

2020

“Ready for Primetime:” EdTPA, Preservice Music Educators, and the Hyperreality of Teaching

Cara Bernard
University of Connecticut

Nicholas McBride
The College of New Jersey

Follow this and additional works at: <https://opencommons.uconn.edu/vrme>

Recommended Citation

Bernard, Cara and McBride, Nicholas (2020) “Ready for Primetime:” EdTPA, Preservice Music Educators, and the Hyperreality of Teaching, *Visions of Research in Music Education: Vol. 35*, Article 17. Available at: <https://opencommons.uconn.edu/vrme/vol35/iss1/17>

“Ready for Primetime:” EdTPA, Preservice Music Educators, and the Hyperreality of Teaching

By

Cara Bernard

University of Connecticut

Nicholas McBride

The College of New Jersey

Abstract

Teacher education programs have widely used edTPA to assess if a teacher candidate is ready to teach. Using a framework of Baudrillard’s (1994) hyperreality, this study examined how preservice music teacher candidates performed the discourses of edTPA within their planning, instruction, and reflection in their student teaching placements. Employing an ethnographic case study of two undergraduate senior music education cohorts, data included an open-ended questionnaire, fieldnotes from class discussions, and conversations between the teacher educators–researchers. Findings suggest that candidates (a) exhibited constant performance anxiety when attempting to meet the demands of the edTPA video requirement, (b) were hesitant to go off book from a carefully scripted lesson that aligned to edTPA standards, and (c) embodied what they believed to be the hyperreal discourse of good teaching as defined by edTPA in ways that did not necessarily align with their developing or real teacher identities. Music teacher candidates conceived of a hyperreal teaching persona that, when triggered by the onset of a recording camera, reflexively enacted the extensive expectations of edTPA. Music teacher educators might consider these hyperreal discourses and their ramifications as they prepare teacher candidates for licensure and their future music classrooms.

Keywords: music education, edTPA, hyperreality, student teaching, teacher identity

Assessment of preservice teachers' readiness for the classroom is a driving topic in education and public policy, aimed toward the improvement and "effectiveness of teacher and principal preparation programs" (U.S. Department of Education, 2009, p. 10). Some believe that using valid and reliable assessments can best demonstrate teacher candidates' readiness to enter the workforce (Cochran-Smith, Piazza, & Power, 2013, p. 15). Over the past 15 years, portfolio-based assessments have become a prevalent tool to measure aspiring teachers' readiness for licensure (Newton, 2010; Wei & Pecheone, 2010; Wilson, Hallam, Pecheone, & Moss, 2007). Prominent assessments used include Beginning Educator Support and Training; National Board of Professional Teaching Standards; and Performance Assessment for California Teachers. Created by the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity, edTPA has become widely adopted across the country as one of the most popular portfolio-based systems to assess if a student is truly ready to teach (Barron, 2015; Darling-Hammond as cited in Scherer, 2012). As of July 2019, 18 states have policies in place for edTPA as their required assessment for teacher candidates to obtain licensure (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education [AACTE], n.d.-c).

As a performance-based, standardized portfolio, edTPA requires candidates to focus on three main pillars of teaching and learning: planning, instruction, and assessment (AACTE, n.d.-a). Addressing these pillars, candidates are asked to submit three to five lesson plans, 10–20 minute videos of their teaching, three samples of student work, and assessments. As candidates display evidence of planning, instruction, and assessment, they are required to identify, utilize, and discuss particular academic language—among them discourse, syntax, language function, vocabulary—and situate these terms within their classroom setting. Accompanying each pillar is a candidate narrative, which provides a reflective analysis on one's ability to plan, instruct, and

assess. Neutral, external evaluators hired by Pearson and the Stanford Center for Assessment, Learning, and Equity and who identify as experts in the content area, review and score the completed portfolios using a myriad five scale rubrics related to pedagogical approaches.

Portfolio-based assessments for preservice teachers such as edTPA can be used “as a measure of teacher quality” (Wilson, Hallam, Pecheone, & Moss, 2014, p. 2) and have been found to affect substantive institutional change (Peck, Gallucci, & Sloan, 2010). Such assessments might provide information about the quality of college and university teacher education programs, identifying strengths and weaknesses (AACTE, n.d.-b, “How do teacher preparation programs benefit by participating in edTPA?”; Lit & Lotan, 2013) and allowing for improvements. Some studies have shown that edTPA helps teacher candidates bridge theory to practice (Hyler, Yee, Carey, & Barnes, 2014), while providing them the opportunity to gather information about and reflect on the backgrounds of their students to effectively plan and instruct (Kleyn, Lopez, & Makar, 2015; Liu & Milman, 2013).

