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Abstract

This thesis reports on a possibly unique example of gifted and talented provision in New Zealand music education. The Music Heartland Project was a holistic programme of learning for musically gifted children based in eight mainstream, publically-funded schools in New Zealand from 2003 to 2005. As the director of the project, I was in an advantageous position for collecting data throughout its duration. The data included work samples, performance recordings, administrative records, Independent Education Plans, observations of child participants in music lessons and their regular classroom, and interviews with child participants, parents, school liaison teachers for Heartland and specialist tutors.

More than half of the selected children (aged 8-13) had no previous music learning other than classroom music. Students who successfully completed the initial selection received a mix of ensemble experience, instrumental learning (mostly keyboard and guitar) and creative projects with children from their own or other schools, mostly in school time. Children retained their place in the Heartland Project based on on-going evaluation of their commitment and musical progress. Music Heartland was dependent on the goodwill and commitment of the participating schools, as well as the teaching and musical expertise of the tutors it employed.

The research design, research questions, and data analysis and interpretation were heavily based on my professional experience and the findings from an extensive review of the literature on the identification and education of gifted and talented students, particularly in music. Research questions focused on the effectiveness of music provision, views of a diversity of participants about the three year programme, and implications for school communities with domain provision occurring as part of the curriculum. The most interesting data pertained to different components of the programme, and how these linked, impeded or enhanced musical growth.

The key conclusions relate to the development and effectiveness of musical ensembles and creative work, and implications for schools engaging children in domain (music) gifted and talented provision. Involvement in sustained and challenging ensemble work, including a diversity of genre and cultural forms, appears to enhance the quality of children’s general musicianship, encourage productive links with instrumental learning and foster a sense of ownership about musical growth. Sustained creative work, in the form of collaborative projects, appears to support the development of situated creativity and innovative product, relative to the declarative expertise of children, as well as offers advantages of enhanced contextualisation of instrumental growth. Domain (music) provision undertaken on a withdrawal basis, and taught by teachers with specialist knowledge appears to be cost effective relative to advantages for
children’s music learning, and contributes significantly to their social confidence, leadership and personal organisation without affecting wider achievement levels. A supportive school culture allows cross-class, and even cross-school activity, of varying intensity in class time throughout the year. It appears that attitudes of school staff are positively influenced as they observe longer term effects of domain provision on children.
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When Music Speaks

I let this music 'speak'

Sounds of other voice swell tendrils in my mind

Captures birth of knowing, and ideas softly strung

Music, becomes a place I can speak directly to my soul

No accident, thoughts as billowing wisps in an evening sky.

Could that I speak or write with phrase and nuance so led by a musical mind

As only music amplifies through breath and bow and chime.

February 1999
Chapter 1: Origins, Roles, Questions and Pathways

New Zealand families and communities are sprinkled with people young and old who could be considered musically talented. Many of these people would have begun learning during their primary school years or earlier. However, we appear to know little about the effects of mainstream primary school music programmes on children with high levels of musical ability, or why some choose to pursue excellence but many do not.

Similarly, there is little research data concerning the specific effects of music provision in schools for musically gifted children, other than the anecdotal evidence that emerges during school festivals and choral and instrumental performances. While such evidence may celebrate children’s musical ability and tell us much about the nature of success, it reveals little about individual pathways and the extent to which current school based activities cater for the diversity of high end music learning needs. Hence, there appears to be a gap in the literature concerning the longitudinal and holistic development of children involved in meaningful school music provision.

Given the current research situation, two specific questions relate to the development of individuals and the role of music in the wider community:

- What factors assist the development of talented musicians within school programmes?
- What impact, if any, does the lack of information about music specific enrichment through sustained provision have on individuals and their respective school communities?

Origins of this study: The Music Heartland Project

In 2002, I initiated, collaboratively designed and continued on to direct the Music Heartland Project. This project was one of seventeen Talent Development Projects funded by the New Zealand Ministry of Education (MoE) between 2003 and 2005. The aim of Music Heartland was to provide children selected as musically gifted with opportunities for intensive exploration and application of the four strands of the Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2000a). Approximately one hundred children were nominated each year from a cluster of eight Dunedin primary and intermediate schools. Each year, between twenty and eighty children were selected for the first year programme, and between twenty and forty children continued on to a second and third year. In total, approximately 160 children were selected over three years, with between sixty and eighty children participating in any one year.

More than half of the selected children (aged 8-13) identified had no previous music learning other than classroom music. About one third of the children who auditioned (participating in about fifteen hours of classroom ensemble) with specialist tutors work passed on to subsequent
stages of development. In these more advanced levels, they received a mix of ensemble experience, instrumental learning (mostly keyboard and guitar) and creative projects involving children from their own or other schools. Children retained their place in the provision, which operated mostly in school time, based on on-going evaluation of commitment and musical progress. The project could be loosely described as an application of Renzulli and Rei’s (1985) three ring model of general exploratory activities, group training activities and individual and small group investigation of real problems. While an externally funded initiative, Music Heartland was dependent on the goodwill and commitment of the participating schools for making children available, as well as numerous logistical arrangements.

The Heartland programme (See Appendix 1) provided a range of learning methods and modes of participation that are explored in this report. The primary goals of the Project were to develop instrumental and ensemble skills and to foster creative ability (See Appendix 2 for Programme Principles). Owing to the MoE funding and the special commitment shown by tutors and schools, Heartland was able to provide a supportive environment and quite intensive opportunities for participants to develop personal musical skill and understanding over a period of one to three years.

Pathways to the study
Prior to, and contributing to my readiness to undertake this study, I have enjoyed roles as a music educator in primary and secondary schools, an instrumental itinerant teacher in secondary schools, a school music adviser and most recently, a music leader and performer in Dunedin and wider settings. Currently, my primary role is lecturer in music education and wider curriculum at the University of Otago, College of Education. I also share-teach conjoint courses with Music Department staff in studio music teaching, musicianship skills, conducting and performance. Within these roles, I have been privileged to observe the development of many young musicians, some of whom I regard as talented.

Threading the effects of my personal and professional experiences into the school setting has resulted in a personal professional goal of working to attain measurable quality in children’s musical growth. This includes development of musical understandings and instantiation capabilities\(^1\), and represents my belief that both performance and creativity are symbiotic with integrity in school or community programmes. It is not surprising then that the operational effectiveness of the Music Heartland Project became integral with my personal well being. Nor

\(^1\) Instantiation for this writer represents the unique qualities of every performance of any music, whatever the combination of cultural, aesthetic, or commercial motivation.
that the development of those involved remains influential in my teaching and my views about the characteristics of quality music education programmes.

Not least, in a revitalisation of my professional direction, was the latitude given to me and the Heartland management group to shape the project according to local intentions. This followed very constructive negotiations with the MoE in 2002. These were in contrast to my experience in leading the Arts Professional Development contract from 2000 to 2003. In that instance, unrealistic goals, unheeded issues highlighted in reporting, and the inability to use professional judgement at a regional level appeared to fetter the outcomes for teachers and children alike. Given the above, it was of little surprise that the professional autonomy and trust experienced by the professionals involved in Heartland meant that the project became an extraordinary chapter of personal musical professional growth.

**An unfolding study**

This study’s initiation was a result of fundamental delight in the standard and musical quality of the skills and music created in school contexts in 2003. This mood alerted me to the possibility that much could be learned about sustained skill-based and creative learning of children whose musical gifts were being openly encouraged. The very nature of the Heartland programme was markedly different from anything else I had been involved in, or had observed over my career. As such, I became interested in the project’s possible implications, not only for school extension programmes, but also for music learning in mainstream school programmes and community situations.

In addition, a sense of purpose soon emerged through interactions with all parties involved in Heartland, including the project’s administrative base at Queens High School. The participating schools displayed a willingness to recognise musically gifted children, to accept that their needs might be different, and to accommodate their learning within the general school learning. Early evidence of this support meant there was every possibility of being able to do better by musically gifted children than in previous initiatives I had been part of.

**My place in the research**

In considering possible research questions during 2004, I worked on the premise that directing Heartland and undertaking this research would perhaps be mutually generative. As researcher and director, I understood I would be both a participant with an enormous influence and an ethnographic observer, and that this duality would inevitably bring tensions. However, since the duality meant excellent access to research participants in formal and informal situations, as well as
the Heartland records, the possibility of an uncompromising and perhaps clearer story was compelling.

As the findings reveal, the interplay of my roles as director and researcher meant reciprocal influences between data gathered for this thesis or MoE reporting, and Heartland’s policy and practice. Possibly, the most important consequence was that in gathering data over two years, my growing awareness of the professional acumen of the individual participants meant that I became more inclined to heed the instincts of tutors and schools when making policy decisions. In effect I allowed shared expertise to replace much of my initial role as Heartland’s principal driving force. Therefore, as a more responsive listener, being receptive and engaging with the viewpoints of the various groups and individual participants became more natural for me. As Elsach (2000) states, “qualitative researchers may become increasingly introspective, becoming more and more aware of their shortcomings and strengths, through multiple retellings of their research experiences” (Elsach, 2000, p. 120).

Approaching the Research Questions
Returning to the initiation of this study, the goals of the Heartland project\(^2\) played an important role as I considered and selected the research questions. Information gathered for oral or written milestone reports for the MoE were already generating rich sources of data that could be applicable to this study. In particular, the negotiated Heartland goals which follow had implications for the investigation of wider social, cognitive and emotional growth, which were matters of interest to me and my research supervisors.

MoE Contract Goals for the Music Heartland Project 2003 – 2005
For a specific group of gifted and talented children to be excited and challenged through music learning:

- To identify children with a range of musical talent and foster those attributes as part of the children’s wider learning and social participation;
- To provide opportunity for acceleration through interaction and performance with students across a wide age and ability range;
- To identify ways in which intensive music learning can contribute to the children’s social, cognitive and emotional growth;
- To provide opportunity for children to develop independent learning skills;
- For children to be cognizant of music learning’s wider community context.

These goals, my professional experience and the early momentum within Heartland in 2003 were equally significant in the development of the primary research questions. In effect, views about

\(^2\) Goals were freely negotiated for the contract between the MoE and Queens High School.
achievement were forthcoming from varying sources before this study commenced. Hence, while the prospect of diverse musical achievement and iterated data was daunting, I realised that a more representative picture would need to include the views of a mix of children, their families, schools and tutors. These factors led me to research questions that I hoped could throw light on detailed matters of music, involvement, self efficacy and wider achievement through longitudinal investigation.

**Primary Research Questions**

- What are discernable effects of the programme on gifted children’s achievement and self-efficacy?
- How is enriched music learning viewed by child, parent, teacher and community?
- On what basis can communities, schools and other providers legitimately define and take ownership of approaches to musically gifted children? What are useful processes for scrutinising process effectiveness and child efficacy identifiable as the result of any unique approach?

As clarification of purpose, the nature of my personal music experience as a lecturer supporting development of teaching graduates and supporter of teachers in the field\(^3\) meant that applicability to school programmes was a critical lens for me. This reinforced my determination to attempt an intricate study from within Heartland. I see this in contrast to the gifted and talented education report from the Education Review Office (2008), for example. In my eyes, that report is somewhat devoid of explanation and examples of the numerous phrases and terms espousing notions of effective provision and achievement for gifted children. Hence, as in the ethics proposal as approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Otago, it is my intention that outcomes of this study of Heartland provide some insight into:

- Facilitation of programmes with musically gifted children
- Fostering acceptance of programmes for musically gifted children in schools and community
- Guiding the development of self determination/self efficacy in musically gifted children.

In writing this introduction some seven years after beginning planning and data gathering, I believe the need for information about strategies for enhancing the musical development of gifted and talented children is ever more pressing. This is because curriculum changes such as the introduction of key competencies and national standards have an ominous potential to reduce the urgency of music education in schools. Similarly, a trend in Dunedin toward greater utilisation of

---

\(^3\) Field in Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe’s (2000) conception is the body of expert people and knowledge within a domain.
music specialists and modular approaches in school music remains largely untested. We know little of the effects on children’s well-being and musical growth, apart from evaluations of front end performance already noted.

The completion of this report also follows six years of contestable MoE funded projects like the Music Heartland Project. In 2005, McDonough and Rutherford wrote from a MoE perspective:

a distinctly New Zealand approach to gifted education is developing. This includes a commitment to meeting the needs of gifted and talented learners in the regular classroom, a broad definition of gifted and talent and the corresponding promotion of a wide range of appropriate identification procedures. (McDonough & Rutherford, 2005, p. 3)

Perhaps this study, a reconstruction of children’s stories and music learning during the Music Heartland Project, will assist teachers, researchers and commentators to scrutinise the validity of the Ministry’s intentions for a different approach, particularly in regard to the feasibility of provision in general primary school classrooms.

Guide to Structure

The scope of this study looks outward from a particular case which motivated qualitative reflection and theory development, grounded primarily in three years of child participant activity. It must be hoped that the learning from this case study allows readers to draw implications of assistance when scrutinising practices in their community, cultural and/or institutional frameworks. As a result, Part A of Chapter 2, the Literature Review, explores music’s value and functions as described in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007) as well as its realisation in mainstream schools. Part B begins the investigation of the nature of giftedness by focusing on three underlying concepts, aesthetic, creative and cultural parameters. Here, themes found in international and New Zealand literature are compared. Each sub-section is closed by proposing parameters that appear to be of relevance when considering the nature of a child’s musical giftedness in mainstream schools. In Part C, giftedness is approached as a contextual concept, that is, socio-political viewpoints, the meaning of excellence and intelligence, and the application of domain perspectives. These lead to consideration of identification practices, that is Part D, with previous themes such as cultural appreciations tentatively interwoven. By necessity for this study, to understand more about the abilities of the child participants, a tentative set of musical giftedness characteristics is drawn from previous parts of the chapter. Given that conceptualisation, Part E revisits identification but this time with a clear New Zealand lens in regard to policy and perceptions of its feasibility in the interests of musically gifted children. The scope of the literature review reflects the fact that I found quite small
amounts of research literature focused on musically gifted and talented children and their development and education within mainstream New Zealand settings.

Chapter 3 addresses the methodology for this research. The introduction explores my place in the study as the researcher, followed by the study’s design including choice of a single case study, researcher activity and intentions for data gathering strategies. Ethical considerations and dilemmas are considered, particularly in relation to potential compromises or conflicts emerging from my dual researcher and project roles. The chapter closes with a natural history of the research process (Silverman, 2005), which includes approaches to data analysis and closes with a description of the anticipated strategies for drawing and grounding theoretical implications in the findings (Hennink, Hutter, & Bailey, 2011) in the lead to writing this report.

Chapter 4, Frameworks, Findings and Implications follows the interdependent line inherent in the research questions. Hence, Part 1 reports on the effects of the programme including identification and the particular learning formats incorporated in Heartland. Part 2 explores viewpoints from the closely related participant groups about components of the programme, and Part 3 considers particular themes relevant to ownership of learning, school practices and children’s self efficacy. Each section in this chapter is completed with a summary of findings which are considered and shaped with a view to emerging theory.

Chapter 5, Discussion, Conclusions and Epilogue reviews matters of emerging theory and considers conceptual implications and applications from the findings. Ensemble and creative products are justified as the basis for the discussion, with other significant data clusters such as specialist teaching incorporated as contributing themes. The place and frameworks for appropriate provision for musically gifted and talented children in New Zealand schools is considered, along with limitations of the study and possible follow-up research. Future research possibilities connect to the participants of this case study and current processes which encourage domain excellence in mainstream schools. How best to bring home applicable aspects and theoretical implications for this study reflects my declared background as a longstanding teacher, passionate musician, and my desire for pedagogical relevance in research situations with which I choose to engage. In respect of that, with the support of a supervisor, I chose to interpolate the study’s theoretical implicatons by way of an epilogue (Chapter 6); writing that one might find in a professional magazine.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

The Rationale for Literature Selection

This review is intended to support the investigation of Music Heartland’s epistemology as well as programme components and outcomes. Since it was a school based project, the nature of New Zealand classroom music is a relevant comparison, hence, it is appropriate to scrutinise current curriculum frameworks before focusing on giftedness conceptions and provision.

Part A offers this curriculum lens through which musical and wider curriculum outcomes of Heartland can be later analysed, discussed and tentatively compared with current provision for musically gifted children. Since a research goal was to investigate possible strategies for New Zealand teachers working with musically gifted children, important questions emerge about the curriculum. For example, how is children’s musical growth valued? What can be said about the credibility of music learning in schools, its capacity to encourage social equity, and how it meets community, social and/or cultural expectations? How is debate about music education, and within that, initiatives intended to foster the development of musically gifted and talented learners shaped by the political framework for Arts education?

The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2000a) and The New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007) encourage cross curricula and integrated learning as key approaches. Yet what is known about depth of music learning in integrated or differentiated programmes? In addition, the wider curricula effect of musical achievement has been a recent topic of interest for researchers and psychologists such as Cmčeč (2006). In New Zealand, by necessity, cross-curricula learning opportunity transpires mostly as a result of the skills and pedagogies of generalist teachers. Thus, literature which clarifies the quality of music learning in generalist and specialist situations is pertinent.

Given this curriculum framework, Part B of the review considers parameters pertaining to being musical, those I found to be significant in cited literature. Specifically, these are aesthetic sensitivity, creative aptitude, and cultural influence and expectations. The healthy and on-going debate about their nature, influence and interdependence is explored in regard to musical development and children’s self-efficacy. Their relevance to the study relates to the length and diversity of child involvement which meant diverse and potentially substantial product from Heartland children necessitated careful appraisal in regard to the three noted themes.

