Pinnegar & Hamilton, 2009, p. 88).

**History of the practice.** A moment of instability for me as a clinical faculty member occurred during my first meeting with Lex and Lucy when we were discussing the various guidelines for our teacher preparation program. I entered into that meeting with a certainty that two general music methods courses, one elementary and one secondary, were needed to prepare our students satisfactorily for their future work in public schools. Although I felt comfortable offering my observations and suggestions in a first meeting, I quickly learned that some of my ideas were impractical.

*Erin:* [Another college] has different guidelines for their program. I’m not sure how it works for them, but they are able to offer two different courses for general music methods—a K–5 and a 6–12.

*Lucy:* That’s common in a lot of schools, but I believe they are not NASM accredited, so they have more flexibility. They also don’t have the liberal arts requirements that we have.

*Lex:* They don’t have the 40 or 42 credits that are required in ISP courses.

In retrospect, it seems that the cause for this moment of instability could be traced to different types of knowledge with which the three of us were operating.
Lucy and Lex were operating out of tacit knowledge (Polanyi, 1967). So much of their experience teaching at the college had occurred during the same time period, and with many of the same people, they seldom had to explain things to one another. In contrast, I was operating from my experiences as a student at the college, reconciling those experiences with the present moment (Stern, 2004) in which our conversation took place. Operating out of two different types of knowledge brought unintentional conflict to the conversation. It felt easy for me to observe the program and make suggestions for improvement, yet the insight I gained was that, as a clinical faculty member, I had little history with the everyday occurrences of this community. There had been many changes to the music teacher preparation program since the time I attended the college as a student, and I lacked knowledge of their inception and development. What appeared to me to be shortcomings in the music teacher preparation program were actually curricular issues that had been carefully negotiated over several years. I also learned that I could be more sympathetic toward the constraints that Lucy and Lex negotiated every day in their work, and that asking them questions could draw out their tacit knowledge.

**Student teacher placements.** I had been engaged over a longer period of time with music student teachers at the college, and I made suggestions and comments about their placements in the years prior to this self-study. As we collectively prepared for Lucy’s sabbatical and my responsibilities in the CoP increased, I felt empowered to be more candid with my recommendations. In one
instance, I began an email thread with Lucy by suggesting a middle school cooperating teacher for our student, Shane.

From: Erin  
Sent: October 9, 2015  
To: Lucy  
Re: Student teacher placements

Hi,

Shane [practicum student] told me he will be doing his student teaching next fall somewhere in the lower part of the state. This made me really excited, because Steve [cooperating choral music teacher] is exceptional, and he seems to enjoy working with Hannah [student teacher] currently. I don't know if you've thought that far ahead, but I thought I'd at least put in a good word for Steve as a prospective cooperating teacher for Shane.

Erin

Although Lucy acknowledged that Steve was a good cooperating teacher, she reminded me that the student teacher, Shane, was an instrumentalist. She suggested that Shane should be placed at Steve’s school, but with primary responsibilities in instrumental music, and one period per day teaching choral music with Steve.

From: Lucy  
Sent: October 10, 2015  
To: Erin  
Re: Student teacher placements

Hi Erin,

Thanks for sending along those communications. Shane is an instrumental major, so perhaps we could place him at that middle with Tina, Steve’s instrumental colleague and schedule it so he works with Steve for chorus for one period.

Lucy
Lucy did not accept my recommendation entirely, yet she took my ideas into consideration. This gave me confidence to share more about Shane’s experiences during the General Music practicum:

From: Erin  
Sent: October 11, 2015  
To: Lucy  
Re: Student teacher placements

Shane is having some difficulties with the cooperating teacher for his practicum placement at Elm Street elementary. He says he is observing what he would not want to do in his own classroom.

Erin

Lucy responded by asking if we should no longer place students with this particular cooperating teacher, and I offered an answer that surprised me:

From: Erin  
Date: October 12, 2015  
To: Lucy  
Subject: Student teacher placements

I think that Dan is not a bad teacher. His philosophical approach is based on educating the whole child, rather than a focus on the music, as we emphasize in our courses and with our students. While I see value in what he does, it is not a natural fit for our students.

Erin

My “ways of being a person in [the] context” (Wenger, 1998, p. 149) of our CoP shifted as I acquired a greater stake in negotiating the joint enterprise. Prior to the self-study, I might have said that a student teacher could be placed successfully with any highly regarded teacher, and that the student teacher could learn, regardless of the cooperating teacher’s values or practice. My response to Lucy
instead was that Dan was a good music teacher, but his approach was not well-aligned with the core values of our joint enterprise. This response demonstrated to me that my trajectory of participation within the community had become less peripheral and more inbound. I was able to offer advice that was consonant with the values of the joint enterprise.

Although I had given recommendations in the past, I knew I was offering my perspective from the periphery, so I had not considered whether my recommendations were valuable or influential. Through this email discussion, I learned that my opinions were valued, and I could have a reasonable amount of influence over where student teachers were placed. Not only did I enjoy contributing to the community of practice in this way, I also felt a new responsibility to understand the joint enterprise in depth and to offer my recommendations in a way that reflected an insider’s view.

**Course development.** As the CoP prepared for Lucy’s sabbatical, I began to understand some of the changes that Lucy and Lex hoped to make for undergraduates. Based on my conversations in the field with cooperating teachers and their concerns with measuring student growth, I believed that pre-service teachers needed more information about curriculum development and assessment. I had always felt strongly that this was one area in which student teachers needed additional preparation. However, I also knew that our students would benefit from learning about adaptive music. Lucy had already asked me to prepare a syllabus for an adaptive music course, and I was certain that our community would need to
make a choice between one course or the other—during our community conversations, there seemed to be no room in the curriculum for two different courses. I was sure that as a community of practice, we would have to make a compromise to best suit the needs of our students and external regulations placed upon us. Nonetheless, I inquired with Lucy and Lex about adding a course in curriculum and assessment.