Despite literature stating the benefits of edTPA (AACTE, n.d.-b; Lit & Lotan, 2013), critical scholarship has identified the manifold impacts that adoption and implementation may have on teacher candidates, teacher educators and teacher education programs, and cooperating schools (Dover, 2018; Dover & Schultz, 2016; Ledwell & Oyler, 2016; Souto-Manning, 2019; Tuck & Gorlewski, 2016). Additionally, others have found that requesting preservice teachers to attend to such detail, coupled with the high level of reflection, is not central to overall teacher development (Clayton, 2018; Parkes & Powell, 2015; Tuck & Gorlewski, 2016). From a programmatic stance in teacher education programs, researchers have found edTPA to be a program eater (Barron, 2015; Greenblatt & O’Hara, 2015; Tuck & Gorlewski, 2016), taking up the majority of faculty and department meetings to discuss logistics and ways to support

students. This has also trickled into courses such as student teaching seminar, where much of the instruction time was dedicated to constructing edTPA components.

Some scholars have found that edTPA portrays an ideological view of how teaching is performed (Sato, 2014), and that preparing lessons and instruction specifically for edTPA beg a sense of inauthentic teaching (Ledwell & Oyler, 2016), or a sanitized (Au, 2013) version of instruction. Such attention to detail to craft carefully worded lesson plans in the desired academic language and carry out the lessons detracts from and erases the messiness of teaching (Madeloni & Gorlewski, 2013). To show that they are ready to teach, teacher candidates display their best teaching. This teaching is filtered through a video presentation, highlighting the candidate's ability to reflect and display strong content and pedagogical knowledge through strong writing style. Tuck and Gorlewski (2016) found that "the videoclip requirement raised additional concerns about which students in which classes would illustrate the kind of classroom that would result in a high score" (p. 203). The video component is the driving factor in a candidate's overall success in the portfolio, as it displays their content and pedagogical knowledge and their ability to realize a lesson plan in live time, all while displaying strong classroom management and a positive rapport with students. However, the portfolio—namely, the video—codifies a particular notion of effective teaching practice, as evidenced by the required structure and rubric items. The desire to capture one's best teaching in short video clips can be both overwhelming and unrealistic, causing candidates to "make compromises in his or her practice to be compliant with the assessment expectations" (Sato, 2014, p. 430). These compromises, made for the sake of a passing score for licensure, might create new values of what teaching should be versus what one thinks teaching should be, and form new professional discourses of good teaching for young teachers. Such discourses might put more value on the performance and portrayal of instruction,

what one thinks a representation of teaching should look like, rather than the messiness. In what ways is edTPA a representation of teaching, and how might it shape preservice teachers' teaching realities?

Theoretical Framework: Hyperreality and Simulacra

Using Baudrillard's (1994) notion of the simulacrum hyperreality as a theoretical framework, this study examined how preservice music teacher candidates in two university music education programs performed, took up, and embodied the discourses and expectations of the edTPA model within their student teaching seminar course and student teaching placements. In a hyperreal state, one cannot distinguish between what is real and what is a simulation (simulacrum) of real. Simulacra become "models of a real without origin in reality" (Baudrillard, 1994, p. 30). The models, then, attempt to become a reproduction of the world, a hyperreality. However, the model, the simulation imagined, gives rise to reality. This new reality, then, is steeped in a material production. As Baudrillard (1994) described,

What every society looks for in continuing to produce, and to overproduce, is to restore the real that escapes it. That is why today this "material" production is that of the hyperreal itself. It retains all the features, the whole discourse of traditional production, but it is no longer anything but its scaled-down refraction. (p. 23)

Through this material production, reality becomes heightened, exaggerated, which produces a simulation. This simulacrum then produces a hyperreality where one cannot distinguish between the real and the false. Baudrillard (1994) notably exemplified simulacra and hyperreality through his description of Disneyland, where an imaginary place with imaginary characters has become realized, all from the use of "hidden gadgetry" (Heyd, 2000, p. 17). From the moment one crosses the threshold of the parking lot into the Disney park, one forgets reality

and enters a new, overproduced, simulated reality which oversteps “traditional and natural reality,” becoming “superior to the old” in people’s eyes (Borgmann, 1992).

When one connects hyperreality to teaching, the two words seem contradictory. Much of teaching is about responding to the environment, which is naturally produced in live time, rather than a simulation. Teachers constantly adapt based on the students around them, the content, and the community needs. Therefore, a teacher cannot place sole dependence on a lesson plan or a series of steps. Examining teacher candidates’ experiences with edTPA through the lens of hyperreality, candidates are asked to display their readiness to teach through videos and carefully crafted lesson plans and reflections, highlighting strong writing skills. The preparation and enactment of the lessons in the video become a performance of sorts, showcasing the teacher portraying a different role than they typically would. There is little research in how teachers take up and enact the discourse of edTPA in a performance of teaching, particularly in music education. Adopting a framework of hyperreality, the research question guiding this study was, In what ways might the hyperreality of the edTPA performance of teaching manifest in preservice teachers’ planning, instructions, and abilities to reflect on their teaching?