Part C explores literature focused on socio-political and equity issues and the diversity of giftedness conceptions available to educators. Schools must contend with these as they develop...
giftedness policy and plan provision for children. The broadening of giftedness and domain conceptions is considered alongside the significance of intelligence and cognitive aptitudes, more traditionally evaluated through testing. Tentative parameters of giftedness are offered as the conclusion to this section. These underpin Part D which focuses on high level musical ability, including the place of musical acuities such as rhythmic confidence. Part D also considers ramifications of domain and generic theories of giftedness for musical development, along with the significance of chance and opportunity. Four principles of musical giftedness are tentatively proposed which bring into question Sloboda’s (2005) notion that differences in musical ability can be explained through environmental influences.

Part E offers specific investigation of the significance of music identification and strategies by which this occurs. It considers international and New Zealand perspectives, in particular the effectiveness of audition and observation in New Zealand classrooms, which are reportedly the dominant strategies employed (Riley, Bevan-Brown, Bicknell, Carroll-Lind, & Kearney, 2004). As the review of literature began, the place of music within the curriculum and likelihood of musical stimulation for musically gifted children are core themes.

**Part A: Placing the Research in the Frame of Music and the New Zealand Curriculum**

**Regard for the Music in the New Zealand Curriculum**

Music is a long-standing discipline within the New Zealand curriculum. Yet, in spite of the Ministry of Education’s (MoE) investment in teacher professional development from 2001, early research suggests that student achievement in music, in particular creating and playing, shows little improvement from 2004 – 2008 (Crooks, Smith & White, 2009). Stated goals for music and how it is valued in school curricula appear to be important factors.

In critiquing the *Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2000a), Joshs (2003) noted an emphasis on linguistic or English literacy parameters in descriptors of children’s artistic outputs. He questioned an inherent emphasis on cognitive skills within the document, at the expense of non-cognitive operations. He further proposed that the purposes of arts education are not altogether transparent:

> Art, especially in a commodity culture, is most often used to sell things. It becomes indistinguishable from the world of advertising and marketing. It can also be used to mystify and manipulate. It serves ideological purposes. It can be used to advance political causes. The new curriculum [2000] is silent on these issues. (Peters, 2003, p. 23)

In *The New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007b), music is advocated to teachers as being key to effective development of an integrated sense of personal, technological and cultural
forms of expression. In my view, this contextualisation is of undeniable significance in relation to music’s place, and role in community and culture. At the same time, reflecting the more generic framework evident throughout The New Zealand Curriculum, the music statement (Ministry of Education, 2007b, p. 21) could be interpreted as de-emphasising personal development toward adult participation the vigorous and diverse community and career oriented music scenarios available in New Zealand Aotearoa. Thankfully, the reality in schools appears to be a little different, as teachers typically prioritise practical musical skills rather more than contextual appreciation. As I observe it, perhaps in response to limited timeframes, teachers sustain children’s engagement through a wide diversity of expressive modes and limited creative activity. I believe that an implicit understanding amongst teachers and particularly older children lies at the base of typical music activity reflecting reciprocity of musical skill level and potential for authentic contextualisation. Hence, some scrutiny of the MoE’s (2007b) framework and purposes for music education would seem appropriate. In short, what constitutes an effective blend of the desire to encourage social and cultural collaboration, with expectations of meaningful skill development, enhanced musical thinking skills, and amplitude of the child through musical growth?

Looking to the purposes of music education, the introduction to music (Ministry of Education, 2007b, p. 21) recognises its real life relevance as a “fundamental form of expression”. However, in describing its potential cultural and community contribution, the primary value of musical outputs appear to rest in the area of “lifelong enjoyment and participation”. In contrast, a more potent sense of integrity is recognisable in the drama statement which records possible learning implications as “new power to examine attitudes, behaviours, and values” (pp. 20-21). In response, I would suggest that personal valuing and empowerment observable in the adult lives of many individuals as musical consumers and producers constitute evidence of the curriculum’s understatement about music’s causal and reflective potential in our lives.

The rationale for the English curriculum focuses on a need for children to achieve competent oral, written and visual language forms of expression. English has an aim of equipping the child to “make appropriate and systematic language choices in a range of contexts” (Ministry of Education, 2007b, p. 15). It is no doubt appropriate, that as the dominant form of communication, English is reinforced as the major player in preparation for effective adult roles. However, I propose that music can play a similarly powerful exploratory and communicative role from birth. The term music encapsulates extraordinarily diverse and extensive production forms, and reflects potential for palpable aesthetic perceptions which influence our daily living and beliefs. In a preparatory paper to the key competencies, the then national Arts facilitators seemed to support this view. For example, they adopted a stronger position about the significance of the

To learn music for example, self management skills are developed to the highest level as students master and apply scientific, mathematical, technological, symbolic and artistic knowledge to music making and interpretation of sound. (O’Connor & Dunmill, 2005, p. 6)

In their summary, O’Connor and Dunmill (2005) recognise that the arts are likely to be in the margins of curriculum delivery in schools where their unique learning qualities are not taken on board. This can, I think, be linked to how music learning is conceived, as a component of *The New Zealand Curriculum* (2007b) by schools. It would be appropriate, in my view, for music to receive greater recognition as a vehicle which stimulates cognitive abilities, such as forming and shaping of ideas and reasoning. This is in addition to music’s typically accepted roles, that is, to enhance expressive confidence, creativity, personal empowerment, cultural grounding and communicative attributes.

Given more incisive and consistent acknowledgement of music’s place in most individuals’ lives, coupled with its relative popularity for pupils Crooks et al., (2009), it is likely learning would stand tall and be more deliberately valued by children. This gives rise to an important question. To what extent are the lives of adults-in-waiting impaired because of music’s diminution as a fundamental and life-long expressive and reflective domain within New Zealand schools? In seeking answers, curriculum limitations would go alongside other contributing factors such as the diversity of school resources and teacher graduate readiness.

Despite these concerns, the actuality of music education gives room for optimism. In Dunedin, music appears to be recognised for its value in a practical and community sense by schools, at least those that I have knowledge of. Reduced national and regional professional development support, acknowledged by the MoE to be a result of reprioritisation of teaching professional development funding (Anderson, 2010), has not muted widespread examples of meaningful musical involvement and learning. It would seem that teachers are willing to utilise local resources to bolster both their confidence and personal skill base for the benefit of children.

British authors Rogers and Hallam (2008) write that teacher perceptions link the empowerment of practice with the availability of face to face musical expertise and anticipation of a comfortable rate of professional development. In line with those findings, it is my observation that many generalist primary school teachers enjoy practical music making with children, as a result of school resourced initiatives, alongside face to face professional development offerings of organisations such as Music Education Otago. Hence, while I think concerns about the
implications of the purpose, structure and depth of the curriculum are legitimate, I observe in Dunedin a fundamentally positive and value driven expectation of children to produce and share musically.

**Perceptions about the significance of music within a child’s learning**

Clare Henderson’s (1998) research thesis compares the curricula of Great Britain and New Zealand. She found that participants in both countries regarded goals such as career and vocational preparation to be legitimate for music education. However, according to Henderson, such goals mean there is tension amongst educators, the commercial music industry and political interest groups. In reviewing the value of arts learning, she questions “the extent to which arts education should serve the interests and needs of industry and to what extent it should question its products and values. Arguably, the arts are no longer for art’s sake” (Henderson, 1998, p. 13). According to Henderson, rising expectations of technology skills, integrated learning, cultural integrity, and student readiness to function in high and low art forms impact on pure arts’ values in education. Furthermore, teachers from both countries perceive that strong control is exerted by government, and that economic considerations rather than sound ideology or practice dominate policy.

In a New Zealand context, Mansfield (2003) warns of risks to young people’s artistic well being and development where scaffolds such as the essential skills frame what is acceptable as effective achievement. As she writes, in spite of rhetoric in the *Arts in New Zealand Curriculum*, “The representation of the arts within the forced constraints of ‘essential skills’ appears to construct students as controlled automatons subjected to ‘disciplinary’ measures.” (Mansfield, 2003, p. 70)

Similarly, from England, Plummeridge (2001a) questions the public demand for schools to sustain a high level of student success in core subjects. In asserting music’s dual affective and cognitive potential, he identifies an inherent duplicity in curriculum documents:

> On the one hand, there is much reference to education as a force which can transform individuals and society, while on the other there is an almost obsessional emphasis on the raising of standards in the core curriculum subjects. (Plummeridge, 2001a, p. 27)

John Drummond (2003) aptly identifies the dangers of curriculum prioritisation from the perspective of the child. He observes that very young children have a high expectation of the contribution music makes to their lives, however, adult communities undervalue music’s relevance for children.
In fact, young people already know it - music is central in their lives because they instinctively know that music’s ‘way of knowing’ speaks to their condition as growing individuals in the real world. It is the rest of us that have not noticed yet. (Drummond, 2003)

Citing Best (1995), Drummond (2003) further suggests that educational institutions can exert a negative influence on children’s musical potential. He notes that, “the width of their perceptual and cognitive proficiencies is astonishing - but this only lasts until all of this wondrous stuff begins to be constricted and shut down by our various cultural institutions” (Drummond, 2003, p. 59)

Folkestad (2005) investigated the confluence of informal and formal learning within older children’s musical development. He states, “it is far too simple, and actually false, to say that formal learning only occurs in institutional settings and that informal learning occurs outside school” (p. 283) According to Folkestad, informal musical involvement may enliven the questions one asks and influence how we engage in our lives. Similarly, citing Bamberger (1982), Howard Gardner (1990) asserts that formal knowledge can mute equally important intuitive knowledge, or alternatively, informal knowing can form a parallel reality in the mind of a learner.

Roger Buckton’s (2003) probe study into the results of the 1996 National Education Monitoring Project Report supports this idea of parallel realities for children in school contexts. Buckton’s analysis showed that a high percentage of Year Four children engaged in music outside school and ranked it in the upper half of their school curriculum choices. However, he notes that interest falls away in the latter stages of primary education. In what I consider as recognition of informal learning, he suggests that part of the solution is for teachers to bring experiences closer to the “culture of children and performers who are well known to them” (Buckton, 2003, p. 18). In that regard, I find it of interest that, in spite of an ever increasing diversity of recreational choices, Crooks et al. (2009) record a slight increase in school Year Eight students’ uptake of instrumental learning outside school between 2004 and 2008.

Regelski (2000) is another who asserts the significance of all forms of musical expression, including informally learned skills. As he puts it:

all possible forms of intentional musicing…no matter how inferior and unrefined they may be in the minds of professional performers, are important forms of praxis governed by their own phronesis and, in my praxial view at least, thus need careful and central account in any praxial theory of music. (p. 13)

In summary, as Henderson (1998) and K. Locke (2004) suggest, more interrogation of the drivers for curriculum change would seem appropriate. Reports of children’s enthusiasm for music are
obvious (Crooks, Smith and White, 2009), yet the current school curriculum risks curbing their interest (Buckton, 2003; Drummond, 2003). Furthermore, economic and commercial pressures, combined with increased expectations for achievement in core subjects, potentially render sameness in children’s musical achievement, rather than amplifying diversity and lifelong learning capability. In addressing this concern, more effective weaving of informal knowledge and skills with formal learning would seem a priority for schools and other providers.

At the base of concerns about how music is regarded in a child’s learning, in my view, is limited acceptance, or perhaps understanding, of the child’s latency to express credibly and fully through music. As Suzanne Langer (1942) aptly encapsulates, music is a powerful force, one which is evident in nearly every facet of living, and which aids our ability to express, clarify and convey ineffable meaning. “Everything that can be said, can be said clearly” (p. 84). Even given the limited resources currently allocated to to music training of primary teachers in New Zealand, I would think an intention of all programmes would be to highlight and explore music as a way of thinking and as a medium for alternative ways to express ideas. However, as Jaramillo’s (2008) research amongst graduates indicates, the tendency is for teachers to teach in the manner that they experienced music. One can only agree with her call for closer links between teacher training processes and contextualised school practice.

Given the possibility of higher levels of integrity in children’s learning, as a popular subject, music could better fulfil its capacity to generate personal challenge and deeper reflection. A bolder national curriculum would appropriately reflect the lifelong ramifications of music learning validated by the extent and diversity of adult music participation in celebratory, recreational or professional performance outputs. Music’s intellectual significance is heightened, in my view, by the realisation that it is one of few global communication phenomena which generate product that can remain essentially un-politicised or restrained by particular social or cultural fervour. At the same time, technology allows simultaneous performance and creativity on a multi-national platform, thereby embodying notions of positive global dialogue. On that basis, how music learning and skills can contribute to the holistic but diverse development of every child, in pursuit of greater personal, community and global empathy would be a legitimate priority in school and national curriculum debates.

**Evaluation of music education provision for gifted and talented children in New Zealand**

At the 2006 Ministry of Education Hui for Gifted and Talented education, the Minister of Education Steve Maharey recognised the significance of the intellectual and creative capital of gifted learners, including that of artists. He emphasised personalised learning as a means to
enhance the resource of creative capital emerging in New Zealand. Citing Milliband (United Kingdom), he described personalised learning as, “shaping teaching around the way different youngsters learn; it means taking the care to nurture the unique talents of every pupil” (Maharey, 2006, p. 3).

Researcher David Keen’s (2006) address to the hui presented the early findings of a two year project which tracked the development of gifted and talented children. According to Keen, the data signalled that teachers are attuned to recognising complex thinking outcomes in the three R’s, but, “visual-spatial skills and musical skills, tend to be seen [by teachers] as the preserve of a significant but specialist minority of children” (Keen, 2006, p. 6). Keen emphasised the importance of music in gifted and talented education and called for schools to offer a more vigorous curriculum. Keen described a ten year old Chinese participant in his research who had little regard for school goals and indicated that “the minimal demands of school work freed up time for him to pursue his real interests – instrumental music, computing and sport” (Keen, 2006, p. 7).

In response to global developments and national issues, both Keen (2006) and Maharey (2006) predicted rethinking of attitudes about individual learning in New Zealand. I find their views to be in line with other international writers who have investigated ways to intensify interest in learning, as well as to increase the range of possibilities by which children will think and respond as members of the global community. For example, Ambrose (2002), writing of socioeconomic stratification issues in gifted education, highlights the importance of curriculum breadth. He calls for:

> diverse and nuanced conceptions of giftedness, intelligence, talent, aspiration, motivation and merit…. It is even more important in a highly diverse, multicultural global socioeconomic system that draws us all together in an interactive, electronic web. (Ambrose, 2002, p. 179)

Given wider acceptance of the need to encourage individual development, Riley, Bevan-Brown, Bicknell, Carroll-Lind, & Kearney’s (2004a) extensive and groundbreaking investigation of provision and policy for gifted and talented children in New Zealand produced telling data. Approximately one third of schools returned data concerning performing and visual arts provision. While it is disappointing that specific data about music cannot be drawn from the report, it is encouraging that schools’ reporting showed that the arts featured as second only in

---

4 The survey produced a return from close to 50% of schools of which 809 fitted in variants of Year 1-8 categories.

5 Reported as single initiatives in about one third of reporting schools, and at between two and four initiatives in about half.
frequency to intellectual/academic areas (p. 193). As to the nature of provision⁶, across the nominated areas of giftedness and talent⁷, withdrawal programmes were identified as schools’ first option. However, in regard to leadership, arts initiatives were less likely to be taught by an expert than subjects such as physical education (Riley et al., 2004a).

Strang’s (2001) unpublished thesis reveals interesting assumptions about what constitutes credibility of provision for a subject like music. Her research involved three generalist teachers in a series of interactive action cycles. In each case, Strang recorded growth in the teachers’ ability to differentiate across the curriculum. She found participants moved toward more effective processes as they “began to see evidence of children’s motivation and quality thinking” (Strang, 2001, p. 221). However, in my reading of the data, participants were seldom forthcoming about any of the arts, and one commented that arts learning is “one of the obscure parts of the curriculum” (p. 121). Further, the report does not include information about the qualities of children’s outputs. On that basis, teacher participant comment such as “feeling comfortable in differentiating all curriculum areas now” (Strang, 2001, p. 152) could suggest a false consciousness about integrity of arts learning. This seems especially pertinent in light of the MoE’s position on gifted and talented provision, which states that teachers are to be clear about what matters in subject content and approaches (Ministry of Education, 2000b).

Furthermore, Strang (2001) acknowledges that teacher participants voiced a need to open up the classroom to specialists or experts where teachers feel unsure about topics or curriculum areas. However, in light of the emphasis placed on differentiation in Ministry of Education (2000b) literature, it is puzzling that Strang’s recommendations for professional development in gifted and talented education do not include specialist curricula support or development. Ironically, in regard to specific domains such as music⁸, it seems to me that Strang’s summation of school capability aptly captures the New Zealand situation for many classrooms.

Unfortunately the current reality for many of our gifted and talented students in the regular classroom is that their abilities, skills and passions remain largely unrecognised and hidden, buried beneath a plethora of myths, misunderstandings and ineffective practices. (Strang, 2001, p. 250)

Concern about teacher credibility is heightened by the findings of Tracy Rohan (2004) concerning general classroom music. Based on interviews with leading New Zealand music

---

⁶ Clubs to full time specialist classes
⁷ Intellectual/academic to culture specific
⁸ For the purposes of this report, adequate facilitation is seen as capability to diagnose where children are at and provide effectively for their musical development
educators, Rohan identified that reliance on generalist teachers is the most significant cause of inadequacy of music delivery in schools. She states that generalists lack “uniquely musical knowledge and understandings” (Rohan, 2004, p. 134). Two years later in a personal position paper about musical children, Rohan’s position appears to have shifted as she suggests that the “skilled and knowledgeable teacher will be able to teach a rich and carefully differentiated programme” (Rohan, 2006, p. 5). However, she still affirms that musical children require a responsive and challenging environment and that good music teaching should be available to any child (p. 1). In that regard, availability of credible teachers for many schools is a matter of grave concern. Riley et al’s (2004a) research revealed nearly twice as many schools involved experts in the arts as for academic/intellectual initiatives. This suggests that teacher capability is a factor in school decisions about arts provision, and by implication, that many schools recognise differentiation to be inadequate for the purpose of fostering high-level musical potential.