From: Erin  
Sent: October 14, 2015  
To: Lucy and Lex  
Re: Adaptive Music

Hi,

In addition to Adaptive Music, I'm hung up on the idea of a two-credit curriculum and assessment, which I feel is valuable as well. This is something that co-ops have mentioned to me when I go observe the student teachers. However, is it realistic to add this? I recall reading that most new teachers don't even think about curriculum until after their first few years because they're trying to stay afloat. However, I do think that the assessment piece is key in the current education climate. I would suggest taking an Understanding by Design (UbD) approach, which provides the language that our new Core Arts Standards have adopted anyway.

Erin

Lucy agreed that curriculum and assessment were worthwhile courses for our students:

From: Lucy  
Sent: October 14, 2015  
To: Erin and Lex  
Re: Adaptive Music

Hi, Erin,
OK, let's think about a two-credit curriculum and assessment course. I think the UBD approach with the National Core Arts Standards is the way to go with the course.

Lucy

As I worked on course development, I was reminded of my place on the periphery because course development and approval had to be channeled through Lucy and Lex. They made final decisions about course content and how the documentation was presented to others for formal adoption of the courses:

From: Erin
Sent: October 13, 2015
To: Lucy and Lex
Re: Adaptive Music

Hi, Lucy and Lex,

I've been putting a lot of thought into the Adaptive Music class, and I've attached a possible course outline/calendar, assignments, and class topics that I think would work well. Lex, I think you might think it's a bit much for two credits, and I am inclined to agree with you. I am trying to give students field-based learning experiences at least two times during the semester. Let me know your ideas, suggestions, or questions that this brings to mind.

Thanks!

Erin

Lucy was grateful for my work on the development of the course and offered suggestions for improvement:

From: Lucy
Sent: October 14, 2015
To: Erin and Lex
Re: Adaptive Music

Hi Erin,
I think it looks like a great class. With it following K–12 General Music Methods, it could be a great way to build skills. A couple of ideas I have would be to adapt their general music lessons, because they will not yet have taken choral and instrumental methods. For the final project, perhaps they take their grade level expectations from K–12 General Music Methods and add an adaptive layer.

If you think the class feels more like three credits, perhaps we add a one-credit part of the load with assessment and make it a four-credit class?

Just a thought... and thank you!

Lucy

I incorporated Lucy's recommendations, but my communication with her made me even more cognizant that she often operated out of tacit knowledge.

Course development responsibilities typically were reserved for full-time faculty who navigated the process necessary to see course proposals through to adoption. Although I was aware that my connections and access were limited to our small CoP, I could not have known ahead of time that I lacked the centrality necessary to see a course through to its adoption. Through this moment of instability, I gained the insight that, regardless of how inbound my trajectory might appear, I would never have an insider role in this CoP.

Describing these important insights to Lucy, I learned that she perceived my activity to be more central in the work of the community:

From: Lucy  
Date: January 19, 2016  
To: Erin  
Subject: Results review

Hi, Erin,
Do you really feel that you will never be a central insider in the CoP because of your adjunct status? I feel like you have a large influence in our recent program changes, even more than full-time tenure-track faculty.

Lucy

Lucy clarified that she offered additional responsibilities precisely because she sought to increase my participation, rather than to limit it. In retrospect, Lucy had interacted with me as if I was a CoP insider, therefore helping to reify my experience of being on an inbound trajectory. At the same time, I was continuing to confront the fact that this inbound trajectory was only temporary during the time that Lucy was on her sabbatical. This reflective dialogue with Lucy helped me to differentiate between feeling empowered at the periphery, an insight that occurred during my work with student teacher placement, and acting in an empowered way from the periphery. I learned that, as a clinical faculty member, it is important not only to understand the history and values of the joint enterprise, but also to be aware of the limits of one’s work. With such awareness, one can act in an empowered way right up to those limits. This allowed me to reframe the creation of the Adaptive Music and Curriculum and Assessment courses. I had understood that these courses were consonant with Lucy’s and Lex’s visions for the direction of the CoP, and I had done everything I could do to complete the course adoption process. In turn, because Lucy and Lex had confidence in my intentions and abilities, they did not hesitate to see the courses through the adoption process.

External mandates and other CoPs. There were occasions during Lucy’s sabbatical when I inquired about the origin and intent of practices, particularly
about student teacher evaluation. Close inspection of the evaluation form suggested that it might be based on Charlotte Danielson’s (2013) model of teacher evaluation.

I inquired with Lucy about how the clinical evaluation form came to be used.

From: Erin  
Sent: October 14, 2015  
To: Lucy  
Subject: Danielson model

Hi,

The clinical evaluation for the student teachers looks like it might be based on the Danielson model of evaluation. It didn’t occur to me until now to ask how it came to be used. Was it put in place by the office of teacher preparation, and you were later told to adopt this form?

Erin

Lucy acknowledged that the evaluation form was required by the college’s teacher preparation program. She also noted that Lex was allowed to add the category of musicianship to the original form to account for this unique element of music student teachers’ preparation.

From: Lucy  
Date: October 14, 2015  
To: Erin  
Subject: Danielson model

It was implemented by educator preparation before I got to the college. Lex asked them to allow the music department to add one criteria, so we could assess general musicianship, which I think is valid for our practicum and student teachers.