Method

To investigate the research question, we conducted an ethnographic case study of two undergraduate music education programs during the 2018–2019 school year. Employing this qualitative approach around the topic of edTPA allowed “us to branch out in exploratory ways to map areas of inquiry that are underdeveloped or unexamined” (Barrett, 2014, p. 130). A total of 36 senior undergraduate music education majors in two undergraduate music education programs in the Northeast participated. To better regulate the scope of data (Yin, 2017), we delimited the participants to two sites in two different states where completion and passing of edTPA has

become mandatory for licensure. Each participant was currently student teaching at the time of this study and was both enrolled in student teaching seminar and completing their edTPA portfolio for licensure. The researchers, also teacher educators in the two respective programs, served as instructors and supervisors for the course and edTPA process.

Data Collection

Choices for data collection sources centered around candidates' preparations and execution of the edTPA video requirement. This decision stemmed from numerous discussions and observation in student teaching seminar and between the researchers around the candidates' preoccupation with the video. Data collection included a semistructured questionnaire (Creswell, 2013). The questionnaire was distributed online and contained open-ended questions. We worded the questions in simple language to remain nonleading and objective and to allow for participant narratives to emerge (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Initially, we created this questionnaire to gain information on students' edTPA experiences in order to better support them in and out of class with edTPA; we hoped the questionnaire would allow us to note where students struggled the most in the portfolio process. Questions centered around locating and comparing candidates' experiences of teaching before and during their edTPA preparation and video recording, describing the differences and changes. We asked students to choose three words to describe their student teaching experiences and elaborate on why they chose those particular words. Then we asked them to choose three words to describe their edTPA experience and describe their choice of words, comparing them to the first set of words. Additional open-ended questions followed. Questionnaire responses were recorded online anonymously for confidentiality purposes, so we could not identify which responses belonged to which student teachers.

Observation fieldnotes (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2011) from student teaching seminar—which we initially recorded by hand in a notebook—allowed us as teacher-researchers to capture particular conversations and reflections from the student teachers. One of the researchers held a bimonthly online edTPA Google Hangout for her student teachers. This Hangout, a nonmandatory event, was separate from the compulsory student teaching seminar, used to provide additional support for students to navigate the edTPA process and to devote less time in class to edTPA. Twice per month students had the option to come and go as their schedules permitted and bring topics or questions regarding specific edTPA components that needed addressing. During and following each edTPA Hangout, the researcher kept observation fieldnotes on the topics of conversation, including issues, questions, and concerns the student teachers had regarding their edTPA video preparation and execution. Lastly, informal discussions between the researchers–teacher educators following each student teaching seminar class and edTPA Hangouts served as additional data.

Data Analysis

We approached data analysis openly, where codes were not determined a priori but emerged from the data (Atkinson & Hammersley, 1998). We analyzed the questionnaires and fieldnotes using a three-step analysis process of open coding, focused coding, and grouping into themes (Emerson, Fretz, & Shaw, 2011). Following data collection, we independently completed open coding, then came together to compare our codes. We then combined our respective codes through a focused coding step; during this step we drew from our researcher discussions, using them to funnel the larger ideas into more succinct codes. During this step, we submitted the three words candidates used to describe their respective student teaching and edTPA experiences into a Wordle—an online word cloud—which prominently showed which words appeared more

frequently (Feinberg, 2014). We used these prominent words to filter our codes more concisely. Finally, we grouped the codes into themes. This iterative process allowed for the most salient themes to emerge from the data. To verify these themes, we triangulated our data in two ways, first through investigator triangulation, which involves having multiple researchers in an investigation, and second through methodological triangulation, which uses more than one method to gather data (Denzin, 2006, p. 472).

Findings

Through questionnaires, fieldnotes, and our own informal discussions, we aimed to explore the ways in which preservice teachers took up and performed the good-teacher discourse and expectations of the edTPA model. We focused predominantly on the preservice teachers' experiences with completing the video component of edTPA. This led to three main themes: (a) performance anxiety, (b) on camera/off camera, and (c) ready for primetime. Keeping with the overarching idea of edTPA as performance, each theme draws from theatrical and broadcasting terminology as the candidate assumed the role of teacher. We explore each of these themes in the following sections.

Performance Anxiety

Our data revealed that the teacher candidates functioned in a state of constant performance anxiety when attempting to successfully meet the demands of the edTPA video requirement and make a perfect recording. When asked to select three words that describe their overall student teaching experience via the online questionnaire, the participants responded most frequently with “fun,” “rewarding,” “challenging,” and “exciting.” In elaborating on their word choices, some participants mentioned the extent to which they enjoyed the improvisatory nature of teaching and the spontaneity required of teachers in real-world settings. One participant noted,

I chose dynamic because you never know what you are going to walk into that day; what mood the students are in, what school activities are going to throw a knot in your schedule, what teacher you may have to serve as a sub for because they called out sick.

It's an ever changing environment that is very different from the college atmosphere.

Sharing a similar perspective, another participant cited the importance of being “experimental in our teaching style and philosophy.” They furthered, “I went into these experiences with an open mind and by doing so, I made myself vulnerable to learn the most about myself, which made me have the most fun.”