Concerning access to provision, Riley et al.’s (2004a) report reveals that approximately half the surveyed schools did not complete a questionnaire return, and that two thirds of the respondents did not record arts information. I think this signals serious challenges or barriers for musically gifted children in New Zealand. It would seem fair to suggest that the extent of provision for musically gifted and talented children is likely to be sparse and often undertaken without particular expertise to support the integrity of music learning. As to the significance of that, Keen (2000) records, “Approximately half of the Talent in the New Millennium participants actively were engaged in music. They drummed, strummed, trumpeted and sang in every style from classical to rock, and they wrote their own tunes” (Keen, 2004, p. 280).

In summary, gifted students appear to attach a high level of significance to music. However, this knowledge only serves to heighten concern about the equity of music provision within school programmes. While it seems that music would be a popular domain if left to the choice of gifted and talented students (Keen, 2004), it appears that messages about curriculum priority are mixed. For example, Maharey’s (2006) support for a more individualised approach to gifted and talented children is not matched in the publication Personalising Learning (Ministry of Education, 2007a). In its final form, the document does not refer to gifted and talented learners or to the significance of specific curriculum development in children’s learning, other than an emphasis on technologies.

With the arts being the second highest reported provision category in Riley et al’s (2004a) data, one might assume schools recognise the urgency for musical provision amongst gifted and talented children. However, my interpretation of the data suggests that generalist teachers are at the front line of Arts identification and development activity in approximately two thirds of New Zealand’s schools. This is somewhat frightening, given Rohan’s (2004) finding of low levels of teacher competence for music teaching.
Finally, research to date has produced little data about the quantity or qualities of gifted children’s music activity or potential growth in New Zealand contexts. Since little is known about the effectiveness of differentiated programmes, particularly outside what I would term priority curricula, more scrutiny of this strategy for supporting the development of musically gifted children would seem to be an imperative. In effect, there is little to dispute Riley et al.’s (2004a) and Riley’s (2005a) general summation of a paucity of evaluative research about gifted and talented programmes.

**High level music learning though integrated learning experiences**

While Music Heartland’s programme was based on withdrawal teaching, integrated learning initiatives were included as part of the offering to the selected children. On that basis, it is appropriate that this report allows the reader to compare child participants’ Heartland learning with perceptions about classroom music and wider curriculum achievement. The comparison will be tentative, because while integration and cross curricula learning are common place in schools, as the literature reveals, substantiating its effectiveness in respective subjects is complex and tenuous.

Henderson (1985) noted that there was no substantial body of research to support evaluation of how integrated learning affected the development of children’s musical capability. More than ten years later it remains difficult to disagree. Holland and O’Connor’s (2004) *Report on Learning in the Arts* describes student participants often using new language from a discipline and making transformative links between music and emotional responses. Student comments include, “The sad parts have different music, it blends in with other parts, like the happy parts…. I couldn’t imagine the movie without music, it wouldn’t be very interesting to me” (Dunmill, 2004, p. 42). However, by submerging individual discipline data within an arts umbrella, even in descriptions of cross arts activity, little is revealed in the report about musical outcomes and involvement. This means that the discipline basis of outcomes highlighted in the executive summary (Dunmill, 2004, p. 3), including critical reflection, more diverse negotiated relationships, and accord about co-construction between teacher and learner is not available to the reader. While these qualities are of great significance for encouraging diversity and independent learning, I suggest, that it is somewhat naive to assume they would necessarily emerge and contribute in the same way across dance, drama, music and visual arts.

David Elliott (2002) suggests that musical outcomes are more limited in schools where integrated programmes are prevalent. He also suggests that a parallel trend for interdisciplinary Arts leaders in schools can undermine the integrity of children’s musical development. Gardner’s (1983) multiple intelligences framework, and music as a definable part of that, informs Elliott’s concerns
about integration and grouping arts subjects to streamline school programmes. Writing a comparative piece, Kari Veblen (2002) clearly supports integrated learning approaches, and notes magical and transformative benefits eventuate from good practice. However, she is clear about its limitations, stating that “I would not trust a series of integrated projects to accommodate the broad and deep music learning (performing, listening, describing, and creating) that our students deserve.” (Veblen, 2002, p. 7).

Veblen (1997) anticipates this theme by describing indicators of quality interdisciplinary classroom work including respect and attention to students’ lives, as well as commitment to deep sharing of teacher and student beliefs. She states that curriculum design needs reciprocal significance attributed to sound qualities and other domains of knowledge, including the social world. Furthermore, Veblen recognises artistry of teacher pedagogy as critical in generating a desirable level of learning depth in subjects such as literature studies and music. Similarly, British curriculum writer Charles Plummeridge (2001) supports teachers making explicit learning connections amongst the arts. In fact, he observes that the priorities of music teachers can isolate students who are more interested in holistic learning. At the same time, he makes what I think is an important observation that the majority of proposals for integrated programmes do not emanate from music teachers. I consider that this reflects the music specialist’s legitimate awareness of the time and complexities involved in fostering sustainable music skills and understandings, notwithstanding the challenges schools face as they attempt to offer children equity across the arts disciplines.

Chrysostomou’s (2004) investigation into recent Greek curriculum initiatives also highlights familiar themes for New Zealand music educators. According to Chrysostomou, given that teachers are encouraged to make links across the curriculum, more investigation is needed as to the extent of discrete learning time and meaningful music outcomes. She identifies that generalist teacher skill levels are typically low, resulting in music curriculum expectations often not being fulfilled. As a desirable framework, she cites Burton’s (2002) three levels of integration, but asserts that teacher knowledge and understanding of respective disciplines are essential, even for the lower levels of integration. Chrysostomou states that “Music aims and goals must be taught and absorbed by students before they are ready to correlate their musical knowledge with information gained in other subjects” (Chrysostomou, 2004, p. 28).

Henderson’s (1998) research highlights the danger of music education fulfilling an effectively subservient role in integrated learning programmes. She cites Stevens (1993), in suggesting there are New Zealand parallels with Australia where music has lost ground as a discrete subject. While acknowledging holistic approaches can better reflect traditional cultural practices, Henderson
(1998) makes a strong recommendation for interdisciplinary arts programmes to value the developmental requirements of each discipline. She notes, if the goal is to foster lifelong musical attributes, “Research shows that the ability to grasp and retain new information and to link it centrally to new ideas, depends greatly on the extent of one’s existing knowledge” (Henderson, 1998, p. 20).

In regard to gifted and talented children, there appears to be an assumption that providing classroom resources will lead to meaningful musical outcomes. However, such resources appear to do little to substantiate the level of musical integrity within cross curricular or integrated provision. For example, Lazear (2005) provides the teacher with an impressive array of creative and listening possibilities underpinned by Gardner’s Multiple Intelligences. However, in applying music to cross curricula projects, however authentic the intentions, Lazear’s strategies do not seem to embrace music as an alternative and meaningful learning pathway, or as a valid catalyst for the encouragement of critical thinking. Furthermore, in my view, he understates the complexity and commitment to sequential music learning required for discrete musical growth to support the applications. For example, while it may be true that gifted and talented students are capable of developing mini-Broadway musicals, to suggest such goals without clarification as to how the necessary musical skills will be arrived at, or to simply assume children already have these, is in my view questionable guidance for teachers.

New Zealand writer Rosemarie Cathcart (2005) also offers many strategies to assist the development of creative outputs and thinking applications. Yet, once again, there seems to be an assumption that these eventuate from generic learning and thinking processes. Cathcart is persuasive in explaining appropriate responses to gifted and talented children9 (Cathcart, 2005). However, in my view, for the intended reflection to have substance, ongoing and meaningful personal domain learning would need to be integral. My concern is supported by Elliott (1995), who tersely critiques moves toward integration in general classrooms, noting “Our future does not lie in schemes designed to make music education less musical” (p. 305). Furthermore, while Cathcart’s approach is intended to be cross curricular and oriented toward skill development (Cathcart, 2005), the suggested strategies appear to be centred on skills that support learning, rather than on building from authentic subject experience. For example, to generate children’s learning interest, the teacher is encouraged to enmesh music in the arts. However, there does not appear to be a call for complexity in the nature of the art form expression itself. Similarly, Cathcart’s question for teachers wishing to ascertain domain integrity, “Am I…drawing on the

9 The programme to focus on learning interest, thinking tools, intellectual and creative potential, and, emotional, social and ethical development.
arts?” (p. 133) reveals a possible assumption that the arts, including music, are a tool rather than significant expressive disciplines.

In summary, Howard Gardner’s (1999) concept of Multiple Intelligences figures prominently in integrated and cross curricula proposals that are intended to inform gifted and talented education. However, it seems largely forgotten that Gardner does not assume the links between these intelligences to be automatic. For example, he acknowledges a link between mathematical and musical interest may be found in pattern relationships. However he states that a “mathematician’s interest in music does not predict that he or she will play [music] well”. He further observes that the link “rarely works the other way” (Gardner, 1999, p. 103). Similarly, and of greater significance I believe, while Gardner records habits of thought to be valuable, he indicates that “these [thinking skills] must be practiced explicitly in every domain where they are applicable; indeed they are called weak precisely because they do not in themselves get one very far” (Gardner, 1999, p. 107).

From my interpretation of the cited research and resource literature, at a surface level, integration is a logical means for catering to the potential of musically gifted and talented children. However, scrutiny is required as to the integrity of musical learning, as well as realistic opportunity for children to experience creative and reflective activity, as called for by Gardner (1993) and Dunmill (2004). About the general curriculum, prior to *The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2000a), Henderson (1998) predicted that disciplines would need to temper expectations of respective arts discipline integrity. For musically gifted children, given the level of reported musical interest amongst gifted children (Keen, 2006), this would seem an even less defensible strategy. As Riley (2005) notes concerning classroom based provision:

What is yet to be determined is how students are selected for ability groups, the flexibility of these, the curricular areas in which they are employed, and most importantly, the level of differentiation provided for students in the ‘top’ group. (p. 5)

**The expectation of music education contributing to children’s wider achievement**

Music Heartland’s negotiated goals included evaluation of the effects on wider achievement amongst the selected children. As to what is meant by wider achievement, current priorities within the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007b) appear to dominate the public view. At the Ministry of Education Hui (2005) for Gifted and Talented educators, the Educational Review Office communicated that the dominant priorities for government and by implication the MoE personnel, were to lift OECD ratings in literacy, numeracy and information technology. No attention was given to reciprocity of these with other curricula. The introduction
of the National Standards in 2010 affirms the government’s priorities, so that, in my view, devotees of subjects such as music feel increasing pressure to advocate for their worth and contribution, regardless of the subject’s apparently lower status.

One approach to advocacy is attempts to maximise the value of music. In a significant review of literature and research, Crnčič, Wilson and Prior (2006) noted that widespread speculation had evolved about positive wider achievement and social effects that supposedly emanate from focused listening, music lessons and background classroom music. They considered research which had investigated links between music and other aspects, including mathematics, reading, spatial application and intelligence. Crnčič et al.’s conclusions about all four areas were the same as for mathematics: “Further studies are required before any effect of music lessons on arithmetical ability can be determined” (Crnčič et al., 2006, p. 583). Taking these findings into account, they proposed that the “value and importance of music lies in music ends” (Crnčič et al., 2006). They suggested that researchers, parents and teachers are on questionable ground where claims are made that substantive cross-curricula achievement benefits and/or enhanced intellectual ability eventuate from learning music. Hodges and O’Donnell (2007) share this doubt, stating cautiously that, “some music experiences have a positive impact on academic performance under certain circumstances” (p. 21, original emphasis).

However, contrary evidence emerges in examples of longitudinal research such as the well critiqued New York project, Talent Beyond Words (TBW). This project produced positive learning results amongst underprivileged children identified during the fourteen year programme. The programme fostered interdisciplinary dance and music learning, and based on student work, produced evidence of meaningful development and influence on career aptitude. While by my reading, home room teacher participant comments were more focused on dance outcomes, the researchers reported examples of student readiness for percussion and jazz ensembles as well as greater confidence in their engagement with professionals. Kay and Subnotik (2004) summarised teacher responses to be recognition of TBW’s effectiveness in enhancing the will to achieve, as well as generating an “I belong-type gleaming” (p. 80) amongst the students.

In view of such evidence, it may be that reports such as Crnčič et al.’s (2006) cognitive investigation undervalue socio-emotional and motivational effects of music on wider achievement. For example, they highlighted music’s inexplicable potential to support family bonding, emotional wellbeing and thinking processes. They also identified that the core curriculum appears unable to cater for more diffuse levels of intellectual activity and productivity, or to produce effective evaluation strategies for such outcomes. Thus, while not finding direct cognitive advantages from music learning, and in spite of the challenges they indicate are inherent
in evaluation of the motivational effects of music on achievement, I concur with their conclusion that it “warrant[s] systematic exploration” (Crnèe et al., 2006, p. 588).

Based on a review of community college programmes (1994-2000), that sought to enhance wider achievement in the United States, Diaz-Lefebvre (2006) advocated the use of rich arts learning experiences, wider application of Gardner’s multiple intelligences and more meaningful arts assessment practices. From my reading however, Diaz-Lefebvre’s strategies cause now familiar concerns. For example, it is suggested that trigonometry understandings are to be developed through dance. However, this does not appear to be supported by the promise of substantive dance development. Furthermore, the absence of data about student work means it is hard to assess the credibility of Diaz-Lefebvre’s claims of greater achievement in core curricula occurring as a result of arts involvement. For all that, Diaz-Lefebvre’s key theme of arts’ representations as an assessment tool does have significance, for example, advancement of creativity, motivation to learn, and improved student retention of academic material (Diaz-Lefebvre, 2006). Furthermore, with some optimism, Diaz-Lefebvre (2006) records ongoing resistance but nevertheless hard won gains for alternative forms of representation as a means of improving achievement.

Clear benefits of music learning for core learning are also described in Eady and Wilson’s (2004) review of literature concerning music and wider achievement. They point to research that had investigated thorough and long term application of integrated learning processes. In particular, Eady and Wilson note that rap can engender interest in poetry and jazz concepts, more diverse speech and lyric improvisation, and that personal empowerment can result from computer-based compositions motivated by tasks in other curricula. While Eady and Wilson’s references reflect the challenge of finding current references on this topic, I concur with their call for teachers to consider the benefits of “distinct and valuable musical expression” (Eady & Wilson, 2004, p. 247) in a wider curriculum framework.

Mishook and Mindy (2006) interviewed principals and Arts coordinators from a mix of eighteen Virginian schools, some with a specific Arts focus. According to Mishook and Mindy (2006), more lower than higher social economic schools saw the arts as being subservient to other curricula, even where they were funded to provide “a strong and comprehensive arts education for students” (Mishook & Mindy, 2006, p. 9). These schools appeared to limit exposure to the arts and were less likely to use them in support of other curricula learning. Mishook and Mindy indicated that these schools appeared sensitive to pressure for student performance in external exams. However, they reported that practices in higher socio-economic schools reflected a more equitable intellectual lens. According to Mishook and Mindy, these schools saw the arts as
coequal with the sciences, and given a framework of clear outcomes, accepted the arts as a genuine pathway towards critical thinking skills (Mishook & Mindy, 2006).

Citing Catterall and Waldorf (1999), Mishook and Mindy (2006) assert that meaningful arts learning and assessment foster learning connections, and significantly in this context, give students opportunity to work with bigger ideas or concepts. Fredricks, Alfeld, and Eccle’s (2010) longitudinal research findings indicate that high school and college students in the United States consider regular classroom work does little to encourage a passion for learning. Rather, Fredricks et al report students identifying high levels of challenge, intrinsic motivation and concentration tend to occur in structured voluntary leisure activities, including the arts and athletics.

In light of this, it is appropriate to question the nature of arts/literature programmes. For example, McDonald and Fishers’ (2006) cite the influence of Eisner (1980) and Gardner (1993) in proposing that the arts motivate involvement in literacy, allow new ways of exploring content, provide meaningful contexts for building children’s literacy skills, provide cultural relevance, and enhance productivity. Citing Fiske (1999), they also claim that children “benefit from better communication skills, friendships with others, and fewer instances of violence, racism, and other troubling and non-productive behaviours” (McDonald & Fisher, 2006, p. 6). About music, McDonald and Fisher record contributions to oral language development, print etiquette, sequencing language ideas, phonemic awareness, background knowledge about time and place, fluency of speech and comprehension of more diverse lyrics (McDonald & Fisher, 2006). Their suggestions appear impressive in regard to potential gains for other areas, however, as noted about integrated programmes, the integrity and authenticity of musical content is questionable. What does it tell us about the potential qualities of music learning when teachers are to, “Search for songs and listening selections linked to literacy skills, themes found in books your students are currently reading, or instructional themes found in social studies, science of maths units of study” (McDonald & Fisher, 2006, p. 13). In my view, elements of creativity, playing and practical knowledge, along with the effects of deeper musical involvement might well be invisible in the curriculum.

Returning to New Zealand contexts, Tina Hong (2003), former national dance coordinator, calls for a more expansive conceptualisation of what we understand by literacy and the arts, with particular reference to socially developed constructs. Using Eisner’s (1998) notion of the arts offering unique forms of communication, Hong describes disciplines as “modes of communication through which we (re)present our thinking” (Hong, 2003, p. 139). Grierson (2003) pushes this line of thought further as she critiques the ethical basis of the Arts curriculum. She suggests it is essentially filtered through English, and states:
in the construction of the new arts curriculum, the concept of difference has been brought under control through linguistic devices which name the boundaries of thought and practice. It thus becomes the ethical responsibility of arts educators to formulate an accessible criticality towards questions of curriculum design and implementation. (Grierson, 2003, p. 114)

Locke’s (2004) research similarly highlights limited acceptance of the diverse intellectual processes and challenges that arts learning generates. She calls on teachers to deal with a constrained curriculum and, asserting the need for more meaningful learning and teaching, states:

If teachers are cognisant of the discourses of politics such as neo-liberalism, economics, globalisation, and technology then they are more likely to be able to acknowledge and resist the potentially subjugating elements to them. Access to these forms of knowledge and their changing states must be made accessible in order for this to happen as these discourses not only inform curriculum, they actually construct it. (Locke, 2004, p. 139)

In summary, much evidence intended to support music’s contribution to wider achievement seems indeterminant, but in my view, does raise questions about the level of musical sophistication inherent in suggested strategies for incorporating the discipline. This is certainly a matter for further research, and like Crnčec et al. (2006), I consider the challenge of clarifying what kind of changes constitute evidence is complex. For example, the integrated school production, however exciting it may be as an event, does not necessarily represent depth of learning in any subject, let alone music in particular.