Lucy

I carried the conversation a little further to see if perhaps the educator preparation
program in the college had been influenced by other external mandates from outside the college.

From: Erin  
Sent: October 14, 2015  
To: Lucy  
Subject: Danielson model

Hi,

It looks like our college, and possibly other institutions in our state, are trying to align pre-service teacher assessment with assessment for K–12 teachers. I will email Sarah [representative from educator preparation] to confirm if this is happening intentionally (unless you know).

Erin

Lucy’s reply was telling:

From: Lucy  
Date: October 14, 2015  
To: Erin  
Subject: Danielson model

Yes, please let me know more about what you learn about this!

Lucy

Lucy’s response demonstrated to me that, although she was always aware of the effects of external mandates on our CoP, she was not always completely aware of their origins. Perhaps this was because our CoP was so small that Lucy had to take on a dual identity as an insider and a broker, or perhaps the nature of external mandates that impact CoPs is not always clear. I learned through this dialogue with Lucy that, even as an insider, negotiating the practice can be frustrating and time consuming. It seems particularly challenging to comprehend how all the CoPs
within a college or university are related, and where practices overlap.

This insight led me to consider my on-going work in *Teaching Music for Children*, a course that engages pre-service elementary teachers, as well as students who want a liberal arts elective. I recognized that this course consistently brought me into contact with students outside the school of music and helped me understand how they navigated their lives in the college. I began to consider whether, in comparison to Lucy, whose teaching was exclusively to music majors, it was possible that I had a broader perspective on the college. I contemplated the extent to which I, as a clinical faculty member, might bring my perspective and experience to those in the music department through serving as a broker between their college or department and the broader institution.

**Insights into my Clinical Faculty Identity**

Throughout this study, as the community of practice prepared for Lucy’s sabbatical, my trajectory of participation changed from one that was somewhat influential at the periphery to one that appeared more inbound. The dialogue that took place among members of the CoP led toward moments of instability that raised questions about my participation in the joint enterprise and provided insight into my identity as a clinical faculty member. Early in the study, I learned that, as a clinical faculty member, I lacked a history of everyday work in the CoP; consequently, I lacked an understanding of the responses to various curricular issues that had arisen during recent years. I had no basis for some of the judgments I was making, so I decided to listen more intently, particularly to Lucy’s experiences,
before offering more recommendations.

Nevertheless, my work as a clinical faculty member prior to this self-study involved giving advice about student teaching placements, and I was less reserved about continuing that practice. As Lucy and I continued our dialogue about student teachers, I discovered that I had developed a greater stake in the joint enterprise, and my improved understanding allowed me to offer recommendations that were consonant with its values. I derived professional satisfaction from participating meaningfully in the community of practice and knowing that my contributions were valued, but I wondered if the satisfaction would be temporary. After all, Lucy would eventually return from her sabbatical, and I would return to peripheral participation in the CoP. However, I learned that my history of interaction with music cooperating teachers was a strength of my identity in the CoP. I observed that this recognized strength could be combined with careful understanding of the values of the CoP to produce feelings of empowerment at the periphery.

Then, when I was asked to develop two new courses for the music teacher preparation program, I continued to feel that my contributions were meaningful and important to the CoP. Course development represented an inbound trajectory of participation in the CoP, but at the same time, my autonomy in organizing course content and my ability to see the proposed courses through their adoption were limited. I discovered that, although I could never become an insider in this CoP, I could act in an empowered way from the periphery.

However, I soon discovered that even insiders face limitations. I had
conversations with Lucy about some of the external mandates that influenced our work in the CoP, and I discovered the complex web of CoPs that extend through the college and out the state education department and also to various accrediting agencies. It often appeared that a regulation made its way through to our CoP, with little notion of its origination, context, or underlying intent. Keeping in mind that “the enterprise is never fully determined by an outside mandate.... The practice evolves into a communal response” (Wenger, 1998, p. 80), I learned that responding to mandates can be a time-consuming and frustrating process, even for an insider. My personal frustration in tracing the origin and intent of particular mandates that influenced this self-study showed me that even central insiders to a CoP might, in some instances, become disempowered. With additional consideration, however, it seemed possible to me that clinical faculty with job descriptions similar to mine might be helpful to full-time faculty, and in certain instances, clinical faculty might take on a brokering role.

**Who I Am and Who I Want to Be**

The moments of insight that helped shape my identity as a clinical faculty member also provided me with a glimpse into my future as a music teacher educator who could be an insider to a community of practice; that is, I could see more clearly who I wanted to be as a music teacher educator. The experience of an inbound trajectory enriched my professional development because it took place in a small higher education institution where frequent interaction between clinical faculty and full-time faculty was essential. Had I worked at a larger institution
where one CoP could develop for clinical faculty and another could develop for full-time faculty (cf. Bullough et al., 2004) my opportunity for professional development would have been much more limited. Being in a CoP consisting solely of clinical faculty would almost certainly have ensured that relationships of mutual accountability and trust might not have been built with Lucy and Lex. Lucy and Lex would probably not have become aware of our shared values or my strengths as a practitioner. Consequently, I would have lacked the insights and support of insiders, as well as the opportunity to learn to act from an empowered position at the periphery of the CoP.