Many student teachers spoke of the importance of learning about themselves while in the role of teacher, and their personal growth in developing a teacher identity. One preservice teacher noted, “I've felt I've grown in my identity of who I want to be as a teacher and my style of teaching.” Another described student teaching as “insightful, because I learned about who I am as a teacher. I learned what my strengths and weaknesses are and how it is okay to learn alongside your students.”

In stark contrast to these responses, when asked to choose three words that describe their student teaching experience in relation to the edTPA requirement, the preservice teachers responded most frequently with “overwhelming,” “stressful,” “frustrating,” and “confusing.” While elaborating on their differing word choices, several participants expressed concern over meeting the significant demands of edTPA within a limited period:

edTPA was the biggest stressor during my student teaching experience. I spent more time trying to figure out how to execute the details of edTPA with the time constraints of my placement than I did trying to be a genuinely good teacher.

As instructors, we noticed these stressors in our conversations with the student teachers, as these concerns began to seep into much of our course content. Before, during, and after class we saw candidates meticulously planning out their lesson plans—scripting their questions and responses almost down to the minute—in order to address as many of the benchmarks of the scoring rubrics as possible. We noticed that these anxieties carried over into non-edTPA, daily lesson planning as student teachers continued to script and plan out their lessons minute by minute, agonizing over the choice of words they would say to their classes. Additionally, we observed that when they spoke about edTPA-related issues with us, many of the students’ natural pitches and tempi of their speaking voices immediately rose and quickened, as tends to happen with nervousness or anxiousness.

Another participant echoed how the time-consuming nature of the edTPA video shifted the focus of the student teaching experience away from students. They described these conditions as “frustrating, because edTPA takes up so much time teaching and all we really want to do is focus on our students and our experience and making music with them.” Additionally, participants felt that the constraints placed upon them by the edTPA video component limited their ability to meet the instructional needs of the students in their charge. One participant noted,

I had to work on a strict timeline to get all the lessons written and recorded. This inhibited my ability to teach effectively because I was more worried about the lesson going absolutely perfectly that [*sic*] ensuring my students were fully understanding the topics we were discussing. I was more concerned with answering all the redundant prompts [as required in the edTPA handbook] than preparing for every lesson I had to teach.

Several participants acknowledged their worry over completing the edTPA portfolio within the short time allotted. In contrast to previous responses that enthusiastically embraced the spontaneous disposition and improvisational skills required of teachers, one preservice teacher acknowledged her fears over the lesson topic potentially veering in a new direction while video recording her teaching:

Especially now, being in a middle school, I never know what I can expect them to come up with, and that is the best part of teaching! However, this was something I greatly feared during edTPA. I did not want my students to take lesson topics in new directions during edTPA video recording, because I wanted to make sure that I checked off all of the required boxes in each video and that I followed my previously planned lesson perfectly (something that I now realize rarely ever happens).

While some of the worries expressed by the participants in this study may seem quite common to the experiences of most novice educators during the induction phase of student teaching, the added stress of completing the edTPA evaluation, namely the video, contributed significantly to their general feelings of anxiety while positioned in their student teaching placements.

On Camera/Off Camera

Like a news reporter nervously preparing to go live, the candidates' performance anxiety seemed to manifest in an on camera persona—a replica of the edTPA good-teacher discourse. The highly structured and scripted nature of these performances required that the student teachers rely heavily on their instructional plans, avoiding what some may refer to as “teachable moments.” Even when permitted, preservice teachers were hesitant to go off-book while instructing from a carefully scripted lesson that aligned to edTPA standards. Candidates felt that

they could not demonstrate characteristics of flexibility and improvisation in their abilities to respond to students' needs in the moment, moving discussions and lesson topics in new directions. Most of the questionnaire responses and an overwhelming amount of the class discussions and questions posed by candidates during student teaching seminar meetings focused on successfully enacting a passing performance for the audience of edTPA evaluators. Even post-edTPA recording, we noticed through our discussions with the student teachers an abandonment of flexibility in their lesson plans as they intently focused on delivering the content as rehearsed.

When asked to contrast their experiences of teaching on camera verses off camera in their videorecording, several of the preservice teachers noted their reluctance to deviate from their lesson plans for fear that such departures would result in a failure to successfully complete edTPA, and thus a failure to receive their teacher certification. One preservice teacher posited, "I think I look visibly more nervous and rigid knowing that my success in this video could potentially determine my future career status." Another noted that,

When teaching on camera, it felt as if I was tip-toeing around the lesson. I had to be super careful with everything I did knowing that it was going to be picked apart and eventually determine whether I would be eligible for my certification.

These views were echoed by other members of the student teaching cohorts who similarly expressed concern over the rigid and inflexible nature of teaching on camera for edTPA:

My teaching "on camera" felt much more forced than "off camera," like everything had to be done right, and if something happened that deviated from edTPA, I would not be able to use that clip because it "was not what edTPA wanted." I felt very nervous while recording, which impacted my teaching abilities. If something started to deviate, I would

not be able to just go with it and circle back. I would have to just get right back on topic, which I know impacted the way the students were picking up the material because they would become disengaged.