Currently, rather than making a direct connection to achievement, the predominance of literature recommends utilising music as a tool for motivation, intensifying children’s learning focus and heightening interest in achievement. The arts in general are identified as an innovative possibility in the assessment of purportedly more academic subjects. However, it appears that the strategies employed towards these ends may all too readily result in superficial musical outcomes, and in the case of New Zealand, without meaningful embracement of the curriculum strands (Ministry of Education, 2007b, p. 45).

There can be little doubt of current government intentions, given the recent introduction of national standards in literacy and numeracy. Furthermore, I believe it would be naive to suggest that these are not in line with the views of many New Zealanders, communities and political interest groups. In response, influenced by Hong (2003) and Fredricks, et al (2010), the possibility of capturing children’s passion and a curriculum in which children are encouraged to speak musically and develop communicative skills using alternative forms to text and number, does appear to provide a credible pathway for music, albeit an integrated one. As O’Connor and
Dunmill write, music is “An instrument of understanding, it prompts us to decipher a sound form of knowledge and…provides a rough sketch of the society under construction” (O’Connor & Dunmill, 2005, p. 4).

However, from the purist musical perspective, like Crnčeč et al (2006) and Plummeridge (2001a), I question an increasing necessity to justify music in the curriculum because of its potential to enhance study skills, or as a pathway toward superior cross curricula achievement. Similarly, Rohan (2004) cites Plummeridge (2001) and Reimer (1997) as she asserts the place of music for its own sake in the curriculum. She highlights deeper learning connections that can emerge out of genuine music skills and understandings. As Robinson (2000) describes it, “Yet, really music, poetry, dance and painting are ways of knowing things that we couldn’t know in any other way…. The arts are ways of understanding” (p. 5).

It is important to ask how these two broad positions, one promoting integrated learning goals, the other subject learning integrity, might be incorporated in classroom programmes for mutual good effect? I suggest, that music’s popularity typically boosts children’s wish to be involved in learning, now and in the future indicative. Therefore, teachers could feel justified in interacting confidently with the notion that innovative and substantive music learning is a tool for lifting learner engagement across the curriculum. In that framework, in my view, consideration needs to be given to assessment strategies that are sensitive to the ongoing personal and community motivational effects of music on wider achievement. Given a richer music learning environment, it may be possible to address perceptions of lower intrinsic challenge and creativity within school curricula (Fredericks, et al, 2010), through thorough skill development and content integrity, coupled with interdisciplinary debate.

As to future research, unless students are engaged in appropriately mature and sophisticated music programmes, the credibility of data is likely to be dubious, in my view. Parameters considering wider achievement are unlikely to expand past rather lightweight language, social sciences interface, or evidence of elementary and didactic music learning, unless the participants’ music programme is encouraging the expression of complex and insightful ideas. Some sophistication of musical practice is necessary in order for children and teachers to understand more about what we can know through music, and how musical sensitivity, understanding and praxis can contribute to the development of unique forms of expression by children.

Kay and Subnotik (2004) described the effects of arts involvement as transformative amongst underprivileged students in New York. I concur, and note that it is powerful indeed to observe students changing their learning approach from being “poorly disciplined fighters with low self
esteem, to ladies and gentlemen in the dance” (Kay & Subnotik, p. 80). Like many other scholars, I observe that music has a striking influence across most students’ lives, and hence, questions about its relevance to intellectual stimulation are simply irrelevant. However, the first and second decades of this century are a time of clear political zest for a streamlined and measurable curriculum. Hence, it is critical to clarify the far reaching implications of the diverse subsidiary roles for music when it is meaningfully facilitated in the cause of encouraging wider achievement. In my view, the essence of music is encapsulated by Eisner (1994) who recognises that the growth of cognition occurs through different intelligences as people match up to, and solve new problems.

**Part B: The Nature of Musical Giftedness**

*Aesthetic parameters within the education environment for musically gifted education and talented children*

Much debate is evident about the relevance of aesthetic sensibility in literature with a focus on gifted and talented children, and in general music education discussions. Since the children selected for Music Heartland experienced relatively long term and sustained experiences, investigation of their perceptions about musical outcomes and any relationship to aesthetic sensibility apparent in Heartland’s evaluation processes seems appropriate. The following themes provide the framework for exploring related literature:

- Diverse viewpoints about the place and value of aesthetic perceptions in general music education
- The value attributed to aesthetic sensibility in gifted and talented education
- Enhancing aesthetic sensibility in provision for gifted and talented children requires more robust expectations amongst educators

**Diverse viewpoints about the place and value of aesthetic perceptions in general music education.**

In regard to general music education, Elliott (1995) asserts that the real meaning of music praxis is to be involved, to know the feelings that emerge with skill development, and to share skills with other people. As such, he sees little merit in adopting an aesthetic basis for music education:

Whereas, the aesthetic concept of music and music education separates musical experiences from everyday life by placing them in the rarefied and purposeless realm of disinterested perception, this praxial perception urges the opposite view. (Elliott, 1995, p. 136)
Elliott (1995) suggests that criteria for praxis excellence need to centre on real life contexts. These might include improvisation within jazz settings, or experiences which are inherently multicultural. According to Elliott, goals emerge from practice-specific traditions which can inform evaluation of the extent to which learner responses are musically intelligent, and/or could support shaping of ability towards lifelong musical enjoyment. He claims that no music is innately better than any other, and that evaluation evolves within the domain. Thus, a cognitive lens, framed by musical conventions and associations, lies at the basis of aesthetic credibility. As such, “Musical patterns give us the artistic means to extend the range of our expressive powers beyond those we find naturally and ordinarily” (Elliott, 1995, p. 150).

In reviewing Elliott’s work, Regelski (2000) questions the breadth of his proposed praxis. Regelski suggests that Elliott’s focus on western classical and related traditions (e.g. jazz), essentially minimises the integrity of other traditions, and forms a barrier as to what is acceptable as good. As an alternative, Regelski calls for praxis in which “ordinary people [are] attempting to bring extraordinary meaning to their lives through music” (Regelski, 2000, p. 84), and asserts that all forms of musical praxis can assist music education’s potential to enhance the life of the ordinary citizen.

Hence, while recognising differentials in respective intellectual processes, Regelski (2000) places consumer and producer of music at the same level. He considers music audiences consist of fanatics who may or not be recognised critics, but they soak up, respond, and evaluate quality through dedicated spectatorship, hence become credibly informed. Essentially, in my view, Regelski (2000) is suggesting that aesthetic sensitivity can develop as distinct from praxis. Furthermore, he proposes that researchers and academics need not try to impose the degree to which an individual may feel, surmise or postulate about great music or performance:

Such a listening musicianship is sometimes quite distinct from the musicianship possessed by professional performers whose training can sometimes cause them to miss ‘the music’ because of their focus on details of techné that mere mortals either fail to hear or find to be of secondary importance. (Regelski, 2000, p. 69)

Similarly, Swanwick and Franca (1999) question what they interpret as Elliott’s formalistic view of music\(^{10}\). Swanwick and Franca describe peak aesthetic pleasure as the degree to which music connects with our life experience. As in the Understanding in Context curriculum strand (Ministry of Education, 2000a, 2007a), Swanwick and Franca call for new forms of curriculum...

\(^{10}\) As associated with formal structural musical relationships proposed by Meyer (1956) (Ministry of Education, 2000)
that traces history and previous life events and have full effect in children’s music learning, through celebration of potential triumphs of insight and revelation (Swanwick & Franca, 1999).

With the purpose of interrogating what he sees as narrow perceptions of literacy within the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007a), Thwaites (2008) writes of embodied knowing, and music being a representation of bodily activity, both of which give rise to understandings. In this theme of aesthetic significance, it seems appropriate to ask; what is the extent to which the body is capable of expression without preconceived intellectual awareness? In my view, perceptual imprints about what is appropriate and what is beautiful germinate before the fact. These gain increasing intensity through experience and reinforcement. Hence, I propose that aesthetic responses serve to encourage valuing, diversity and resilience. Perhaps, more encouragement of aesthetic sensibility in children’s music learning would mean greater empowerment, legitimisation of personal expression, and bolder and more insightful product in our schools or wider community.

**The value attributed to aesthetic sensibility in gifted and talented education.**

Swanwick and Franca’s (1999) assertion of peak aesthetic pleasure from musical involvement serves to highlight concepts such as crystallising moments, flow, perspicacity and volition. These are recurring themes in gifted and talented literature. Authors such as Csikszentmihalyi (2002) and Piirto (1999) suggest that crystallising moments ignite revelation, which in my view, can be regarded as integral with aesthetic perspicacity. In a given domain (for example music), Csikszentmihalyi (1996) advocates, that to experience flow means automatic and effortless learning or activity while simultaneously maintaining a highly focused state of consciousness. In that state of mind, the individual is confident, not self-conscious, and his/her outputs are seemingly auteolic. I interpret this as a dynamic facility for individuals to operate comfortably and explore uncharted challenges using known skills. Within Csikszentmihalyi’s (1996) conceptualisation, I think the term “the musician knows” is significant. It implies that the blend of knowledge, skills and understandings coalesce to a point at which intuition has significance in decisions made. It is the juncture at which the individual knows what to do next, and has sufficient personal confidence to engage with the related challenge(s).

Piirto (1999) cites Winner (1996), suggesting musical precocity is like a “rage” to make music” (Piirto, 1999, p. 247). Signposting aesthetic appreciation of musical structures as a characteristic of musical giftedness, Piirto uses an analogy of being “bothered by the thorn” (p. 33) in talent areas like music. This means personal interplay, flow, and volition influencing one’s domain passion and commitment to a level of intensity, at which the individual appears to have no choice about full engagement. Citing Feldman (1982), Piirto (1999) considers that crystallising
experiences fortify one’s talent area focus. I consider that this metaphoric explanation of intellectual involvement helps us understand the obsessive nature of learners who cannot leave an area of study alone, and for whom the time consumed appears to be of little consequence (Csikzentmihalyi, 1996).

Freeman’s (2004) research, amongs an identified group of gifted and talented choir choristers, revealed examples of participants being glued to music, or enjoying heightened feelings of security because of particular experiences. Freeman acknowledges validity challenges in attempting to evaluate crystallising experiences including deliberate sample bias, typically high parental support and exposure, as well as previous learning. However, she tentatively supports the notion that an initial crystallising experience has a positive effect on children’s commitment to instruction (Freeman, 2004). Furthermore, Freeman highlights the value of subsequent or refining experiences. While acknowledging the importance of holistic environmental support, she suggests that exposure to a particular music or instrument can trigger the potentially gifted learner’s deeper intellect. Whether the trigger is the sound of the instrument or sensitivity to musical qualities remains a moot point, however, for a single experience to carry such apparent weight for some learners, a preconception of aesthetic quality and appeal would seem a reasonable assumption. As Freeman records, boys made decisions based on the dramatic and sustained first hearings of an instrument. In some cases such experiences were shown to kick start musicianship prior to the commencement of formal training (Freeman, 2004).

Stollery and McPhee’s (2002) research amongst instrumental teachers highlights crystallising experiences as key to children’s musical involvement. Discussion amongst research participants revealed, that crystallising experiences are perceived as “intense positive emotional or aesthetic states in response to music” (Stollery & McPhee, 2002, p. 95). Stollery and McPhee note that these experiences require favourable access, and caution that paralysing experiences can be of equal or greater significance for music learners. Furthermore, I think reflecting the complexity of this topic, research participant’s formal written responses attributed less weight to the impact of crystallising experiences than informal comments. Similarly, Haroutounian’s (2000) research which investigated musical talent and identification revealed that aesthetic sensitivity appeared as a greater priority in participants’ verbal commentary than written responses. Comments about first impressions of focused involvement and an aesthetic basis for creative interpretation suggest that Haroutounian’s expert participants recognised predisposition and actualisation of aesthetic sensibility are evident, even in beginners.

Swanwick (1999), and Gardner (1983) interpret Suzanne Langer’s (1942) concept of form and feeling as a source of knowledge that has parallels with language development, initiation of new
thinking via metaphor, and non-discursive thinking. As Langer explains, sensory experiences create a sense of form, and it becomes communicable through a language i.e. verbal, plastic arts or music. As such:

this unconscious appreciation of forms is the primitive root of all abstraction, which in turn is the keynote of rationality; so it appears that the conditions for rationality lie deep in our pure animal experience – in our power of perceiving, in the elementary functions of our ears and ears and fingers. (Langer, 1942 p. 89)

In short, while Langer’s essence of form is founded on subjective knowing, it is nevertheless significant. As I read it, it predicts a facility to hold knowledge and modes of perception open for reflection, and/or creative application.

But if there be a world which is not physical, or not in space-time, it may have a structure which we can never hope to express or to know…perhaps that is why we know so much physics and little of anything else. (Langer, 1942, p. 83)

Joan Freeman’s (2005) talent-based research found that potential aesthetic excellence was more similar amongst gifted visual and musical students than in control groups consisting of general music and visual art learners. Also, in an investigation of innate aesthetic potential, Winner and Martino (2000) found that a sense of passion to master a domain is typically not evident amongst children. Furthermore, their analysis of musical tests such as the measures of Seashore (1938), and psychological reviews of Teplov (1966) suggest that emotional responses may be at the core of musicality. As evidence, Winner and Martino (2000) found that most people with high or low levels of musical training classify music extracts analytically, while participants noted to be gifted performers do the same task according to expressive qualities. On that basis, Winner and Martino argue that “sensitivity to expressive properties may be a marker of inborn musical giftedness” (p. 105).

**Enhancing aesthetic sensibility in provision for gifted and talented children requires more robust expectations amongst educators**

The New Zealand Curriculum’s (Ministry of Education, 2007b) introduction to music states, that “students are to value aesthetic qualities”. As a framework, in my view, this stance appears to place aesthetic understanding and application in a somewhat passive role. However, aesthetic sensitivity is more strongly represented in a paper produced as a precursor to the development of the 2007 curriculum by O’Connor and Dunmill (2005). As I read it, their paper acknowledges predisposition to musical qualities, in that musicality includes the potential to decipher sound form(s) of knowledge.
In a MoE publication for schools, Riley et al. (2004b) outline strategies intended to guide the development of differentiated programmes in classrooms. The text draws attention to appropriate content, learning processes and product for gifted children. Aesthetic sensibility can be identified in desirable learning categories such as transformation, personal dimensions or even within methods of inquiry (Riley et al., 2004b). However, it is not a specifically identified attribute.

In an English setting, Hallam’s (2001) much quoted article Learning in Music calls for greater recognition of enculturation, generative processes (creating), and attention to learning outcomes in music programmes. Yet, in spite of Hallam’s support of diverse learning styles (Hallam, 2001), it appears to me that her curriculum recommendations can be seen to frame the learner as a recipient of knowledge, as one without preconceived notions about what and why particular music is preferred, or admired. To the contrary, my classroom experience has revealed that children hold strong views about musical qualities, and that musically able children share these with surprising sophistication. As Gardner (1983) observes, even though there is little in schools to stimulate musical development, evaluation of ability which probes further than pitch and rhythm acuities reveals that most children develop an early appreciation for musical form. Because of the significance of structures to music, including matters of repetition and contrast, Gardner’s observation highlights the importance of educators being alert to and encouraging of what is effectively a form of aesthetic sensibility.

Paynter’s (2002) review of music education’s purposes is more assertive about the value of aesthetic and ineffable musical elements. He cites Francis Bacon in suggesting that excellent beauty has need for a strangeness of proportion (Paynter, 2002), which can be traced to the influence of the Grecian Pythagorean golden rule. According to Paynter, the construction of art works, such as cathedrals, represents humanity’s ongoing search for models of beauty, and is as relevant today as historically. He suggests that the search for beauty in music warrants special consideration, because its lack of a physical nature means it is the most subtle and fleeting art form (Paynter, 2002). While somewhat inconvenient in the current New Zealand curriculum framework, one in which achievement objectives dominate, I find myself agreeing with Paynter’s assertion about aesthetic appreciation:

11 He explains the sense of musical structure as awareness of appropriate endings, rhythms, synergy between style and rhythms all of which may be evident before training begins (Swanwick, 1999).

12 The Golden Rule, proportions of two thirds one third which are common in natural phenomena and human products.
the necessary feature of every art object or event – is surely a response to those things which, because we cannot take hold of them, ultimately trouble us most: time and space and their mysterious relationship with life and death. (Paynter, 2002, p. 222)

This is not to be confused with emotional wallowing, which as Reid (1969) points out is not valid when evaluating aesthetic capability. Instead, as a tentative position, aesthetic responses could be more effectively encouraged as sensitive and informed mental activity. An outcome would be reflection at a sufficiently deep level to embody meaning(s) but without feeling the need to express or define a particular object or idea (Reimer & Wright, 1992). Seeking an enhanced curricula application for aesthetic sensitivity, and specifically in the learning of musically gifted children, Mursell (1948), cited in Reimer and Wright (1992), provides a possible framework. That is, recognition that one’s aesthetic sense rests in a realm of deeper intellectual capacity, but, education is essential to avoid wild, arbitrary or undisciplined outcomes. Hence, I agree with Reimer and Wrights’ (1992) attribution of significance to aesthetic sensibility in performer’s, composers’ and listeners’ development because it offers “a discriminating but appreciative emotional response” (p. 223).