I learned that observing, assessing, and supporting student teachers in the field is what I enjoy most, and a role I will definitely take on in the future. I was drawn to this final stage of pre-service teacher development because I wanted to support and mentor student teachers in their transition from college to in-service teaching. When I tell student teachers to call me for support in any capacity, even after they graduate, I truly mean it. My desire to support our graduates has grown so much that I have recently accepted the position of “Collegiate Coordinator” for our state music association. I will use this role to curate and provide special interest sessions for student teachers and recent graduates at all of our state in-service conferences, taking what I have learned in this self-study into the broader profession. In addition, I will continue to connect our recent alumni with each other and the college through the online music alumni group that I initiated during this study. I hope it will provide a source of support for our graduates for many years.
Through the unexpected opportunity to develop courses in Adaptive Music and Music Curriculum and Assessment, I learned how essential this content knowledge is to everything educators do. I have already begun to integrate the content into my conversations with student teachers, and I see how they apply the knowledge immediately to the lessons that they are teaching.

As much as I appreciate the professional development I experienced while being placed on a temporary inbound trajectory, I also experienced a struggle. As I saw myself on an inbound trajectory, I began to feel removed from my identity as a music classroom teacher. My conversations with cooperating teachers reminded me of the challenges I initially faced in the music classroom, challenges I used to reference easily during my conversations with student teachers, but now these sometimes elude me. I was a bit alarmed to learn how quickly I forgot about the realities of being in a classroom, and I have contemplated what this identity change means for my relevance as a music teacher educator.

Regardless of any tensions or misgivings, my experiences as music educator in the classroom, along with the experiences I have gained as a member of this community of practice, have informed the vision of the music teacher educator that I hope to be in the future. I look forward to continuing to develop as a pre-service music teacher educator, and welcome additional opportunities for my past experiences to inform my future practice.
Chapter 6: Implications for Clinical Faculty and Other Communities of Practice

In Chapter 4, I described the joint enterprise of a music teacher preparation CoP from my point of view as a member of that CoP. I noted the position of the CoP in relation to broader enterprises, external mandates that influenced members’ work within the CoP, shared repertoire that we negotiated with the outside mandates, boundaries of the CoP, and boundary objects relative to other CoPs. Finally, I described members’ trajectories of participation across multiple CoPs. In Chapter 5, I discussed how my identity was shaped through my participation in the CoP, not only through my trajectory of participation, but also through moments of instability that occurred during dialogue with others in the group. Furthermore, I shared the insights I gained into my faculty identity and drew distinctions between the professional I am currently, and the professional I hope to be in the future.

In this chapter, I draw together what I have learned through this self-study with empirical research on contingent faculty in the U.S., specifically discussing classification of faculty, reasons that separate cohorts of full-time faculty and contingent faculty did not evolve during this study, and the relative autonomy contingent faculty have for teaching and designing their courses. Next, I narrow my focus to the theme of multimembership in CoPs that was prevalent throughout this study, and I discuss it in relationship to the theoretical literature. Finally, I describe implications of this study for practice and for further research.

This self-study took place at a small public university in the northeastern United States where I work as a clinical faculty member in music education. I used
concepts from Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998) to show how the members of a small community of music teacher education practice learned together and negotiated their identities. Two of the members of the CoP were full-time tenure-track faculty, and two other members, including myself, were not.

Reflecting on how our CoP prepared for Lucy to go on sabbatical, I see how many of my experiences were typical of a contingent faculty member, yet in a few ways, my experience was unique.

**Classification of faculty.** Typical of contingent faculty experience, as Kezar and Sam (2010) indicated, were the three classifications of faculty: part-time, full-time non-tenure-track, and tenure-track. Even in my initial descriptions of our CoP, I had to qualify the nature of our appointments: Lucy and Lex were full-time, tenure-track faculty, while Sharon was part-time faculty. My role at the college had usually been part-time, but it was close to full-time as I took over some of Lucy’s responsibilities during her sabbatical. The three-classification system was most evident to me when I compared my work with Sharon’s. Although I initially lacked information about the history of the joint enterprise, and I felt somewhat distanced, Lucy and Lex invited me into conversation, and I learned enough to negotiate my work more effectively. I came to feel very successful, especially in my work supervising student teachers. Eventually Lucy and Lex gave me additional responsibilities of new course design, which for me, marked an even closer relationship with the music department. By comparison, Sharon also was very effective teaching the elementary music methods course and she seemed to relish
her role preparing future music educators. Because Sharon's main responsibilities were in her public school, however, she simply never had the time to become more engaged in the life of the department. It became evident that Sharon was more distanced like the part-time faculty to which Levin and Hernandez (2014) referred, while my role was more like the full-time non-tenure-track faculty in Shaker's study (2008).

Separate cohorts. Shaker (2008) and Bullough et al. (2004) emphasized how contingent faculty formed cohorts separate from full-time faculty. Shaker identified these cohorts as composition faculty, who were mainly non-tenure-track faculty, and English faculty, who were mainly on the tenure-track. Bullough and colleagues identified these cohorts as clinical faculty associates (CFAs) and full-time education faculty. The reasons for separation were somewhat similar between the two studies: Shaker noted that teaching composition was perceived as lower status work, implying that it required less skilled teaching. Bullough et al. highlighted the hierarchy of theory over practice in the school of education, with full-time tenure-track faculty recommending that CFAs should only be responsible for modeling excellent practice.

Our CoP never separated into two distinct cohorts, and reflecting on this literature, I propose that there were several reasons for our unity. First, our CoP was small, and it was obvious that Lucy and Lex could not manage the entire workload themselves. They appreciated all the help that Sharon and I provided; thus, there were never any hints of animosity between the members of our CoP.
Second, our institution was a regional university with a strong emphasis on teaching, and less emphasis on research publication even for the full-time tenure-track faculty. Therefore, we all tended to value practical knowledge. In Chapter 4, I described our shared repertoire, which in many ways represented the value of practical knowledge. For example, entry into the program required piano and aural skills, which as Lex and Lucy argued, were among the most essential skills that a music teacher put to use in the classroom. Likewise, our choices about course content and course development also reflected an emphasis on practical knowledge.