Additionally, several of the preservice teachers expressed concern over focusing their teaching so heavily on the expectations of edTPA while filming, and the gaze of the unseen audience of evaluators who would ultimately determine the student teacher's fate while reviewing their video. This caused the candidates to shift their attention away from the students:

While on camera, my teaching method was oriented around what edTPA reviewers noted they were looking for in their assessment rubrics, rather the [*sic*] necessarily responding directly to what the students needs around me were. My goal was to get through the lesson and highlight as many bullets as possible.

Many of the preservice teachers noticed a change in not only their own teaching personas while on camera, but also in their rapport with students. One candidate stated that “teaching on camera felt so fake to me. It is so much harder to teach when someone is watching you, and I felt disconnected from my students.” Another preservice teacher noted, “I had a better rapport with students away from the portfolio requirement and felt I had made a bigger difference as a teacher.”

Students in one of the university cohorts often referred to the video component as the “magic ten minutes” of teaching. They expressed apprehension over meeting the significant demands required of edTPA and in demonstrating such “flawless” instruction in brief, unedited video segments. In discussing these concerns, the seminar class began to strategize over how to effectively satisfy the demands of edTPA within the bounded 10-minute timeframe. These “production meetings” reflected the technical demands placed upon student teachers, while also

discursively positioning pedagogy and instruction as types of mechanical processes that are perfected through repetition.

Additionally, we noted that during discussions around edTPA in class and in the Google Hangouts that, almost immediately, students' bodies became tense, crossing their arms over their torsos, as if to guard themselves. Some also slumped over into their computer taking notes on the discussions. The tone of their voices became more serious with a hint of nervousness, and their facial expressions tightened. Coupled with these actions, we observed a shift in students' language when talking about lesson planning and teaching as it related to their edTPA work. This language shift occurred almost immediately upon topic discussion—often taking us aback at the quick change of student persona. Students' prose included more technical terms often involving the academic language required by edTPA when discussing the lesson sequence. Through analyzing our fieldnotes from seminar as well as the questionnaires, we found that these carefully crafted words and discourses seemed reflective of the teaching that occurred in candidates' edTPA videos when they were on camera in the role of teacher.

Ready for Primetime

As news anchors prepare for primetime, they rehearse the content they will disseminate, often focusing on delivery, pauses, transitions, and timbre of voice. We observed our students in similar positions as they nervously prepared for their edTPA videotaping, their version of primetime. Yet, coupled with this, we noticed a difference between students' conceptions of being ready to teach—something more flexible and open—versus being ready for primetime (edTPA teaching)—something more rehearsed. This, in a sense, created a type of simulation from class to class, a carefully timed and scripted lesson that, although perfected through

repetition, was not necessarily responsive and malleable to the needs of the students on hand.

One student reflected,

There were like three times in my videos where I should've stopped to clarify and I didn't because I had to get through the lesson. That sucked. And then that feeling was still inside me after videotaping, even when my co-op told me to stop or slow down. It's like, I couldn't, you know? Like I didn't know how to stop even though I should.

Some students had the opportunity to teach multiple sections of a class (for example, three 4th grade general music classes). In order to feel ready for their videotaping, candidates taught their edTPA lesson with each class period, videotaping each period to become more comfortable and well-rehearsed. As one student noted, "The more something is taught/rehearsed, the more polished it gets. Teaching the same lesson to multiple classes allowed me to do this." On the contrary, some student teachers only saw their students a handful of times throughout the semester, and had to put on a particular—over rehearsed—teacher persona to show that there was good rapport:

The guidelines seem to assume teachers see the same students on a daily basis and have time to build a rapport, when in reality we sometimes only saw students five or six times during our placement, which left inadequate time to show such strong teaching.

This, in a sense, created the appearance of a forced yet detached rapport with students, an immediate shift to a new teacher persona who was, on the surface, delivering the lesson content with visible ease, though in reality some teachers were still learning students' names.

However, in subtle but noticeable ways, the majority of the preservice teachers embodied what they believed to be the hyperreal discourse of good teaching as defined by edTPA, in ways that did not necessarily align with their developing or real teacher identities. For many, this was

an internal ethical struggle, one in which their intrinsic feelings about teaching were preempted for the values espoused by edTPA. Students displayed a difference between, as one student described, their “edTPA self” and their “typical teacher self.” This caused them not only to question their previous and current teaching practices and beliefs, but to accept them as incorrect as they lived in a constant state of working toward a polished performance. Over the course of the semester, we noticed that, for many candidates, their edTPA self was overpowering their teacher self. The students began to talk about pedagogical concepts in seminar in very clinical and formal ways—a stoic presentation reminiscent to an anchor delivering the news—ways that we as instructors had never previously talked about, modeled, or taught. One student reflected, “sometimes I had to sacrifice what my cooperating teacher and I felt was good instruction to satisfy certain requirements; but you know, by the end I didn’t know what was good instruction and what was not good.”