**Summary of aesthetic considerations for musically gifted and talented children**

Coincidentally revealed in reports by Haroutounian (2000) and Freeman (2000), formal recording by research participants appears to reflect a discomfort about according value to aesthetic sensibility in children’s musical development. However, informal verbal commentary is more positive about its significance. I suggest that this duality has emerged because mainstream education thinking and government policy are dominated by an epistemology that gives much prominence to learning outcomes and defined achievement parameters. Plummeridge (2001b) goes so far as to suggest that advocacy for aesthetic sensibility creates tension in the education community, since it is regarded as a distraction from the real curriculum.

Elliott (1995) constructs the purpose of music education around the individual as doer or maker, the product he or she makes and the activity whereby the product is made. Elliott does not favour aesthetic appreciation as being central to music education priorities, although he recognises the significant effect of listening on praxis. In response, Swanwick (1999) considers Elliott’s construction to be founded on a formalistic and restricted view about what motivates music learning. Swanwick’s (1999) adoption of Langer’s triumph of insight as an element of artistry appears to me to be an overt call for consideration of aesthetic sensibility as an important faculty, one which underpins our musical involvement, be that personal, community, cultural, professional or academic. Swanwick argues the importance of encouraging individuals to go beyond replication, to alternative and fresh ways of approaching sound which can emanate from aesthetic sensitivity. As he puts it:
Meyer is right: music inevitably involves cognitive elements, among these making connections and comparisons, the facility to ‘read’ established musical conventions and the ability to recognise and respond to deviations from expected musical norms. (Swanwick, 1999, p. 7)

New Zealand writer George Parkyn (1975) identifies universal aesthetic qualities to be form, unity in diversity, rhythm, and harmony with the natural world. While he considers the arts are subject to fashion swings, putting aside purposive beauty or ugliness, Parkyn contends that we should not be blind to an essential universality in aesthetic appreciation. However, importantly I think, he states that an individual with high aesthetic awareness may go unnoticed because a field of endeavour, community or culture, consciously or unconsciously sustains convergent and familiar forms of output (Parkyn, 1975). As a result, potential ability can remain dormant because of incompatibility with existing norms of quality.

In spite of some rhetoric, more than thirty years after Parkyn’s writing application of aesthetic perception in music learning and creativity does not appear to have gained in breadth or sophistication. Unlike New Zealand’s visual arts discipline resources, in which the Communicating and Interpreting strand (Ministry of Education, 2007b) encourages engagement with a diversity of contemporary and historical greats, I observe that skill-based music programmes in primary and intermediate school levels seldom explore beyond relatively contemporary charts (music). Similarly, in practically based work, however exciting it may be, assessment infrequently values or affirms aesthetic sensibility in a way that approaches the significance of skill based outcomes, or more obvious accuracy indicators.

As a tentative alternative, aesthetic significance could be encouraged as part of sensitive and informed reflection on musical quality, understanding, and contextual integrity. Paynter (2002) cites composer Aaron Copeland in reinforcing the importance of perceiving in sound. “Every composer begins with a musical idea – a MUSICAL idea, you understand, not a literary or extra-musical idea.”

While, debate generated by a reaffirmation of aesthetic sensitivity in assessment matters almost certainly would be vociferous, I believe the following points justify heightened awareness of its importance in musical epistemologies. I think that the points are pertinent because of the emphasis on aesthetic sensitivity in the thinking of musically gifted people as listeners, performers, or composers that is highlighted in the literature.

- Personal phenomena, such as a rage to be involved, obsessive drive and response to positive crystallising experiences are indicative of an individual’s aesthetic sensitivity about domain product. While existing repertoire provides the frame of reference, an individual’s aesthetic sensitivity is a catalyst in the interrogation of the known. This is identifiable in
history where communities have wrestled to accommodate unfamiliar, and possibly futuristic aesthetic qualities of new work (Freeman, 2000; Piirto, 1999);

- First evaluation of great examples of music, from any genre, typically reflects holistic and aesthetic parameters (Swanwick, 1999). On the way to that kind of product, it is likely that a musically gifted child will more quickly assimilate musical traditions and practices, and subsequently change/move parameters in the interests of their own evolving mode(s) of expression;

- It is reasonable to propose that intellect may include perceptual and aesthetic predispositions about musical quality and beauty that are context specific (Haroutounian, 2000). In this, the use of metaphor allows us to liken, explore and re-constitute musical qualities. As such, aesthetic predispositions shape our musical responses and, with encouragement influence product in previously unimaginable and ineffable ways.

**Creative parameters within the education environment for musically gifted education and talented children**

Significant time and physical resources supported the creative components of the Music Heartland programme. Hence, a theoretical basis for evaluation of children’s creative work became a priority. As a result, I adopted the following premises to inform this evaluation of literature:

- Creative ability refers to the intellectual facility to make new or innovate; however, its application and value are reflective of credibility amongst existing practice and social frameworks.

- The evaluation and understanding of an individual’s creative potential appears to be more plausible in domain-specific contexts.

- The frame, purpose and significance of children’s creative outputs require careful consideration if they are to empower creativity.

- The evaluation of children’s creative outputs demands sensitive domain treatment.

- Exemplars allow some appreciation of creativity’s lifelong influence.

*Creative ability refers to the intellectual facility to make new or innovate; however, its application and value are reflective of credibility amongst existing practice and social frameworks.*

According to Fraser (2004), while there is no universal definition, creativity is regarded as indispensable within constructs of humanity and crucial for its survival, innovation and enterprise. Csikszentmihalyi (1996) describes unquenchable curiosity and fierce determination to succeed as necessary attributes for the production of novelty. This is regardless of environmental influences such as parents or education. As to conditions that encourage creativity, he suggests that unlike creative outputs of past centuries, high-level creative output is now less likely without domain training.

Gardner (1999) separates creativity from other aspects of ability, such as intelligence. He suggests that an individual with a lack of creativity is like a powerful computer that can process but not
innovate. As to what is considered creative, Gardner notes that product must gain approval from a niche group or wider community during the creator’s lifetime, or posthumously. Hence, like Runco (2005), Gardner (1999) rejects the notion that to feel creative, or to be deeply involved, necessarily constitutes genuinely creative work. On the other hand, Gardner indicates that all have the capacity to be creative and that potential is more or less universally distributed. Hence, like Csikszentmihalyi (1996), Gardner considers differentiation between individuals lies in the level of motivation or intention without which creative acts are unlikely to occur.

Runco (2005) proposes that originality is not the same as creativity. With a view to music, he cites Simonton (1988) in suggesting examples of originality are readily traceable through history. According to Runco, acceptability provides a safety net for distinguishing psychotic or bizarre outputs. On that basis, original outputs do not count as creative if identified as contrary to the common good. Such product may reflect the unusual but lack effectiveness, aesthetic appeal or appropriateness (Runco, 2005). In regard to originality, Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe (2000) explain it by analogy with the organs of the body; these can be seen to be interdependent, i.e. each remarkably different but integrated in their contribution to whole body functions. As a result, Csikszentmihalyi’s much quoted systems model of creativity highlights the significance of culture, family background, and societal expectations in evaluation and resulting level of esteem.

However, in my view, applying notions of acceptability presents issues in school contexts. Fraser (2004) lists a variety of character traits labelled as attractive and positive. However, she notes there are also traits that are likely to put creative students out of favour with teachers and peers. As I interpret this, there is potential for social attitudes to influence evaluation processes, and as Renzulli (2005b) indicates, subjectivity in measurement can count against gifted children. Similarly, citing Davis and Rimm (1998) and Getzel and Jackson (1962), Fraser (2004) suggests that creative children feel less liked by teachers with the implication of possibly lower child self esteem. Fraser also notes that teacher selection for gifted programmes in New Zealand tends toward more compliant and neat students.

The matter of acceptability is of significance to music, since there is ample historical and contemporary evidence of composers taking up the cudgel of equity. For example, New Zealand composer Chris Adam’s (2010) \textit{Progress March}. In this regard, Renzulli (2005a, 2005b) and Gardner (2007) signal a pressing need to foster social conscience and appropriate leadership skills amongst gifted children. By implication, these become a frame for encouragement of innovation and related traits such as optimism, courage, and romance with a discipline. It appears to me that

\footnote{\textit{Progress March} symbolises the breakdown of democracy through the actions of zealous governments in the name of progress.}
to foster sensitivity for human concerns is a long-term aspiration with ramifications for evaluation of creative ability. For example, as children explore, one off product would justifiably attract less dramatic or judgemental environmental responses, in favour of evidence relating to holistic and long-term creative development. All creators need permission to make mistakes, in my view. Applied to school contexts, a shift in attitude toward more vigorous and broader expectations of social responsibility amongst gifted children might also engender greater flexibility and perhaps equity in teacher’s assessment. Furthermore, in specific domains such as music, more searching and contextual evaluation criteria for creative product would be justified.

Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe (2000) claim that schools are primarily concerned about learners’ confidence with existing bodies of knowledge, and that learners need to show conformity with this. Hence, they perceive a tension between accomplishment and creative potential. Furthermore, they note that while teachers are alert to innovative thinking, they are limited in strategies that can cater for innovative outputs. Hence, in Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe’s view, most creative acts happen outside the school, for example in arts programmes and science fairs. They identify three factors as being critical:

• cognitive and motivational factors which bring students to a current area of community interest;
• personalities that favour questioning, even breaking the rules, and early experiences that make them want to do so;
• willingness to seize opportunities and have the necessary expressive attributes to convince the domain to accept innovation (Csikszentmihalyi & Wolfe, 2000);
• Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe (2000) conclude, “Instead of focusing exclusively on students, it makes more sense to focus on educational institutions that may or may not nurture novelty” (p. 85).

The evaluation and understanding of an individual’s creative potential appears to be more plausible in domain specific contexts. (Fraser, 2004, pp. 148-149; Renzulli, 2005a; 2005b, p. 246)

Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe (2000) comment that scientific study of creativity is difficult where evaluation is not connected to outputs. Indeed, by my interpretation of the predominance of international literature, creative output being the basis for assessing aptitude has more support than testing. Fundamental in this, divergent thinking tests involving pen and paper or manipulation of materials do not appear reliable in predicting real-world creativity (Fraser, 2004; Baer, 1994; Sternberg, 1998; Renzulli, 2005b).

However creativity is defined, because evaluation occurs where the work of an individual, domain and field intersect, product must gain approval from the field to be accepted creative (Csikszentmihalyi & Wolfe, 2000). Hence, by implication, the attribution of creativity is
dependent on the lens of those assessing, including their “past experience, training, cultural biases, current trends, personal values and idiosyncratic preferences” (Csikszentmihalyi & Wolfe, 2000, p. 82).

Within school settings, Renzulli (2005b) suggests that active nurturing of inquiry and creative outputs is critical in gifted children’s education. At the same time, Renzulli (2005b) cautions about overvaluing schoolhouse creativity, reminding us that history remembers those people who are creatively productive rather than those who are clever in the classroom. The research findings of Han and Marvin (2002) led them to suggest that a shift in researcher interest to domain-specific creative processes would be appropriate, because an appreciable number of children do not score well on more generic divergent thinking tests. Similarly, they recommended that educators focus on domain development because the fostering capability in one domain is the most likely route to broader creative ability. On that basis, the focus of schools could move to how a person is creative, rather than how creative is that person (Gardner, 1983; Han & Marvin, 2002).

It is of some concern, that according to Keen (2004), gifted students in New Zealand find the regard for learning processes which call for imaginative responses diminishes progressively through their schooling. This is in spite of school data typically recording that they see development of student creativity as a high priority. Keen asks, “is there something in the structuring of New Zealand education which progressively atrophies imagination in the gifted, and especially in gifted males?” (Keen, 2004, p. 272)

Part of the answer may be a trend in recent New Zealand literature to explore generic, rather than domain focused creative thinking processes. I observe this trend in sources such as MoE documentation like *Gifted and Talented Education in New Zealand Schools* (Riley et al., 2004b), Fraser’s (2004) effective review of creative literature and learning processes, and as earlier explored, gifted and talented teaching resources. In these examples, there appears to be an assumption about ease of transfer between thinking strategies and creativity. However, international writers such as Gardner (1999), Baer (2004), and Piirto (1999) emphasise the importance of domain development in creative productivity. Riley (2004a), also cautions about schools choosing to adopt curriculum enhancement strategies such as multiple intelligences. Citing Gardner (1994), she suggests that the extension of provision to all children may result in superficial application from those who are gifted. As I read the literature, a need for subject authenticity even in differentiated programmes is signalled: that is, programmes need to be rigorous enough for creative product to support more abstract conceptualisation (Riley, 2004b).
As a result, I concur with Renzulli (2005) and Gardner (1999), who propose that giftedness reflects mastery, qualities such as curiosity and the strated excellence in at least one pursuit. About adults, Gardner (1999) suggests that the gifted individual will operate at a high level in one or more of the eight intelligences, with extraordinary facility in at least one of them. In search of authentic creative outputs, Gardner suggests domain mastery requires about ten years of application, and offers a caution for educators concerning creative empowerment, perspicacity, and wider capability:

But creators are not defeated by intellectual weaknesses…. Creative individuals come to know their strengths and recognise their cognitive or cultural niches, and they pursue these with the full knowledge of their competitive advantage. They do not waste precious minutes, let alone months or years, lamenting what others can do better. (Gardner, 1999, p. 123)

Concerning development pathways, those individuals sometimes attributed with the title creative genius by researchers have the potential to not only master but also change a domain. However, Winner and Martino (2000) cite Gardner in highlighting a significant hurdle for genuinely creative individuals: their product, particularly initial product, may not sit comfortably with the domain. Gardner (1999) describes renowned examples of this stretching and/or breaking with traditions and field practices, for example, renowned composer Igor Stravinsky who reconfigured the contributions of his teachers (Gardner, 1999).

The frame, purpose and significance of children’s creative outputs require careful consideration if they are to empower creativity.

If a learning situation is intent on fostering authentic creativity, writers such as Piirto (1999), Parkyn (1984) and Fraser (2004) advocate for exploration without pressure for quick results. Piirto summarises factors, she considers enhance creative aptitude, as environmental acceptance and sensitivity to peculiar product, provision of space or solitude, and a collaborative spirit of development amongst students and teachers. Like Fraser (2004), Piirto encourages the use of metaphor as a means by which students can delve creatively amongst disparate intellectual elements, suggesting also, that metaphor allows exploration of more abstract ideas (Piirto, 1999). In promoting a more organic approach to fostering creativity14, she emphasises that self-evaluation is inherent in personal transformation that a patient learning environment can engender (Piirto, 2003).

Suzanne Langer (1942) offers an appropriate reminder that creative exploration is context-driven and requires a deep connection with the subject matter:

---

14 Piirto’s Less Linear, Organic Approach to Creativity Enhancement includes imagery, imagination, intuition insight and inspiration. In (2003) these are expanded to include improvisation and incubation
One might say if ritual is the cradle of language, metaphor is the force that makes it essentially relational, intellectual, forever showing up new, abstractable forms in reality, forever laying down a deposit of old, abstracted concepts in an increasing treasure of general words. (Langer, 1942, p. 141)

Accepting the significance of open exploration and metaphor in the pathway towards creative outputs, I perceive that epistemologies which render creative intellectual activity as ordinary and observable cognitive functions, such as those of Elliott (1995) and Russo (2004), may truncate creative development. According to Hargreave’s (1999, 1996) empirical data, cognitive processes in creative artistic activity may be distinct from those associated with scientific development. Gardner (1999) also considers adult forms of creative product as outcomes which defy normal cognitive functions and distinctive to the individual:

By the time they are capable of carrying out work that will be judged as creative, they already differ from their peers in ambition, self confidence, passion about their work, tough skins, and to put it bluntly, the desire to be creative, to leave a mark on the world. The difference between the intelligent person and the potentially creative makes intuitive sense. (Gardner, 1999, p. 120)

Parkyn’s (1984) description of appropriate creative frameworks for gifted learners encourages further scrutiny of assumptions about links between cognition and creativity. In addition to supporting incubation and wait-time, he calls on both the environment and artist, to process ideas without feeling a need for verbal representation. As justification, he asserts that pre-cognitive events are unconscious processes, and too complex to verbalise. Using a visual art analogy, Parkyn suggests that scribbling must be allowed to be free, and that clarification of an image should not be premature (Parkyn, 1984). In the total process, while Parkyn acknowledges that the artist will at some point convert creative ideas to a perceptible form, so as to achieve meaningful communication, an appropriate expectation is understandable elements within the image, rather than familiar cognitive content and representation (Parkyn, 1984). While the outputs of visual art and music are different in form, I suggest that there are strong similarities in their origins and underlying creative processes toward product. As Langer commented nearly twenty years before Parkyn, the evolution to a representational form of ineffable musical ideas means a composer’s mind is no longer free to wander irresponsibly (Langer, 1942).

The evaluation of children’s creative outputs demands sensitive domain treatment.

According to Guderian (2003), creative thinking and ongoing creative opportunity provide impetus for learners to work in integrated and intuitive ways, as well as stimulating their use of

---

15 Here Parkyn utilises the visual arts as the vehicle, because of what he states, are advances in understanding the power of visual thinking in relation to the treatment of trauma, evident in the work of psychologists such as Rudolf Arnheim.
higher level thinking skills. In addition, he considers that these experiences enhance understanding of interrelationships amongst the music elements. Guderian goes on to suggest that aesthetic cognition and creative thinking are possible from a child’s first music class. Furthermore, he notes that even early creative experiences can contribute to meaningful co-curricular programmes. However, in my view, matters of creative wait time, respect for the child’s creative output, and fostering individuality have a lesser priority. As I read his curriculum suggestions, creativity has less prominence than knowledge about historical periods and social studies goals. In addition, probing Guderian’s suggestion, that creative applications can always be integral in music learning, I believe that his suggested evaluation criteria focus on surface features, such as effectiveness of time usage, organisation, effort and correctness of notation (Guderian, 2003).