Recall Lucy’s comments about the string methods teacher and also about Sharon:

*Lucy: Our string methods teacher is perfect for our students because she can say, “This is really what happens for elementary string programs.” That’s also one of the benefits of having Sharon, who is in the field, teaching general methods.*

Similarly, Sharon believed that, in an ideal certification program, pre-service teachers would be spending their time in a real-world classroom learning how to teach, and she introduced grade level expectations into the general music methods course. Finally, Sharon and I chose our positions as contingent faculty members, and we had no desires at the time of this study to become full-time tenure-track faculty members. Sharon already held a full-time position in the local schools, and I wanted to honor my commitments to my young family, so our work as contingent faculty fit our needs perfectly. Although it was not common, several full-time non-tenure-track faculty in Shaker’s study fit this same description; however, in the Bullough et al. study, most university-based faculty perceived clinical faculty as threats. Neither
Sharon nor I wanted Lex or Lucy’s position, so Lex and Lucy never felt threatened.

**Autonomy within limits.** Kezar and Sam (2010), Shaker (2008), and Levin and Hernandez (2014) all wrote about how both part-time and full-time contingent faculty valued autonomy in their teaching roles. Based on my experiences as the instructor of *Teaching Music to Children*, where I designed and taught the course with little oversight from anyone on the full-time faculty, I was somewhat surprised to feel more restricted when I taught the music teacher preparation courses. This was not attributable to my position relative to the full-time tenure-track faculty, but instead it was due to their sense that the curriculum was limited by regional accreditation, NASM accreditation, and CAEP accreditation standards, along with state regulations for teacher certification. In other words, the entire CoP sensed a lack of autonomy.

In addition, I was surprised to be given the responsibility for developing two courses for the department and subsequently given the responsibility for teaching those courses. However, even this unusual responsibility for a contingent faculty member had its limits. Because I was not a full-time tenure-track faculty member, Lucy and Lex were required to preview my course syllabi and bring the new courses forward for adoption. Nonetheless, in our small CoP, Lucy, Lex and I remained in close contact with each other. They were able to learn more about me as a professional and trust that I was able to participate more fully in the CoP. Had I worked at one of the institutions described in Kezar and Sam (2010), Shaker (2008), and Levin and Hernandez (2014), I most likely would not have been given such
expanded opportunities. Through inviting me into the departmental dialogue more fully, Lucy and Lex demonstrated that they believed I was capable. They treated me as a professional, and consequently, I felt that my contributions were valuable.

Although I have touched upon concepts from the literature on communities of practice in these descriptions of relationships between contingent faculty and full-time faculty in this study, I now turn to that literature more fully, highlighting the concept of multimembership. First, I will describe how multimembership was a necessity, and how it both benefitted and constrained our CoP. Second, I will share how my views of students as members of multiple CoPs have changed as a result of this self-study.

**Communities of Practice**

Throughout this self-study, I have used Lave and Wenger (1991) and Wenger (1998) as a framework so that I could refer to our work in music teacher preparation as a CoP positioned relative to other CoPs in the college and in the local area. Seeing our work through a communities of practice framework, however, has helped me to recognize Wenger’s most basic propositions: CoPs are everywhere, and if CoPs are everywhere, individuals will always be engaged in more than one CoP. Individuals’ trajectories of participation in each CoP are different, so the individual will always be engaged in reconciling identities. These basic themes were important to my understanding of being a contingent faculty member in a CoP that also included full-time faculty, and also to my identity in the classroom.
Multimembership can benefit and constrain communities of practice.

Through this self-study, I learned that an individual’s multimembership can be an asset to a CoP. For example, Lucy and Lex were members of music performance and music teacher preparation CoPs, but rather than working at the periphery of both CoPs (typical of boundary spanners), they were insiders to both CoPs. Consequently, they were knowledgeable about the history of both CoPs, and more specifically, they were central to the interpretation and negotiation of external mandates stemming from regional accreditation and NASM accreditation that affected both communities. They were responsible for many overlapping practices of the two CoPs, such as the aural skills and piano proficiency exams, as well as the common language we used to speak about those practices. Lex’s and Lucy’s dual memberships in the music performance and music teacher preparation CoPs not only facilitated Sharon’s and my participation in the music teacher preparation CoP, they helped all members of both CoPs become more effective at their joint work.

However, multimembership can also pose a challenge to individuals and communities. Due to her position as coordinator of the music teacher preparation program, Lucy was also a member of the teacher preparation CoP. Presumably, she was not the only program coordinator in our small college who had multiple responsibilities, and our educator preparation office was designed to help ease some of the burden for these program coordinators. One of the effects of the educator preparation office was to prevent Lucy from accessing some of the mature practices of teacher preparation, such as the rationale for development of the
clinical evaluation form, and the in-depth knowledge of cooperating teachers and schools necessary for student teaching placements. It seems likely that Lucy’s marginalization in the teacher preparation CoP was unintentional, yet it affected our CoP adversely. In comparison to regional accreditation and NASM standards, we knew less about CAEP standards, particularly as they were related to evaluation of pre-service teachers. As a result, our CoP activity was designed more to comply with our perceptions of those external mandates, rather than to negotiate them creatively.

Conceiving of our music teacher preparation faculty as a CoP helped me to envision all higher education faculty, whether contingent or full-time tenure-track, as members of multiple CoPs; however, it seems that there may be more demands on full-time tenure-track faculty, and especially those in music teacher education, to act as boundary spanners. This is especially important so that future teachers stay informed and become qualified for state licensure. As a result of this self-study, I believe that awareness of such demands is critical, and it is also important when one is placed in a boundary-spanning role in music teacher education to understand where resources lie, both in the music department or college and in the education department or college.