Others felt that, despite the large amounts of time spent writing, videotaping, and reflecting through edTPA, they would not be truly ready for primetime with a polished product: “This process of becoming a ‘good teacher’ takes time. If all teachers were ‘ready to teach’ by the end of their student teaching, then we would not need any professional development.” In contrast to their peers, this group of candidates differentiated between their conception of being ready to teach and edTPA’s definition of ready to teach:

To be ready to teach means to have knowledge of your content enough to share it with others, AND to feel comfortable *enough* to put yourself out there. You don't have to be perfect, you don't (and can't) know everything there is to know before you start, but you do have to be willing to put yourself out there. I feel that I show my readiness to teach in my placement by taking every opportunity available to me as they come up, and

maintaining a positive attitude throughout the process. I don't believe my definition of ready aligns with edTPA's, because there is no way to objectively evaluate if someone is "ready."

This small group of candidates seemed firm in showing a division that being ready to teach is different from being ready for primetime. However, despite the student teachers' divided reflections, many of the discussions in seminar and in the edTPA Google Hangout showed a larger internal struggle of what a teacher intrinsically feels regarding being ready to teach versus edTPA ready.

Considerations and Conclusion

We undertook this research to make sense of the many emotions and discussions elicited from observing our students complete edTPA. As our semesters progressed, and as edTPA related matters consumed more and more instructional time in our courses, we began to notice how our students' discourses and dispositions toward teaching changed. As is well documented, it is common for novice educators to encounter feelings of anxiety and self-doubt while navigating the induction phase of student teaching (Ballantyne, 2007; Conway, 2001). Likewise, frustration and confusion may be expected when acclimating to unfamiliar surroundings and responsibilities as apprentice teachers (Berg & Miksza, 2010). However, the somewhat acute nature of the student teachers' shift in language and demeanor, in tandem with the onset of edTPA, seemed deserving of further examination.

What we found in this inquiry, essentially, were inexperienced music educators attempting to generate flawless performances of experienced music educators. Our student teachers performed what they perceived to be the look and language of good teaching—at least according to what they thought edTPA perceived as good. As a consequence, the preservice

teachers in this study conceived of a type of teacher avatar, a hyperreal teaching persona that, when triggered by the onset of a recording camera, reflexively enacted the extensive expectations of edTPA. In doing so, many felt obligated to shelve much of what they learned from their teacher preparation program and cooperating teachers, while also sidestepping core practices in teaching that value student rapport, responsiveness, and flexibility (Abramo, 2016). They now saw the new, hyperreal ways of teaching as deemed by edTPA as superior to the old. The hidden gadgetry of which Heyd (2000) and Baudrillard (1994) spoke manifested in the saccharine relationships formed with students on camera, the consistent use of academic language both on and off camera, and the new teacher personas embodied. For some, this new reality of teaching, made for the sake of edTPA, felt antithetical to good teaching (Souto-Manning, 2019) at first yet over time became the normal. It was also clear that many candidates felt conflicted over engaging in these types of practices as maturing educators. These were ethical decisions for many.

We worry that these ethical struggles extend beyond the edTPA. The performances we witnessed, both in person and on video, seemed to enact a new and problematic value system for what good teaching may look like. This teaching resembles a technocratic archetype of an educator consumed with particular discourses that define the benchmarks of good teaching. Yet such discourses are not genuine to the teacher, student, or community at large. Baudrillard (1994) warned, “The real is produced from miniaturized cells, matrices, and memory banks, models of control—and it can be reproduced an indefinite number of times from these.... It is no longer anything but operational” (p. 2). Our candidates, at their earliest point of their career, were operationalizing their instruction based on a third-party description of teaching, one bound by structure, language, and streamlining. In this sense, the candidates could almost have taught

their lessons to any group of students in any context or setting; it was teaching off of a teleprompter.

Like most performers who are constantly aware of their surroundings, throughout their experience the student teachers were conscious of their audience. Over time, they began to know their students, their cooperating teachers, and larger school communities; as a result, they developed an ability to play to these different types of audiences, adapting to them as necessary. This also lessened the performance aspect of teaching, allowing students to settle into their teaching roles more comfortably pre-edTPA. However, the student teachers did not know their audience with regards to edTPA. They did not know who was watching them, or what the scorer's background was. Because of this, candidates constantly displayed—and quite literally, performed—a simulation of what they thought good teaching was based on the edTPA guidelines. As the student teachers worked toward a polished performance, they adopted a hyperreal instruction, constantly operating on camera and shifting this intimate knowledge of their student and community audiences. This simulated instruction was, over time, indistinguishable from their off camera instruction.