The utilisation of musical creativity mainly as a convenient support tool for the development of music skills is also evident in general music classroom approaches. For example, Merrill (2004) reinforces what I think is a widespread view amongst music educators, that creative work should not be separated from skill building when working with young children, and is at the core of musical understanding. However, Merrill’s suggested contexts for exploring rhythmic and expressive qualities, such as pretending to be the animals, fitting nonsense words with a song rhyme, or developing Kodaly like singing phrases (Merrill, 2004) are in my view questionable. While such activities may offer engaging skill practice to children, it is hard to accept they would influence meaningful creative development significantly. Furthermore, Merrill’s activity descriptors say little of desirable learning processes like wait time, or how originality and personal creative determination are to be encouraged.

In New Zealand, the matrix of music progress indicators for the Arts Exemplars (Ministry of Education, 2003a) encourages the development children’s improvisation and original music. As I read them however, exemplar evaluation profiles lean toward an early emphasis on notation, use of devices that are representative of a style, e.g. hip-hop, and effective manipulation of the music elements, such as call and response correctness. A similar trend exists in my work with student teachers, in which time constraints heighten the necessity of such frameworks. Sadly in my view, early or rigid expectations curtail desirable creative exploration qualities in favour of ready product. Similarly, while the important cycle of action and reflection (Ministry of Education, 2000a) is appropriately reinforced throughout the music examplars (Ministry of Education, 2003a), statements about the importance of problem solving, expression of ideas and reflection through music, and wider abstraction from creative processes could, in my view, be more overt.

16 Creative applications are noted as composition, musicianship building and improvisation.
in the evaluation guidelines. For these reasons, the creative framework of the Arts Examplars (Ministry of Education, 2003b) appears somewhat underwhelming, compared to Dunmill’s (2004) reflection in support of creativity. “They constantly reflect on and refine their creative inventions, connect ideas with other musical and non musical experiences, and transform these understandings to new contexts and new paradigms” (Dunmill, 2004, p. 75).

Significance attributed to children’s creative outputs varies markedly in the literature. For example, citing Csikszentmihalyi’s emphasis on field, Elliott (1995) proposes that the musical musings of a young child can be categorised as novelty and are therefore without substance to the domain. Elliott considers that to attribute worth to children’s product puts achievement, originality and even the integrity of teaching at risk where they do not have a technical appreciation for style and technique. He states, “In a situation where everything counts, nothing counts, and the concepts of musical challenges, musicianship, and creative achievement evaporate” (Elliott, 1995).

As previously discussed in regard to Elliott’s (1995) argument against music learning being dominated by aesthetic content, his emphasis on praxis and domain achievement reflects commitment to the existence of strong connections between musical creativity and cognitive processes. In that regard, Elliott sides with Perkins (1981) in suggesting creative processes are best evaluated as exceptional versions of familiar mental operations (Elliott, 1995). He describes musical promise as the ability to problem find, solve and to take risks in finding solutions. “The process is motivated and directed by targeting one’s attention toward increasingly challenging problems. This upward spiral of difficulty requires learners to set new goals that, in turn, demand higher levels of musicianship.” (Elliott, 1995, p. 226)

Regelski (2000) agrees with Elliott about the significance of standards of achievement in creative production. However, Regelski places higher emphasis on the contribution of creative activity to general musicianship. Hence, as for aesthetic development, Regelski proposes that a learner’s creative work should not be minimised or obscured. Rather, it should be construed as the “‘basics’ for widely varied musicing, especially on the part of lay, naïve, amateur and recreational users” (Regelski, 2000). By implication, then, it would appear that performance ability is not necessarily indicative of creative potential. Furthermore, as I do (Moore, 2007), Regelski calls for situatedness of judgement about product, and value being attributed to less stable or non-annotated creative traditions. As I see it, this approach to evaluation offers alternatives to absolute quality, immediate domain reference, or excessive influence from musical genre that are sometimes construed as superior. This situated evaluation also appears sit comfortably with Stravinsky’s (1947) description of musical creativity, being innate complexity of intuition and
possibilities, from which a final work is a functional realisation (Reimer & Wright, 1992; Stravinsky, 1947). The significance of more informal or localised factors in creative product is similarly reinforced in Reimer and Wright’s (1992) assertion of connections with language. They adopt Bernstein’s idea of musical transformation from inspiration to product being parallel with creative literature, i.e. where bytes of aural and verbal information eventually become interpretable language.

Hargreaves (1999) offers a pathway through potential conflicts between children’s creative products and their aesthetic credibility. In recognising that a complex set of social and musical understandings (Hargreaves, 1999) is inherent to composition, he suggests that there is a blurred line between improvisation and creativity. He argues that a child’s musical statements represent not only musical outputs, but also verbal interactions and acting out of ideas. Hargreaves (1999) cites Sawyer (1999) in describing an everyday creativity which has improvisational thinking at its heart (Hargreaves, 1999). He offers three parameters: that it is social and collaborative, it emerges from situated cognition in everyday events and conversations, and that a mutual interdependence between group and individual activity is evident (Hargreaves, 1999). From analysis of his children’s compositions, Hargreaves (1999) observed important personal qualities emerging. He describes these as a feeling of the individual wanting to contribute (social/collaborative), some brokerage of leadership in the composition process, and adoption of cultural framing or influences. Citing an example that merged musical styles and child interests, by my interpretation he is suggesting that creative improvisation reflects a significant but complex balance of environmental and personality factors. Hence:

The successful negotiation of this balance between constraint and freedom is at the heart of creativity. Creative improvisers or composers are those who are able to work within given cultural frames or forms, but who are also able to use the arbitrariness and freedom in a new and productive manner. (Hargreaves, 1999, p. 32)

Folkestad (2005) is another who asserts the significance of informal experiences within institutional achievement. His conceptualisation appears to regard the effect of a child’s wider musical culture as integral with the development of musical ability. Like Hargreaves (1999), Folkestad suggests that negotiation, or establishing balance between freedom and structure, is an important and necessary challenge in creative development. Folkestad (2005) values creative musical processes, in contrast to those associated with pure product. Thus, he recommends that schools change composition from being, “a task executed in order to fulfil someone else’s wishes or demands, to composition as a free choice, as a way of expressing oneself and to communicate in music” (Folkestad, 2005, p. 285).
Hargreaves (1999) emphasises the significance of everyday improvisational creativity by recognising the growth of self-awareness emerging from social activity, i.e. individual’s ideas being brokered by group processes. As I interpret it, he is suggesting that musical and personal creativity are two sides of the same coin, so that as children create, their music takes on a merged identity. He states “I have tried to develop the concept of improvisational thinking as a source of creativity, and to show that it is essentially social in character” (Hargreaves, 1999, p. 33).

Similarly, Folkestad (2005), considers that music offers common and uncommon ways of learning. Hence, he proposes that while instructions and frameworks may assist productivity (Folkestad, 2005), more localised and global musical genre interactions would foster diversity. Linked to this, a diversity of authors, including Russ (2006) highlight the significance of play, particularly affective play where young children are engaged in expressing feelings about stories and fantasy. In that regard, Russ cites Root-Bernstein (2004), who report that tertiary scholarship winners speak of more vivid memories of imaginary worlds in childhood play than other students.

School evaluation of creative product appears largely to reflect the relative priority attributed to music and creativity in wider school curricula programmes and debates. John Paynter (2002) goes so far as to suggest, that musical creativity’s significance is a justification for equivalence of music and other curriculum components such as literacy or citizenship. He cites Read (1958) in stating that creative praxis and aspiration form the only pathways to genuine appreciation of beauty. Paynter stresses that creative activity, or early making up music as he calls it, evokes judgment, decision making and the courage to stand up for decisions made (Paynter, 2002). Hence, about early creative development, he helpfully suggests that teacher pedagogy needs:

> to develop the right atmosphere, one in which it is assumed that what students do in ‘music lessons’ is to make up pieces, present them, and discuss them. At least in the early stages, such pieces will not be notated. Like the bulk of the world’s music they will be invented directly through experiment and improvisation, confirmed by repetition, and remembered. (Paynter, 2002, p. 224)

In regard to how creative expression might be engendered in schools, Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe (2000) assert that access to expertise and accepted cultural framing is a necessary factor where schools wish to nurture novelty. As I observe the situation in New Zealand schools, in spite of best intentions relatively few children have access to informed creative musical expertise, or to the wide diversity of cultural frameworks that are integrated in our communities. Similarly, as referred to previously, frameworks for creative work in gifted education resources require scrutiny by teachers as to inherent musical credibility. Not surprisingly, in regard to availability of appropriate expertise, the challenge of including appropriate teachers does not appear to be a New Zealand only issue. For example, in an integrated arts learning text, Australian writers
Sinclair, Jeanneret and O'Toole (2009) reinforce the importance of exploratory time for children and teachers. Yet, by my interpretation, while they affirm a significant potential role for generalist teachers, the creative music exemplars are essentially reliant on cultural and/or musical expertise which is external to the school to support exploration and subsequent development of product (Sinclair et al., 2009).

Even where there is expertise available, it appears that decisions about appropriate creative learning goals are complex. For example, Crow’s (2008) research amongst a graduate group training to be specialist music teachers showed that students believed creativity to be about high quality, inspiration, and originality. However, in both pre- and post-training classroom activity, these aspects emerged at a low level in the students’ pedagogy, with the focus changing to encouragement of self-expression and life skills. Crow’s interpretation of the data led him to conclude that even for these strong student teachers, “preparedness for teaching creativity was lacking” (Crow, 2008, p. 387). However, in line with Hargreaves’ (1999) reinforcement of links between improvised creativity and socialisation, another interpretation could have been that student teachers tried to build learner self esteem through meaningful recognition of the personal significance of creative activity, rather than by seeking an absolute sense of originality.

In a final thread, Swanwick (1999), Regelski (2000) and Reimer and Wright (1992) support the notion of creativity in interpretation and performance. “Composers create by giving direction to, and following, musical impulses as they are imagined. Performers create by shaping a composer’s imagined sounds into expressive sonorities” (Reimer & Wright, 1992, p. 157) On the other hand, as previously noted, Elliott (1995) considers that children’s work has little value because it cannot be compared with mature outputs. However, as Renzulli (2005a) clarifies, well grounded creative growth improves the quality of intuitive responses. “The depth and breadth of one’s declarative knowledge base improves the foundation on which creative-productive behaviours can be based” (Renzoulli, 2005a, p. 256).

Silverman (2008) goes further by pointing out dangers that can occur in teaching a single interpretation, “Imposing particular interpretations on students, however ‘authentic’ or ‘authorative’ some teachers may believe they are, is an arguable practice. Again, dialogue, and the generation of ‘multiple solutions’ may be more fruitful” (p. 265). At the same time, Silverman acknowledges implicit ethical issues in the interpretation of a piece. These means that a musician is required to balance a will to express with expectations and boundaries inherent in a score (Silverman, 2008).
Putting product and interpretation into a holistic frame, Swanwick and Franca (1999) assert the significance of listener, composer and performer in musical development. They suggest that while the greatest gains come from making decisions and meeting challenges in composition, performance also offers creative outlet and decision-making opportunities. In asserting the necessity of activity that encourages integration of the three roles, they ask:

How can students develop at a higher level of musical understanding if they are not given the opportunity to work or ‘function’ at that level?... How can students engage in music as a symbolic discourse if they never have the opportunity to produce a musically meaningful statement? (Swanwick & Franca, 1999, p. 17).

In a review of expressive strategies in mature performance, Clarke (1995) states that cognitive studies are limited in what they can reveal about exceptional performance. He notes that a ready trap for tutors is overemphasis of certain expressive techniques in response to particular musical structures. He calls for investigation of multi-dimensional understanding of expression, a “rich and intriguing manifestation of human creativity” (Clarke, 1995, p. 53), which includes kinaesthetic, social, visual, localised and cultural elements of particular performances.

Given the significance being attached to interpretive expression, I concur with Graham’s (1998) call to American music educators concerning classroom and performance outputs. As he states, “Too many of us are still failing our students in not promoting a creative process in performance, not to mention other important areas of creative expression.” (Graham, 1998, p. 29).

**Exemplars allow some appreciation of creativity’s lifelong influence.**

Like Folkestad (2005), I suggest that exploration of possible links between personal empowerment from musical, and in particular creative involvement are priorities for music education research. With that intent, the outputs of four musical creators are briefly considered.

Morrisey (2001) deduces that several sources of Jimmy Hendrix’s creative drive, including aestheticism and emotional sensitivity were at the seat of his dream to create and play, in spite of much rejection by the field. According to Morrisey, unlike more predictable notions of schoolhouse creative giftedness, Hendrix displayed intensity, valued perfection, and in his youth showed excitability about sound and colour stimuli. As I interpret Hendrix’s approach, he gained flow and strength from introspective personality tendencies and intellectual preoccupation i.e. daydreaming (Morrisey, 2001). While Hendrix might not have been predictable or consistent in how he functioned as a community member, his tenacity, ability to be creatively ahead of others and to produce songs that realised the imagined and abstract became hallmarks. As Morrisey puts it:
This mode of composition may have also been the source of much of his originality, in that for him the guitar was an instrument for the expression of imagination, rather than something mastered technically for the reproduction of an existing canon. (Morrisey, 2001, p. 9)

Australian composer Graeme Koehne’s (2003) address to a gifted and talented conference in Adelaide explored personal effects of being musically gifted. He noted, many environmental factors that had stimulated his passion were random or unplanned. Recognising the importance of chance, Koehne spoke against practices that separate children with gifted abilities, for example, moving them to a special school. About music, he questioned the ongoing emphasis on achievement in classical genre, noting its emphasis on replication of what has gone before. Instead, he called for all children to be offered a creative environment, one in which they could discover the creativity within themselves. Looking forward, he strongly advocated for the arts to abandon a demeanour of superiority and separateness in favour of applications to the real world suggesting, “We need a new generation of musicians who are creative, broad minded, widely knowledgeable about different forms of music…. The primary thing in our ambition should be to stimulate creativity and a creative spirit at all times” (Koehne, 2003).

At the same conference, Piirto (2003) offered John Lennon’s report card as an example of field indifference to creative aptitude. Music was not available in Lennon’s high school, and in all subjects except literature, his teachers did not regard his lack of personal application kindly. Clearly, history tells a different story about Lennon’s poetic, musical and creative aptitude, and his eventual influence. Similarly, reinforcing the significance of childhood volition in adults’ creative outputs, Piirto (1999) describes composer Christopher Reynold’s independent exploration and determination, often regardless of disadvantageous personal circumstances. Piirto also highlights the importance of mentors, or in her words encouragers, in Reynold’s creative development. She quotes him as saying, “My call, my daimon, (emphasis in original) is one of making a music that touches the soul and of educating individuals in a way that they realize how their creative act has a one-of-a-kind impact” (Piirto, 1999, p. 182).

Finally, Gagné’s (2000) description and analysis of guitarist and composer Dat Nguyen’s life shows the significance of creative daimon overcoming dramatic life circumstances. In accordance with his Differentiated Model Of Giftedness and Talent (Gagné’, 2000), Gagné considers the effects of Dat’s natural ability, learning and practising, intrapersonal abilities, environmental factors and chance. Factors included evidence of pre learning high aural ability, the effects of a crystallising concert experience, and personal volition sustaining development during several years without tutoring. Gagné indicates these contributed to Dat’s accelerated growth, and a successful audition for entry to Fullerton University. As Gagné (2000) points out, either
blindness or his birth in Vietnam could have thwarted Dat’s development, and eventual performance and composition excellence. Instead, serendipidy was apparent in the eventual award of study scholarships with notable American mentors and teachers.

In each of these examples, it appears that personal volition, rapid and sustained independent progress, and realisation of singular or diverse forms of domain aptitude were consistent factors. Further, except in Morrisey’s (2001) report on Hendrix, some combination of model, mentor, tutor, and teachers appear to be influential, regardless of the extent of self-determination.

Translating these factors into classrooms in a literal sense would not be appropriate in my view, however, greater appreciation of creativity’s non-lineal and unpredictable development, as well as some provision for independent creative activity should be possible. For example, while acknowledging that personality factors determine the passage to maturation as creative adults, Koutsoupidou and Hargreave (2009) claim that in order to support musical, social and psychological development, that all children need improvisational opportunity. Strang’s (2001) research supports the potential of generalist teachers to foster gifted children across the curriculum, and also notes, that if children are to become more than consumers of knowledge then provision to explore, discuss and create is required (Strang, 2001). While it seems to me that these are desirable outcomes, the extent of self-determination and sometimes non-conforming behaviours identifiable in the preceding case studies suggest the desirability of particular pedagogical practices. In my view, these would include a shift of music focus from performance to exploration, a diverse and challenging curriculum, and sensitive valuing of creative outputs, each of which might well test the musical confidence of generalist teachers.

Robert Sternberg (2006) affirms that anyone can be creative, however, only a few actually are willing to risk societal rejection. In a message relevant to teachers he asserts that “Society can play a role in the development of creativity by increasing the rewards and decreasing the costs” (Sternberg, 2006, p. 101). By implication, overt encouragement of shared leadership skills and abstract musical practices, commensurate with musically gifted children’s resolve, would be evident in schools that are committed to the development of musical creativity.