**College students and multimembership.** Returning to the basic themes that everyone has membership in multiple CoPs and consequently always reconciles multiple identities, I began to consider college students’ multiple memberships—particularly those students enrolled in *Teaching Music to Children.* Earlier in my
practice as an adjunct faculty member for this course, I was concerned with maintaining the musical integrity of this course. So, course content was focused completely on music education theories and methodologies, specifically those of Orff-Schulwerk, Dalcroze, Kodály, and Gordon’s Music Learning Theory. Each semester, a number of students enrolled in the course are pre-service teachers from programs outside music education. Perhaps they are more familiar with Erickson’s stages of development or Piaget’s cognitive psychology than they are with theories of musical development. Even those students enrolled in the course who are not education majors might have some familiarity with psychology. Strict emphasis on music education methods, then, may do these students a disservice—the course may not connect easily with their prior understanding. By reinforcing cognitive and developmental theories in *Teaching Music to Children* and using those theories as a bridge to music education theories, for instance, explaining why some music activities are more developmentally appropriate than others, students can integrate knowledge and make connections across all of their courses. Furthermore, they can begin to reconcile their identities in their own majors with musical identities. When such reconciliation takes place, some students might investigate participation in musical activities, either on campus or in the community. Those students who are pre-service elementary teachers might be more willing to incorporate music into their daily routines when they are eventually employed as teachers. Therefore, using the CoP framework to view undergraduates as members of multiple communities may have benefits for students that extend beyond college graduation.
Implications for Practice

Having drawn the major themes of this study together with existing research, I now explore implications for campus practices among full-time tenure-track faculty and contingent faculty, especially those who work closely in a CoP. My recommendations are meant to improve the working climate for all faculty, making higher education institutions, and especially teacher preparation departments, more welcoming.

Contingent faculty in higher education. Similar to the findings of other studies (Levin & Hernandez, 2014; Shaker, 2008), full-time faculty in the college were unable to teach all of the necessary courses of the curriculum, which necessitated hiring contingent faculty. Sharon and I were therefore essential to the operation of the music department. Also similar to other studies, there were times when both Sharon and I felt detached from the music department in which we worked. Because Sharon’s full-time work kept her away from campus most of the time, she also felt detached from the institution. Following Levin and Hernandez (2014) and Shaker (2008), then, the most basic recommendation from this self-study is that full-time faculty and administrators should acknowledge the important roles that contingent faculty fill within their department, and they should try to understand the conditions that may make contingent faculty feel detached, so that they can take steps to creating a more welcoming environment. Taking Wenger’s definition of a CoP (1998) into consideration, it is the diversity of identity within the CoP and members’ awareness of their interdependence that strengthens and
motivates practice. If full-time faculty learned more about contingent faculty identity and experience within the university, it would enable full-time faculty to become allies, and the practice of teaching in the university would be strengthened.

At the end of this self-study, I have no doubt that higher education departments could foster a sense of belonging for all contingent faculty by welcoming them immediately and inviting greater participation in all facets of the enterprise. Perhaps several social events among all faculty could create a greater sense of community and belonging for a member who feels detached from the everyday life of the institution. Other simple ways of community building might include keeping a joint calendar for each department and an electronic newsletter that is distributed regularly.

Beyond the department, modifying university policy so that contingent faculty can take part in shared governance is important for inclusion. Although some contingent faculty might want to serve on campus-wide committees, it seems more likely that they would serve on department committees, where they could take part in such activities as approving new course proposals, scheduling courses and field experiences. At the outset of this self-study, I would have considered faculty governance committees too time consuming, but upon completion of the study, I recognize that serving on a committee could influence the overall climate for my work.

Unlike the non-tenure-track faculty represented in Shaker’s study (2008), our CoP operated smoothly and without animosity among its members. However,
similar to Shaker’s recommendations, our practices might have been strengthened if we shared an understanding of the qualifications for contingent faculty, along with how contingent faculty were evaluated and recommended for subsequent contracts. Full-time faculty would have no doubt that contingent faculty were qualified for their roles, and work within a CoP could be assigned based on each member’s specific qualifications and skills. Contingent faculty awareness of the evaluation procedures would offer specific feedback to improve their practice and some sense of security, if they were doing good work, that they could be re-hired.

**Contingent faculty in music teacher education departments.** As Kezar and Sam (2010) observed, contingent faculty positions now comprise about half of all faculty positions; therefore, prospective faculty should understand the conditions for future employment in their individual fields. If a position is advertised as a part-time position or a full-time non-tenure-track faculty position, prospective faculty should inquire about institutional expectations. Could the position become a tenure-track position in the future, or will it always be part-time? How are evaluations handled, and to what extent do positive evaluations figure into decisions to re-hire faculty? Are part-time faculty protected in any way by union contracts? Because contingent faculty positions are seldom discussed, either in the literature of practice or in research, prospective faculty may know little about such positions. Like me, some prospective music teacher educators may find that clinical faculty work is a good fit with their family responsibilities.

Throughout this self-study, my clinical faculty responsibilities included
observing and evaluating student teachers in their placements. This responsibility is commonly given to clinical and part-time faculty in other teacher preparation programs as well. Considering requirements for the number of times student teachers must be observed, the relationships with cooperating teachers that must be developed, and the extensive written evaluations that must be completed after each observation, it is reasonable to characterize supervision responsibilities as an intense workload. Shaker (2008) characterized teaching and grading responsibilities in undergraduate composition classes similarly, and she recommended that the number of students in each section of composition should be limited, so that contingent faculty would view their workload as equitable with their full-time tenure-track colleagues. Clinical faculty observing student teachers in the field would benefit by being assigned a limited number of pre-service teachers not only because they might view their workload as equitable to their full-time colleagues, but also because they could give ample and timely feedback to student teachers to support their professional growth.