Thus, in recalling our original research question (i.e., In what ways might the hyperreality of the edTPA performance of teaching manifest in preservice teachers' planning, instruction, and ability to reflect on their teaching?), we might speculate that the technically-based performative values of edTPA were reflected in all aspects of the preservice teachers' planning, pedagogy, and performance while situated in their student teaching placements. Perhaps most troubling was the realization that edTPA had undoubtedly influenced their passion for teaching as well. As one participant noted during seminar class, "I feel like the joy of teaching has been stripped out of me and I don't know if I'll be able to get it back."

While this study focused solely on preservice music educators, we recognize that the word *music* rarely appeared in the data for this study. In this sense, music was wiped clean from larger discussions of pedagogy with regard to edTPA. We were curious why music never intersected with the edTPA discourse of teaching in the ways the candidates planned their lessons for execution and how much music was absent from our conversations with them in person and online. As music teacher educators, we constantly weaved musical content into our discussions about instructional planning in our courses; however, musical examples were not prevalent in candidates' responses in our questionnaire. And we noticed that many of the candidates chose to submit edTPA videos in nonperformance based classes such as general music or theory, where making music is often secondary to the content. This suggests that even an art form as nuanced and elastic as music cannot disrupt the simulated teaching practices deemed by edTPA. We argue that this is evidence of a new, hyperreal, sanitized version of teaching, one which looks the same regardless of content area. In this hyperreal teaching subject-specific mastery is minimized in favor of broader, more general practices.

We are concerned that the hyperreal performance of teaching will follow the teacher candidates into their induction period as in-service educators as they are evaluated under the new generation evaluation systems (e.g., Danielson and Marzano), continuously operating on camera. In turn, they will prioritize the performance and production of instruction over the actual art and craft of teaching. Since they have already adopted this performative-based teaching, new teachers may continue to perform hyperreal discourses of teaching, situating them within the structures and language pertinent to their school or district policies. As the camera turns off, will these newly enacted performances extend into what teaching looks like, with an emphasis on time-bound teaching rather than content-specific practices that are pragmatic, social, and

flexible? Will the anxieties, scripting, and on camera performance become the permanent off camera posture of teaching and learning? It is unclear whether or not these performances will redefine what teaching will look like moving forward, or what influence, if any, edTPA or other accountability measures will have on the next generation of teachers and their values. This begs further examination of how new teachers navigate their induction periods and their evaluation systems. Music teacher educators might consider these hyperreal discourses and their ramifications as they prepare teacher candidates for licensure and their future music classrooms.

References

- Abramo, J. (2016). Developing core practices for an instrumental music education methods course. *Visions of Research in Music Education*, 27. Retrieved from <http://www-usr.rider.edu/~vrme/>
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (n.d.-a). *About edTPA*. Retrieved from <http://edtpa.aacte.org/about-edtpa>
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (n.d.-b). *FAQ*. Retrieved from <http://edtpa.aacte.org/faq>
- American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. (n.d.-c). *Participation map*. Retrieved from <http://edtpa.aacte.org/state-policy>
- Atkinson, P., & Hammersley, M. (1998). Ethnography and participant observation. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of qualitative inquiry* (pp. 110–136). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Au, W. (2013, Summer). What's a nice test like you doing in a place like this? The edTPA and corporate education "reform." *Rethinking Schools*, 27(4). Retrieved from <http://www.rethinkingschools.org/>
- Ballantyne, J. (2007). Documenting praxis shock in early-career Australian music teachers: The impact of pre-service teacher education. *International Journal of Music Education*, 25, 181–191. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761407083573>
- Barrett, J. R. (2014). Case study in music education. In C. M. Conway (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of qualitative research in American music education* (pp. 113–132). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Barron, L. (2015). Preparing pre-service teachers for performance assessments. *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies in Education*, 3(2), 68–75.
- Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and simulation*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Berg, M. H., & Miksza, P. (2010). An investigation of preservice music teacher development and concerns. *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 20(1), 39–55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1057083710363237>
- Borgmann, A. (1992). Hyperrealities. In A. Borgmann (Ed.), *Crossing the postmodern divide* (pp. 82–97). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Clayton, C. D. (2018). Voices from student teachers in New York: The persistence of a subtractive experience of the edTPA as a licensure exam for initial certification. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 26(27), 1–30. <https://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.26.2888>