**Summary of creativity considerations for musically gifted and talented children**

While creativity is a cornerstone of the arts in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007b), the nature of creative music making and evaluation that I have observed gives rise for some apprehension, especially in regard to primary aged children. The previous five sections indicate that intentions to foster deeper creative outputs can be realised through positive social frameworks, authentic opportunity, and careful evaluation strategies. In approaching a
conception of musical giftedness, one that is conducive to the development of creativity, it would appear that:

- the bulk of the international weight of literature encourages the development of creativity in domain contexts with subsequent potential transfer to wider life applications and abstraction (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996).
- while creative ability is likely to be distributed amongst children universally, it will be the creative production of a few that will eventually test and expand the domain (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Gardner, 1999; Piirto, 2003);
- creativity is a form of intellectual activity that cannot be measured in cognitive terms alone, and conceptualisations need sufficient latitude to incorporate non-verbal, non-written, and non-visual forms of thought and expression (Parkyn, 1984);
- creative personalities will offer forms of production reflecting a will to question and break rules (Csikszentmihalyi & Wolfe, 2000), hence, pressure to conform can be a barrier. However, it appears that practices and outputs which value social conscience and show responsibility in leadership are increasingly relevant (Gardner, 2007; Renzulli, 2005a).
- creativity is an intellectual process that develops through authenticity in exploration, acknowledgement of informal influences, open ended and inclusive frameworks, mentoring, sensitivity and patience about child perceptions and orientation, and if of substance will coalesce to recognisable forms of expression (Dunmill, 2004; Folkestad, 2005; Hargreaves, 1999; Langer, 1942; Parkyn, 1984);
- musical creativity may be undervalued for its contribution to the development of self determination, social collaborative skills, ability to work for extended periods without resolution, and in the realisation of practical performance skills (Hargreaves, 1999; Piirto, 2003; Reimer, 1995; Swanwick & Franca, 1999);
- product is evaluated and valued in the frame of a child’s musical capability and experience, and thus justifiably can be fenced from arbitrary imposition of domain standards about originality. Learning processes empower the child to value exploration, situated product, aesthetic parameters, and the sense of achievement that can emanate from creative production (Folkestad, 2005; Koehne, 2003; Paynter, 2002); Regelski, 2000; Renzulli, 2005b).

**Cultural parameters within the education environment for musically gifted education and talented children**

The nature and purpose of music within culture and the degree to which ability is culturally derivative are prevalent themes in current education research and writing. In New Zealand, the debate is particularly interesting because of the diversity of cultural stakeholders, music functions within and across cultures, derivative epistemologies, and provisions of resources to support different expressive forms. Hence, out of respect for the diversity of children participating in the Heartland project, it seemed essential to consider literature that could inform the interplay of cultural and musical factors in their music learning. Three themes emerged as significant:

- Music education evolves within a sensitive political and cultural framework;
- Music educators increasingly negotiate their way through diverse student cultural concepts about self and identity;
Musical giftedness and talent may be influenced but not defined by cultural precepts and respective modes of expression

**Music education evolves within a sensitive political and cultural framework**

Kelly’s (2002) comprehensive review of contemporary culture identifies music as a bonding force, one that affects our attitudes, behaviours, dress and language. Kelly differentiates music’s roles from product, citing Haack’s (1997) proposal that music is an “uncontrolled substance, a multi-million dollar industry, and powerful social entity” (Kelly, 2002, p. 42). Kelly claims music’s prominence is self-sustaining and concurs with Kaplan’s (1990) assertion that while cultures may change, music remains a constant force (Kelly, 2002). Given music’s significance to culture, Kelly calls for a more prominent sociological basis in music education. As I read it, the intention would be to incorporate greater relevance for particular cultural groups in the classroom and foster attitudes that are more responsive to changes occurring in respective cultural traditions.

However, while clearly recognising the significance of culture to music, citing Haack (1997), Kelly also emphasises that music constitutes a way of thinking in its own right, and is a knowledge system which allows cultural transmission (Kelley, 2002).

Folkestad (2005) highlights interplay between formal and informal learning processes and a student’s ability to switch between them. Recognising contemporary theory, Folkestad highlights shifts in education from teaching to what students learn (p.280), the importance of students owning decisions, and the need for teachers to be alert to intentionality in their planning (Folkestad, 2005). Furthermore, Folkestad encourages music education researchers to work more in the field, as well as to recognise the influence of an increasingly globalised world. In that regard, he calls for classroom programmes to be more responsive to the full global range of popular, world and indigenous music.

In the New Zealand context, Engels-Schwarzpaul (2003), like Henderson (1998), observes that the arts curriculum is not politically neutral, nor free from market forces. While Engels-Schwarzpaul considers the arts continue to help define New Zealand’s identity, she asserts a diminution of Māori culture caused by the influence of the dominant pakeha framework. She also critiques attitudes that render the arts as an ornament within our society (Engels-Schwarzpaul, 2003). Concerning New Zealand students, she considers they are ill informed in articulating or questioning cultural ethics, and states that “Their learning and practice are based on deeply contradictory models through which abstract cultural and political values (freedom, equality, etc.) are framed and ‘operationalised’ under the influence of market logic” (Engels-Schwarzpaul, 2003, p. 209).
In the future indicative, Engels-Schwarzpaul (2003), like Kelly (2002), reinforces the possibility of the arts fostering alternative ways of thinking, and therefore, justifiably commanding more intellectual significance than being treated as a tool of culture:

When dreaming and analysis are brought together, the present can be overcome through imagination and participation, and with cunning and courage. Then, hope can draw out pregnant images from an uncompleted past that hold promise for the future and express the ‘not – yet’ existing. (Engels-Schwarzpaul, 2003, p. 216).

In my view, Engels-Schwarzpaul’s (2003) intent parallels that of Drummond (2003), i.e. for new learning pedagogies to shift in focus from mastery towards a concept of education as a communal exploration of mystery. As O’Connor and Dunmill (2005) put it, the classroom can allow the learner to experience the music of cultural others, share challenge to stereotypical beliefs, and be a catalyst for self discovery, acceptance, reflection, imagination, and ultimately social change (p. 6).

**Music educators must negotiate their way through diverse student cultural concepts about self and identity**

From examination of the cultural implications of the *Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2000), David Lines (2003) calls for increased valuing of music’s cultural roots. He is critical of duplicity that occurs where educators acknowledge that musical expression dwells within culture, but founded on analysis of music elements, the typical classroom approach serves to objectify musical meaning. Lines effectively argues that such learning reflects a sense of musical homelessness instead of affirmation of music “dwell[ing] in the cultural practices and the capacities, possibilities, profundity and affirmation that envelop our lives” (Lines, 2003, p. 173). In that regard, Lines challenges music educators to move past rigid cultural interpretations by engaging more genuinely with the sometimes elusive and puzzling aspects of culture, and music within.

Similarly, Swanwick (1999) paints a bleak picture of relativist classroom approaches, even labelling school music as a potential sub-culture, one which may be remote from authentic cultural expression. He chides educators for pentatonic like gamelan experiences, aleatoric soundscapes, and like Regelski (2000) is suspicious of a narrow concept of performance (Swanwick, 1999). In alignment with philosopher Susanne Langer (1942), Swanwick’s (1999) alternative proposes interactive learning which fosters expressive shapes, shapes which find new relationships and fuse the past with new experiences. He considers that it is important for teachers to consider shared cultural, social, and aesthetic meanings so that music education becomes a window to different world views instead of only manifesting as a cultural mirror (Swanwick, 1999). From that stance, Swanwick encourages depth of practical musical goals and
response to place and context in classroom curriculum approaches. Furthermore, he asks teachers and children to interrogate relationships between music and culture, thereby fostering experiential authenticity relative to life and music in foreign places (Swanwick, 1999). In my view, here Swanwick is positively acknowledging that music learning can be investigative, adaptive to multiple cultural springboards, and responsive to changing cultural conditions.

From another perspective, Kwami (2001) suggests that it can be appropriate for classroom music programmes to form their own performance realities. In this, I am in accord with Kwami because in my experience, while authenticity is a goal for educators, most school curriculum is at best a partial replication of real world activity. An important factor in this differential is that culture and ethics are themselves in flux and to a degree relativist. Why would musical learning be different? In calling for acceptance of classroom music as a communal process in its own right, Kwami (2001) suggests teachers need not kid themselves about replication of other musics, and encourages them to foster collaborative investigation, creativity, and performance with learners. As he concludes:

A possible solution to the problem of cultural skewing might be to accept a plurality, diversity, and the coexistence of divergent, sometimes diametrically opposed viewpoints; for example, as in the duality of linear and cyclical orientations regarding time and structure in music. (Kwami 2001, p. 151)

Green (2001) similarly offers support for inclusive approaches. However, she reminds us that there has been little research about the outcomes of music education purportedly aimed at fostering cross-cultural understanding or inter-ethnic tolerance. Like Veblen (1997), Green cautions about music learning that challenges cultural practices, thereby creating awkward situations. Green suggests that if the potential of a broad and inclusive curriculum is to be realised, teachers need to show greater sensitivity to the personal values and musical meaning of children (Green, 2001). Such sensitivity could encourage more open adoption of other perspectives, as well as confidence in what is important to self among social or cultural groups in the classroom. This appears to resonate with New Zealand writer Tracy Rohan (2010), who highlights the value children from non-mainstream cultures place on personal cultural experience and belonging. Rohan comments that while children move happily within varying forms of expression, given the opportunity they value that other ways of knowing that are discoverable in their personal cultural expressions. As a result, Rohan suggests, “The ultimate goal is to foster student dispositions toward engagement with and participation in the arts that are open, inclusive, curious and critical.” (Rohan, 2010, p. 12)

However, the selection of parameters for such engagement can bring challenging issues. As Drummond (2010) points out, parameters typically used to describe and evaluate western
Classical Music can inhibit sensitivity and marginalise when applied to the music of other cultures. Drummond proposes that it is possible to see Classical Music as no less of a form of privileged court music than the traditional music of numerous other cultures. As a way forward, Drummond suggests that addressing this bias in teacher education programmes, “may bring unconscious prejudice into the open, and provide the opportunity to deal with it” (Drummond, 2010, p. 123).

Similarly, Alton Lee’s (2003) vision for discourse in the classroom promotes the importance of a strong curriculum in which conflict and debate are viewed as resources, rather than being undermined by anti social activity or stymied by a culture of niceness. Applied to musical exploration and participation, as I read Alton Lee’s intentions, musical cultural expressions would be accorded respect and appropriate protocols, perhaps viewed as taonga17, but not be regarded as static or inviolate. Furthermore, if the idea of active debate is interpolated with the comments of O’ Connor and Dunmill (2005), musical expression could assist scrutiny of cultural ethic, as well as the formulation of new and alternative practices within culture.

Clearly, the tone of literature cited suggests that more open scrutiny and dialogue about the inclusion of diverse cultural musics in classroom programmes is both plausible and desirable. However, the challenge for teachers in negotiating their way toward robust and equitable cultural musical exploration appears to be ongoing, significant, and relative to context. In that regard, Mansfield’s fiery critique of the Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2000a) reminds us that embedded in the debate are layers of suppression and control, at political, social, and cultural levels. In response, I have accord with her call for positive negotiation to heighten the omnipresence of the arts in New Zealand. In this vitalisation, an individual’s musical output could be, “composed of diverse cultural and musical references [which] express identities that are often multiple and contradictory, yet form a positive statement of hybrid musical identity” (Mansfield, 2003, p. 77).

**Musical giftedness and talent may be influenced but not defined by cultural perceptions and respective modes of expression**

Bevan-Brown’s New Zealand 1990’s research explored Māori perspectives of giftedness and highlighted significant inclusion issues. According to Bevan-Brown (2004), giftedness is classless and may be group-owned or individual. It may be woven with other cultural attributes, applied to benefit others, and become evident in the form of personality attributes. For example, participant responses indicated that approximately a quarter of people show “outstanding personal qualities and high moral values” (Bevan-Brown, 2004, p. 178).

---

17 Taonga can be loosely translated as gift.
In regard to effective provision, Bevan-Brown’s (2004) data indicated the need for it to be socially based and avoid practices which isolate children from their peers. Similarly, Australian writers Gibson and Vialle (2007) emphasise the importance of knowing the community and its values in provision for gifted Aboriginal children. Gibson and Vialle (2007) found a better intellectual fit occurs when the provision is in a mutually supportive group of Aboriginal children.

Galu’s (1998) unpublished thesis presents a slightly different viewpoint. Reporting on withdrawal class provision, he found that Māori, Pasifika, Asian, and Caucasian student participants felt an overall sense of success in withdrawal situations. Galu found that students were “challenged and inspired to achieve beyond their previous expectations” (Galu, 1998, p. 124). Research participants commented that withdrawal led to better achievement because it was easier to cruise in mainstream classes. They also noted that there was no change in friendship patterns and more integrity in preparation for brainy work at high school, as a result of withdrawal opportunity (Galu, 1998). However, like Bevan-Brown (2004), Keen (2004), and Moltzen (2004), Galu signalled low representation of Māori students as an issue in gifted and talented programmes. He called for more cultural appropriateness from teachers in responding to student needs and strengths, and for progressive learning environments to incorporate the uniqueness of student cultural identity as a source of celebration (Galu, 1998).

Moltzen (2004b) cites Biddulph, Biddulph and Biddulph (2003) in identifying complexities surrounding the interplay of giftedness conceptualisations and cultural values. He notes that under-representation of culturally diverse groups in giftedness programmes as an international issue (Moltzen, 2004b). According to Moltzen, the literature indicates that under-representation can occur where the identification lens is culturally exclusive or irrelevant, inappropriate approaches are used for students of different cultures, or where cultural difference is regarded in a deficit light within the school community (Moltzen, 2004b).

Keen (2004, 2006) reports, that the prevalence of Māori or Pasifika learners being identified as gifted is about half that of children from New Zealand European or Asian groups. Keen (2006), and Bevan-Brown (1991) affirm that what is acknowledged as gifted performance is subject to cultural conditioning. Relevant to this, Riley, Bevan-Brown, Bicknell, Carroll-Lind, and Kearney (2004a) record evidence of schools having broad and wide ranging definitions of gifted and talented behaviours, however, that few definitions are inclusive of all represented groups in school populations, such as respective cultures.
In regard to music and learning expectation, Bevan-Brown (2004) cites Henderson’s (2003) research findings indicating low level teacher expectations of Māori students identified as musically gifted. This may have relevance to the Education Review Office (2008) report that many schools thought that they were meeting the needs of Māori students through aspects of kapa haka, Te Reo and tuakana-teina\(^\text{18}\), but were doing so without genuine regard for Māori values, tikanga and pedagogy. Could it be that Heath’s (2006) finding that Māori educators are less inclined to seek educational leadership roles in some way reflects the lifelong effects of cultural conditioning about achievement?

Freeman’s (2000) research into fine arts and musical talent in England found that musically talented children were relatively easy to find where the schools showed musical sensitivity, or there was other community provision. However, the data indicated that tutor participants tended to confirm children who enjoyed what could be termed as dominant music styles:

> Although there were many ‘experts’ involved in this selection of children it is possible that they worked to an (unconsciously) accepted aesthetic style associated with prevailing cultural and social mores…. Consequently, this sample could possibly have been selected in terms of conforming rather than the ‘bohemian’ traits which are essential to creativity. (Freeman, 2000, p. 9)

Freeman’s (2000) methodology placed the onus on schools to locate child participants. Perhaps unsurprisingly, she found that the schools which made no nominations were usually in poorer districts (Freeman, 2000). In New Zealand, citing Hattie (2000), Bevan-Brown (2004) highlighted similar issues around identification and encouragement of gifted children in lower socio-economic schools. These often have both populations of Māori and/or Pacific Island children.

Freeman’s (2005) findings, concerning what could be termed musical inclusiveness parallel those of Keen (2004) and Bevan-Brown (1991), in that the extent to which particular cultural musical responses are outside mainstream practices can influence acceptance of an individual’s musical ability. Like Drummond (2010), Freeman questions the manner in which widely divergent skills and musicianship from different cultural genre are valued\(^\text{19}\), as well as associated implications for learner self-efficacy: “The barriers are potently effective by undermining children’s developing sense of self-worth and thus their courage to devote themselves to an outcome that may not be acceptable” (Freeman, 2005, p.82).

\(^{18}\) The three terms relate to music performance activity, language and collaborative activity.

\(^{19}\) For example, to compare a leader in Cook Island music and dance with the classical violinist, both of whom are amazing executants, can have little substance in my view.
In that regard, Freeman (2000) recommends that future gifted and talented research activity focus more on context, thereby including examination of the wider social implications of the arts, as well as curriculum equity. In reflection on New Zealand gifted and talented education research, Renzulli (2004b) affirms that addressing mismatches between school values and cultural considerations has emerged as a priority, at least in the literature.

However, authenticity of cultural valuing remains in my view, a difficult area for teachers to manage. For example, Heavner’s (2005) music curriculum for gifted and talented students appears refreshing, in that she includes the study of Eastern/African musics amongst instructional western art literature (including pop and jazz) (Heavner, 2005). One would assume that depth of cultural awareness and personal investigation would emerge through the associated performing, creating, conducting, analytical listening, and discussion she recommends. However, as I interpret it, the suggested evaluation criteria stop at child interest and feelings about lessons. Were these applied in classrooms, it seems to me, that the likelihood of debate, deeper cultural understanding, or critical awareness of underlying cultural issues could be minimal.

Similarly, concerning pedagogy, it appears that the cultural epistemologies influence the very ethics of learning. For example, Piirto (1999) reports on Suzuki’s belief in the importance of memory in all facets of learning, including music. Piirto describes the priority Suzuki gives to intense memory training for Japanese children as a way of stimulating skill development, seeing accomplishment as the basis of later creativity. In terms of individual outputs, from analysis of Germanic giftedness research perspectives, Ziegler and Stoeger (2007) note evidence of paradigm shifts and a mood of “healthy friendly competition” (Ziegler & Stoeger, 2007, p. 92). As I interpret their position, some German research now reflects a move away from psychometric or expertise based approaches toward evaluating the ramifications of ongoing personal actions. In addition, in this research, there is a reduction in the significance being attributed to personality traits, in favour of gauging the realisation of traits in the area of self organisation, even if this is “heuristic but difficult to measure” (Ziegler & Stoeger, p. 87).