From Wenger’s theoretical point of view (1998), a boundary spanner like Sharon may feel somewhat incompetent in teacher education practice; however the conditions of a CoP should help Sharon and others appreciate their competence at boundary spanning. A part-time faculty member like Sharon would sense greater support for her responsibilities and identity if she could meet other boundary spanners, form a community and develop shared notions of what it means to be a competent boundary spanner in teacher preparation. By having a support system of
other contingent faculty, boundary spanners like Sharon might feel less isolated within their departments, and they could develop the courage to share their observations within their departments. In our institution, as well as many others, the educator preparation office could assist part-time faculty in the formation of such a CoP by facilitating introductions, scheduling monthly meetings, and providing on-campus locations for boundary spanners to meet and interact with each other.

**Implications for Further Research**

As Kezar and Sam (2010) and Levin and Hernandez (2014) pointed out, very little research has been conducted from the perspective of part-time faculty in higher education. This self-study using a communities of practice framework therefore is a timely addition to the research literature, and it could be replicated by other contingent music teacher education faculty in their own institutions. It could also be valuable to extend replication of this study to contingent faculty in other teacher education divisions such as elementary education, early childhood education, physical education, and special education.

Although Kezar and Sam (2010) as well as Levin and Hernandez (2014) make it evident that research is not expected from part-time faculty members, there are most likely a number of boundary spanners who have roots in local schools, much in the way that Sharon did for this study. Perhaps these clinical faculty members could engage in self-study of boundary spanning practices to shed light on the constraints of boundary spanning posed both by public schools and universities.
Such studies might help teacher education programs structure the work of boundary spanners more carefully and help compensate such contingent faculty fairly.

Kezar and Sam (2010) also noted a general lack of research about faculty life in higher education, especially within individual disciplines. By this, they meant that part-time, full-time non-tenure-track, and tenure-track faculty should be represented as well as interactions among all types of faculty. Although I engaged other CoP members in this study, they did not design the study or analyze data. A collaborative self-study between a full-time faculty member and a contingent faculty member in music teacher education, using a communities of practice framework would not only provide insight into how faculty view their own identities but also identify the ways in which they help shape each other’s identities and together influence the practices of the community. Like a replication of this self-study, it may be beneficial to extend collaborative self-study to other teacher education divisions.

The themes from this self-study, such as external mandates, full-time faculty members’ reliance on tacit knowledge, all faculty members’ multimemberships and reconciliation of identities, and my opportunities for professional development could be used in the future to construct a comparative case study of contingent music education faculty across multiple institutions. This type of case study could shed light on the work-life experiences of contingent faculty of the same discipline but in institutions of different sizes and regions. It could also be extended to specialized institutions such as historically black colleges and universities (HBCUs)
or Hispanic-serving institutions. Furthermore the idea of comparative case study could be extended to contingent teacher education faculty across different divisions of teacher education. For example, contingent faculty who work for teacher education disciplines that typically certify student teachers in grades P–12, such as music, physical education, and art, could be compared to each other, within one institution or across multiple institutions. Such case studies would help professionals learn if contingent teacher education faculty experience similar work-life conditions, and how the institution for which they work influences contingent teacher education faculty identity and practice.

A Contingent Faculty Member with Greater Responsibility

This study has taught me more about myself and my role within the CoP than I could have ever imagined. At the beginning of this study, I viewed myself as just another adjunct faculty member who was “plugging the holes” when full-time tenure-track faculty could not cover all that needed to be taught. However, as I began to compare my role with Sharon’s, I was led to the realization that I was fortunate to have a greater connection with other faculty, and more time to be connected to the college in general. Just as Lucy and Lex bear the responsibility of being welcoming to Sharon, so too, must I. Rather than take for granted the wonderful experiences I have had as a contingent faculty member, I should strive to be more inviting to Sharon, so that perhaps I can help lessen her feeling of detachment from the department. My role within the college can expand to include much more than what is written on my contract—it could include helping improve
the work-life of other part-time and contingent faculty.

Like the contingent faculty about whom Levin and Hernandez (2014) and Shaker (2008) wrote, I initially experienced a great amount of autonomy within my teaching at the college. However, I learned during this study that autonomy came with some limits. I view the specific circumstances in which these limitations occurred favorably. Through dialogue with Lex and Lucy, I gained new perspectives about what is best for our students and what should be included in the two courses I designed. As a result of such dialogue, I began to view myself more as one of many moving parts that work together and are interdependent—such a view was consistent with Wenger’s description of a community of practice (1998).

Studying myself in a community of practice taught me that individuals bring with them knowledge derived from a rich history of personal experiences gained through their memberships in multiple CoPs. Knowledge and identity from other CoPs must be reconciled with new understandings and identity in the present moment (Stern, 2004). Although multimembership can be a hindrance for some, it can also be a benefit that helps propel the work of a CoP forward. I learned that my multiple memberships, including my relationship with the education department, and the college in general, through teaching the course, *Teaching Music to Children*, had potential to be beneficial to the music teacher preparation CoP, something I never would have considered at the outset of this study.