- Cochran-Smith, M., Piazza, P., & Power, C. (2013). The politics of accountability: Assessing teacher education in the United States. *The Educational Forum*, 77, 6–27. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2013.739015>
- Conway, C. (2001). What has research told us about the beginning music teacher? *Journal of Music Teacher Education*, 10(2), 14–22. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10570837010100020104>
- Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry: Choosing among five approaches*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Denzin, N. K. (2006). *Sociological methods: A sourcebook*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction.
- Dover, A. G. (2018). Your compliance will not protect you: Agency and accountability in urban teacher preparation [Monograph]. *Urban Education*, 1–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042085918795020>
- Dover, A. G., & Schultz, B. D. (2016). Troubling the edTPA: Illusions of objectivity and rigor. *The Educational Forum*, 80, 95–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131725.2015.1102368>
- Emerson, R. M., Fretz, R. I., & Shaw, L. L. (2011). *Writing ethnographic fieldnotes*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Feinberg, J. (2014). Wordle (0.2) [Software]. Retrieved from <http://www.worldle.net/>
- Greenblatt, D., & O'Hara, K. E. (2015). Buyer beware: Lessons learned from edTPA implementation in New York State. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 42(2), 57–67.
- Heyd, T. (2000). The real and the hyperreal: Dance and simulacra. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34(2), 15–26. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3333573>
- Hylar, M. E., Yee, L. S., Carey, R. L., & Barnes, S. R. (2014). *Summary: Teacher performance assessment and culturally responsive pedagogy*. Retrieved from <https://secure.aacte.org/apps/rl/resource.php?resid=432&ref=rl>
- Kleyn, T., López, D., & Makar, C. (2015). What about bilingualism? A critical reflection on the edTPA with teachers of emergent bilinguals. *Bilingual Research Journal*, 38, 88–106. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2015.1017029>
- Ledwell, K., & Oyler, C. (2016). Unstandardized responses to a “standardized” test: The edTPA as gatekeeper and curriculum change agent. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 67(2), 120–134. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487115624739>
- Lit, I. W., & Lotan, R. (2013). A balancing act: Dilemmas of implementing a high-stakes performance assessment. *The New Educator*, 9(1), 54–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1547688X.2013.751314>

- Liu, L. B., & Milman, N. B. (2013). Year one implications of a teacher performance assessment's impact on multicultural education across a secondary education teacher preparation program. *Action in Teacher Education, 35*(2), 125–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01626620.2013.775971>
- Madeloni, B., & Gorlewski, J. (2013, Summer). Wrong answer to the wrong question: Why we need critical teacher education, not standardization. *Rethinking Schools, 27*(4), 16–21. Retrieved from <http://www.rethinkingschools.org/>
- Newton, S. (2010). *Preservice performance assessment and teacher early career effectiveness: Preliminary findings on the performance assessment for California teachers*. Retrieved from <https://edpolicy.stanford.edu/library/publications/200>
- Parkes, K. A., & Powell, S. R. (2015). Is the edTPA the right choice for evaluating teacher readiness? *Arts Education Policy Review, 116*, 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10632913.2014.944964>
- Peck, C. A., Gallucci, C., & Sloan, T. (2010). Negotiating implementation of high-stakes performance assessment policies in teacher education: From compliance to inquiry. *Journal of Teacher Education, 61*, 451–463. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487109354520>
- Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.
- Sato, M. (2014). What is the underlying conception of teaching of the edTPA? *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*, 421–434. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487114542518>
- Scherer, M. (2012, May). The challenges of supporting new teachers: A conversation with Linda Darling-Hammond. *Educational Leadership, 69*(8), 18–23.
- Souto-Manning, M. (2019). “Good teaching” and “good teachers” for whom?: Critically troubling standardized and corporatized notions of quality in teacher education. *Teachers College Record, 121*(10), 1–44. Retrieved from <https://www.tcrecord.org/>
- Tuck, E., & Gorlewski, J. (2016). Racist ordering, settler colonialism, and edTPA: A participatory policy analysis. *Educational Policy, 30*(1), 197–217. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0895904815616483>
- U. S. Department of Education. (2009). *Race to the Top program: Executive summary*. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/racetothetop/executive-summary.pdf>
- Wei, R. C., and Pecheone, R. L. (2010). Assessment for learning in preservice teacher education. In M. Kennedy (Ed.), *Handbook of teacher assessment and teacher quality* (pp. 69–132). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.

Wilson, M., Hallam, P. J., Pecheone, R. L., & Moss, P. A. (2007). *Using student achievement test scores as evidence of external validity for indicators of teacher quality: Connecticut's Beginning Educator Support and Training program*. Berkeley, CA: Berkeley Evaluation and Research Center.

Wilson, M., Hallam, P. J., Pecheone, R. L., & Moss, P. A. (2014). Evaluating the validity of portfolio assessments for licensure decisions. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 22(6), 1–27. <http://doi.org/10.14507/epaa.v22n6.2014>

Yin, R. K. (2017). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Nicholas McBride (mcbriden@tcnj.edu) maintains an active career as a music teacher-educator, researcher, and conductor. He is Assistant Professor of Choral Music Education at The College of New Jersey, where supervises senior-level student teachers and conducts TCNJ's College Choir; an ensemble he has prepared for collaborative performances with the Philharmonia Orchestra of New York and The Philadelphia Orchestra.

Cara Bernard (cara.bernard@uconn.edu) is Assistant Clinical Professor of Music Education at the University of Connecticut in the Neag School of Education, where she teaches courses in choral and elementary methods and curriculum and supervises student teaching. She has been invited by choral organizations and state music education associations across the country to give workshops and lead festival performances for students and teachers. She has conducted, performed, and prepared choruses for performances at Carnegie Hall, Avery Fisher Hall, Lincoln Center's Rose Theater, in addition to many other venues throughout the Northeast.