Finally, I have also come to view my role as an adjunct instructor of *Teaching Music to Children* differently than I had in previous years. As I discussed earlier, I did
not consider students’ other learning that was taking place both on and off-campus as they were members of multiple CoPs. However, now that I reflect on my role as a music education faculty member, I am reminded that for many of these college students, my class might be the last music class they will ever take. This realization weighs heavily on me. It is quite possible that students in my class will choose to integrate music in their daily work and lives, especially when they have children of their own, based on their experiences with me as their instructor. It seems to me that students will be more likely to have a positive experience in the class if they are able to make connections with previous knowledge acquired. Accordingly, I now view my role for this course as much more than an instructor of music education methods, but as one who is responsible for fostering music connections and understandings across multiple disciplines.
### APPENDIX A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Definition of Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>An individual discusses, describes of exhibits an activity that takes place at the periphery of the CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>An individual discusses, describes of exhibits an activity that is central to the CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>An individual describes autonomy (empowerment) over an activity in the CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEM</td>
<td>An individual describes lack of autonomy (disempowerment) over an activity in the CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPP</td>
<td>An individual describes or demonstrates potential between the periphery to the center of the CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>An individual discusses or describes an activity that connects or brokers between two CoPs, such as a public school or a university</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICoP</td>
<td>An individual describes their own inception into the CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoPI</td>
<td>An individual discusses their work within the CoP in relation to their own views and the views and work of other CoPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PK</td>
<td>An individual describes or demonstrates practical knowledge and attributes that teachers need to other members of the CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TK</td>
<td>An individual describes or demonstrates theoretical knowledge that teachers need to other members of the CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITPK</td>
<td>An individual describes or demonstrates integration of practical and theoretical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISKCoP</td>
<td>An individual discusses their own or other’s current skills and training that influence their views and/or use for their work within the CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDCoP</td>
<td>An individual discusses outside professional development opportunities for themselves and/or other members of the CoP and other CoPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoPCOMM</td>
<td>Evidence of relationship building and trust within the CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXJE</td>
<td>An individual discusses an activity that extends past the immediate joint enterprise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHCoP</td>
<td>An individual discusses challenges members of other CoPs face and how it relates to their work within the CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJE</td>
<td>Conversation unrelated to teaching or education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GVCoP</td>
<td>An individual discusses their general views regarding the effect of their work within the CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCoPOV</td>
<td>An individual discusses how the views other members of the CoP inform or influence their own views</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHARED</td>
<td>REPERTOIRE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DM</td>
<td>An individual describes institutional and/or government policies or requests that influence their decisions for the CoP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DMB</td>
<td>An individual discusses their beliefs regarding institutional and/or government policies that should or should not influence their decisions for the community of practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCOMP</td>
<td>An individual discusses or describes the current music courses used to develop pre-service teachers’ musicianship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCOMPB</td>
<td>An individual discusses or describes the music courses they believe should be required to develop pre-service teachers’ musicianship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBARFY</td>
<td>An individual describes the current juries or barrier exams used to qualify prospective music teachers for the next level during the first year of the undergraduate program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBARSY</td>
<td>An individual describes the current juries or barrier exams used to qualify prospective music teachers for the next level during the second year of the undergraduate program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBARTY</td>
<td>An individual describes the current juries or barrier exams used to qualify prospective music teachers for the next level during the third year of the undergraduate program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBARLY</td>
<td>An individual describes the current juries or barrier exams used to qualify prospective music teachers for the next level during the last (senior) year of the undergraduate program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBARB</td>
<td>An individual describes what they believe should be the juries or barrier exams used to qualify prospective music teachers for the next level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METH</td>
<td>An individual discusses the current characteristics of and inclusion of various pedagogical approaches taught to students in music education courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHB</td>
<td>An individual discusses their beliefs regarding what should be characteristics of music education methods courses and ways to include those in pre-service teacher training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHNM</td>
<td>An individual talks about or discusses elements or characteristics of non-music major courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREQ</td>
<td>An individual discusses the current nature and amount of student teachers’ assignments throughout their practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STREQB</td>
<td>An individual discusses what they think should be the nature and amount of student teachers’ assignments throughout their practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVAL</td>
<td>An individual discusses the current measures of evaluation of student teacher progress during fieldwork and practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEVALB</td>
<td>An individual discusses what they believe should be measures of evaluation of student teacher progress during fieldwork and practicum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADMIN</td>
<td>An individual discusses an administrative task that needs to be accomplished within the CoP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

CLINICAL OBSERVATION FORM

Candidate: ___________________ School: ___________________ Date: ______
Observer: _________________ Grade/Class: ___________________

1=Needs Improvement  2=Meets Expectations  3=Exceeds Expectations

Comments

I. Planning and Preparing for Instruction
A. Knowledge of Students and School Context

B. Knowledge of Content and Associated Pedagogy

C. Instructional Goals/Activities/Assessments/Learning Outcomes

II. Creating a Positive Learning Environment
A. Respect/Rapport

B. Managing Routines and Procedures

C. Managing Student Behavior

III. Instruction
A. Activating and Maintaining Engagement

B. Flexibility/Responsiveness

C. Activities

D. Pacing and Timing

E. Musicianship

IV. Professional Responsibility
A. Clear and Accurate Communication for all audiences
B. Professional Interactions and Pursuit of Professional Development
C. Use of Technology
D. Reflective Practice

____________________________________
____________________________________

Signature of Teacher Candidate (following conference)  Signature of Observer (following conference)

Field placement: □ Methods/Practicum (check one) □ Cooperating/Mentor Teacher
□ Student Teaching/Internship  □ Methods/Practicum Instructor  □ College Supervisor □ Site Supervisor  □ Other Course Instructor

Key: 1=Needs Improvement 2=Meets Expectations 3=Exceeds Expectations □ Other Professional Educator (please describe)  N/O=Not Observed
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