Concerning classrooms, Australian researcher Maria McCann (2007) cites Vasilevska (2005) in identifying, that inappropriate responses to diverse cultural notions of giftedness is a major cultural issue. However, while in accord with Green’s (2001) view, that music generates particular complexities in relation to meaningful cultural response, Kwami (2001) offers a helpful stance for teachers who must confront the issue in the classroom. He asserts that flexibility goes alongside knowledge and confidence about cultural context and that this can “allow the music to grow and be enriched, without it losing its basic tenets” (Kwami, 2001, p. 153). Here I perceive negotiated processes, and even given the dangers and tenuous nature of intercontinental comparative
research in which they were engaged, Burnard, Dillon, Rusinek, and Saether (2008) conclude that collaborative practices with students enhance real world and stylistic authenticity, as well as positively influence teacher pedagogy.

**Summary of cultural considerations for musically gifted and talented children**

Vigorous debate is apparent in the literature about numerous equity issues encompassing cultural differentiation and sensitivity, school population socio-economic differences, and domain specific topics such as regard for diverse musical genre and authenticity of classroom outputs. Through all of these discussions, including viewpoints concerning cross-cultural valuing, a call for deeper respect of the child’s cultural dimension appears a prevalent theme. At the same time, Kelly (2002) proposes that musical expression is a constant force in cultural change. Of similar importance, in my view, given the prevalent demand for integrity in children’s work, writers such as Drummond (2003) and Engels-Schwarzpaul (2003) support a fundamental shift to a more exploratory arts curriculum. By my interpretation, greater acceptance of music’s role in cultural change, facilitated by a more exploratory curriculum, could enhance reciprocity of cultural and music praxis in classrooms.

However, what counts as meaningful appears to be about researcher/writer perspective, and subject to shifts in emphasis, both in western and indigenous cultures. For example, Gibson and Vialle (2007) summarise research supporting excellent linguistic, spatial, interpersonal, and naturalist and spiritualist abilities amongst Aboriginal people, but note that some values are challenged and/or perceived as less relevant in mainstream education practices. However, there are also research trends towards more holistic conceptions. For example, Phillipson and McCann’s (2007) consideration of meta-theoretical conceptions of giftedness in socio-cultural contexts lead them to recommend, that the experimental paradigm be accompanied by “auxiliary assumptions and heuristics”. This would mean ongoing observations could respond to a more inclusive understanding of giftedness. Similarly, Phillipson and McCann, (2007) remind us that cognitive processes are themselves conceived cognitively based on a postmodern research paradigm centred on individuals. As such, cultural perceptions of a collective sense of giftedness present issues for many researchers. However, in my view, Phillipson and McCann offer some latitude for alternative conceptions. They emphasise that as more cultures enter the discussion about Critical States, “altruistic and communal aspects remain important components of AE [achievement excellence] and CS” (Phillipson & McCann, 2007, p. 482).

---

20 Giftedness (CS) detailed as having interactive components i.e the domain of eminence, personality and environmental conditions.
Bevan-Brown is a much-cited New Zealand author concerning Māori perspectives on giftedness. She indicates that research participants valued music as one of the traditional forms of Māori knowledge (Bevan-Brown, 2004). However, in her overview of learning priorities, music is absorbed into artistic expression, itself some way through the list of gifted attributes and intangible qualities. While perhaps a reflection of recent New Zealand curriculum directions, I find this effectively subdued placement intriguing in light of music's recorded significance in oral Māori history. According to McLean (1996), and Komatua21 Barney Taiapei (2007), young children were selected and trained in preparation for the role of carrying historical meaning to subsequent generations, via complex waiata. Similarly, in my view, the contemporary popularity and economic impact of Māori musicians and product in Aotearoa is significant and sustained.

Acknowledging there are diverse beliefs about the role and importance of music within cultures creates a need for teachers to be responsive and inclusive of differing perspectives, but I think also to be somewhat courageous in their approaches with children. The Education Review Office (2008) reports limited or surface outcomes from provision for Māori students. However, I suggest that meaningful curriculum can occur when students are encouraged to feel musically at home in a wider world sense (Swanwick, 1999), especially when the curriculum is informed by opportunity for deep-seated debate (Alton-Lee, 2003) concerning integration of music functions and cultural praxis.

In regard to gifted children, I find Regelski's (2000) views on lifelong musical expression are particularly relevant, especially given Keen's (2004) claim that close to half of his respondents recording high levels of musical interest. Regelski proposes individuals experience a diversity of musical involvement and motivation:

[because] to include the most common ‘goods’ music serves in the life well lived, many of which are amateur, recreational, lay, and naïve in nature and purpose…. In addition to practice considered as this or that in musical tradition, style or genre, then I am interested as well in praxis in the broader sense of the ubiquitous functions that music is “good for” in life. (Regelski, 2000, p. 87)

Within that frame of multiple expressive avenues, I suggest Line's (2003) recommendations resonate for music educators and cultural stakeholders. Where there is acceptance of music as personally significant and unique to individuals, in enjoying musical praxis as a cultural signature, music can manifest as a, “multi-dimensional conception of musical space as the location where the acoustic and cultural forces set up instances of musical art, a model in which the earthly capacities of sound, meaning and expression are potentially realised” (Lines, 2003, p. 174).

---

21 Komatua translates as spiritual and community leader.
Linked to this communication theme, like Phillipson and McCann (2007), I think that investigation of possible links between speech and musical development in cultural contexts bear consideration. In brief, ongoing research into the reciprocity of speech and music shows closer parallels than previously acknowledged. As Lerdahl (2003) suggests:

> music and language share the same evolutionary roots, in the form of pre-musical and pre-linguistic communicative and expressive auditory gestures involving shapes of grouping, stress, duration, contour and timbre… These elementary shapes appear to lie at the basis of the expressive utterance in language and of musical expression. (Lerdahl, 2003, p. 369)

Similarly, Trinnick, Sauni, and Allen (2010) cite Gardner (1993) in suggesting that a predisposition for music as an interdependent intellectual capability may be recognisable in early language development. Furthermore, as Lerdahl (2003) proposes, it is legitimate to emphasise, that the study of one’s own and multiple musical cultures can enhance internalisation and deeper understanding of music elements. In turn, this confidence becomes central to human ability and “map specific musical motions onto specific emotional qualities, again in reflection of real-world equivalences” (Lerdahl, 2003, p. 372).

Probing perceptions about the extent to which gifted musical ability is culturally derivative, music development is undoubtedly framed by cultural praxis. However, relative to personality and ability, an individual’s musicianship is unlikely to be constrained by cultural parameters. I propose, that musical growth and cultural praxis gel according to an individual’s preferred and evolving mode(s) of expression. Musically gifted children’s outputs are more likely to challenge established customs in favour of innovative material, regardless of particular cultural, community, aesthetic or commercial value systems. Given that ongoing praxis feeds intuitive confidence (Gardner, 1993), coupled with gifted individuals’ typical propensity to challenge, I believe, that gifted musicians insightfully encapsulate cultural perspectives about what has gone before, as well as generate insight into what is yet to come.

In the school situation, since youth function across increasingly global and electronic paradigms, more intense cross-genre and cross-cultural communication forms are a growing reality. Furthermore, musical products are increasingly representative of multifarious cultural origins. Hence, applying Bereiter and Scardomalia’s (1993) clarification of general growth toward expertise, it may not be singular cultural representation that is of interest, rather, how and why pieces originated, their distribution and level of accessibility, and how they generate accord and debate across cultures. In this frame, teachers can feel licence to engage children in as many musical camps as possible (Swanwick, 1991) an intent that I believe is encapsulated, at least in the 2000* Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum*, “They [children] are actively listening and developing
aural sensitivity while composing and performing, and they enhance their understandings of the world through listening to music within and from diverse musical contexts” (Ministry of Education, 2000a, p. 53).

Looking forward, in one of numerous calls for educators to look outside the classroom for curriculum input, Miralis (2006) seeks ever more collaborative activity amongst diverse professionals, including teachers, researchers, ethnomusicologists and anthropologists. Furthermore, Patricia Campbell (2003) reminds us of the many forms of cultural expression that have gained credibility and relevance in all levels of academic programmes in recent years. She predicts, “The reverse may be just as plausible, that music education may be a means by which ethnomusicology is made more relevant, and is revolutionized” (Campbell, 2003, p. 28).

Considering perceptions of gifted musical ability and expression in cultural contexts is a dynamic challenge, but I believe, an essential discussion in the development of music educators. Hence, a tentative summary of principles pertaining to the relationship between music and culture in a framework of gifted and talented education is that:

- Culture partially motivates and provides relevance for the development of musical skills and personal volition, through involvement in robust traditional and contemporary contexts (Engles-Schwarpaal, 2003; Rohan, 2010; Swanwick, 1999);
- The study of music and culture moves beyond simple mastery to exploration of mystery and deeper communication, thereby supports diversification of an individual’s ways of feeling, knowledge and expressive alternatives (Drummond, 2010; Mansfield, 2003);
- Relative to a learner’s situation, music is accepted as a catalyst for learner’s preparedness to feel at home in their own and other cultures (Swanwick, 1999);
- Musical expression is recognised as a constant within all cultures, hence able to inform debate, foster student voice, assist discovery about meaning and integrity, and offer the gifted learner a legitimately hybrid sense of musical identity (Burnard et al., 2008; Kelly, 2002; Mansfield, 2003).

**Part C: Theories on the nature of giftedness**

**Introduction**

The guidelines for MoE (2003-2005) funding to Heartland included responsiveness to multi-category and cultural frames of giftedness, as well as evidence-based strategies in planning and implementation. These were significant in the compilation of milestone reports for the Ministry, and assisted in the development of inquiry themes for this study. Early reading revealed that a predominance of international literature concerning music focused on conservatoire models of development, or, conversely, situations in which children were significantly disadvantaged. As Heartland’s practices amongst the eight mainstream and publically funded schools evolved to a point of conception and policy, comparison between its provision and theory became a priority.
Within this framework, the following themes were adopted:

- Conceptions of giftedness emerge through a socio-political lens;
- Current conceptions of giftedness and talent respond to a thirst for excellence in all fields of human endeavour;
- A conceptualisation of giftedness and talent focused on intelligence may limit what is acceptable as high level aptitude;
- Multiple issues affect a school’s ability to achieve a diversity of gifted domain outputs.

Conceptions of giftedness emerge through a socio-political lens

Advocacy and critique of academic and research positions about giftedness appear to be influenced by author conceptions of giftedness and talent (McAlpine, 2004b; Riley Bevan-Brown, Bicknell, Carroll-Lind & Kearney, 2004b, 2004c; Van Tassell-Baska, 2005). Furthermore, Don McAlpine (2004b) suggests that localised parameters determine who is deemed gifted, and the nature of provision. In this regard, he cites Peterson’s (2001) view that much can be learnt about alternative cultural values by people from dominant cultures.

Townsend (2004) highlights a range of on-going “e” issues22 for gifted education, at least in part caused by the allocation of resources to a minority group already perceived to have advantages over other learners. Similarly, Gagné (2005) is cautious about exemplars that annotate the lives of exceptionally gifted learners, since they constitute a tiny percentage of the population. He questions the equity of administrators authorising large investment to cater for gifted learners’ special needs (Gagné, 2005).

Borland (2005) cites authors such as Margolin (1994) and Sapon-Shevin (1994) in challenging the socio-political ethicacy of giftedness; that it is a convenient social construction for those who are already privileged. However, representative of the dominant view of the field, Piirto (1999) asserts that while many parents have the means to find accelerant or special alternatives, in the case of less well-off families, school-based gifted and talented initiatives are a socio-political necessity. Piirto’s (1999) conception coins the term “environmental suns”, being home, community and culture, and she recognises marked inequity of how children experience these. According to Piirto (1999), a school must compensate for powerful encouragers or deterrents of talent development that exist, even amongst neighbouring households.

Because of an uncertain correlation between talent and high-IQ, as well as high IQ not being a guarantee of effective productivity or contribution, Piirto (1999) claims that precise giftedness descriptors are necessary. She notes that creativity in particular needs to be described in terms of the evaluation parameters being applied; for instance life situations, a checklist or a divergent

---

22 Townsend lists “e” issues listed as equity, equality, equal opportunity, excellence, egalitarianism.
production test (Piirto, 1999). Gardner (1999) expresses similar semantic concerns around giftedness. He comments that the international adoption of multiple intelligences would have been less enthusiastic had he used a label like multiple gifts or faculties.

According to New Zealand’s Justine Rutherford (2001), discourse and labelling practices in schools, in regard to giftedness are fraught with potential to deny and damage a gifted child’s self-image. She is critical of the normalising effect of allowable discourse in schools, apparently for the sake of stable internal competency. Furthermore, Rutherford questions practices that mean gifts and talents remain hidden. “We forget that schools not only reflect society but also help to create and reproduce ‘norms’…we need to accept the responsibility of ongoing reflection on ‘the what’ and ‘the why’ of what we are creating.” (Rutherford, 2001, p. 17)

Rohan (2006) concurs with Rutherford, suggesting that music education should leave labelling to the side, with a view to building the quality of music education for all children. However, care must be taken when linking the two authors’ intentions. I believe Rutherford’s position does not necessarily mean that gifted and talented children should be invisible. Rather, in her call for school principals to open out the discourse, Rutherford suggests a holistic but individualised approach to education (Rutherford, 2001).

In the interests of greater equity, Renzulli (2004) calls for academia to move past interpretation and re-interpretation about the nature of giftedness. He proposes that all who are active in the field need to exert their positive energies into qualities of provision (Renzulli, 2004). In a further twist, Gagné (2005) notes that giftedness is not necessarily a constant, and that in general, provision needs to include on-going evaluation of consistency and alacrity of outputs. Apart from highlighting the importance of on-going high-level outputs, Gagné’s (2005) suggestions affirm a link between provision and identification. However, as to the merits of provision as an identification strategy within music, Haroutounian (2008) points out that the current emphasis on academic achievement means the arts are rarely included.

Similarly, reflecting socio-political influences, Gardner (1990) comments that much more has been explored and clarified about development in science disciplines than for artistic pursuits. According to Rutherford (2001) and Gardner (1999), how we respond to intelligences is not accidental. Gardner comments that it was almost inevitable that psychometric tests would reflect the typically strong amalgam of linguistic and logical intelligence evident amongst the psychologists and scientists who created them (Gardner, 1999). He argues that “Deciding how to employ one’s intelligences is a question of values, not computational power” (Gardner, 1999, p. 46).
Mayer (2005) calls for education to base provision plans on research evidence and comparison of initiatives. I would argue that declaring one’s socio-political lens is a significant matter in the credibility of comparison or evaluation. For example, I am in accord with Trevor Thwaites (2008), who questions interpretations of the current emphasis on literacy in the New Zealand’s curriculum. He asserts that “certain modes of life deserve our support and endeavour” and asks, “what does school performance mean outside the constructs of the knowledge-economy, credentialism, and the thrust for a homogenous learning preference?” (Thwaites, 2008, p. 18)

**Current conceptions of giftedness and talent respond to a thirst for excellence in widening fields of endeavour and personal attributes**

Since the mid 1980s, Joseph Renzulli has advocated for wider concepts of giftedness, distancing provision from dominant cultural processes, and inclusion of a wider range of academic disciplines. Furthermore, as conceptions evolve, Renzulli (2004), like Gardner (2007), proposes that it is imperative that gifted and talented learners be encouraged to use abilities in socially constructive ways. In this matter of social well-being, Gottfredson (2003) postulates that how personal abilities are regarded is reflected in a society’s willingness to tolerate difference.

When considering social capital as previously described, Renzulli (2004) nominates inherent traits such as “optimism, courage, romance with a topic or discipline, sensitivity to human concerns, physical and mental energy, and vision and a sense of destiny” (pp. 65-66). He further contends that a shift from dominant norms is appropriate in order for girls or learners from minority cultures to have a better chance of being included in advanced opportunities and suggests that:

If we provided a broader range of students with highly challenging and exciting learning options, we will see more students displaying gifted behaviours and higher levels of motivation for challenging and engaging learning experiences. (Renzulli, 2004, p. 66)

Renzulli and Reis caution about school house giftedness, suggesting that creative productivity offers a more reliable barometer. Their popular three ring conception is based on the gifted learner showing above average ability, task commitment and creativity in a domain (Renzulli & Reis, 1985).

Gardner’s concept of multiple intelligences, described by McAlpine (2004b) as multiple “abilities”, similarly offers an applied framework for evaluating giftedness. Gardner (1999) indicates that his approach responds to generic psychometric approaches not being particularly reliable in terms of productivity. He reinforces the contemporary relevance of multiple
intelligences, commenting that advocates of psychometric testing have simply widened the sphere of tests to take into account multiple intelligences (now proposed to be eight\textsuperscript{23}) (Gardner, 1999).

Similar to Moltzen (2004b) and McAlpine (2004b), Gardner (1999) calls for greater consideration of cultural parameters in notions of ability. He asserts intelligence does reflect the individual’s capability, and looking to the future claims, “I suggest that the big challenge facing the deployment of human resources is how best to take advantage of the uniqueness conferred on us as a species exhibiting several intelligences” (Gardner, 1999, p. 45). Similarly Li (2004), concerning cultural perspectives of giftedness, reinforces intellectual ability by claiming that cultural appreciation of domain specific ability can “yield insight into human high ability and excellence”.

Gagné (2003, 2005) considers chance as the most significant factor in emerging talent, for example birthplace or a family’s socio-economic level. He proposes that people can develop as talented in one or more aptitude domains across intellectual, creative, socio-affective, and perceptual motor areas, plus a range of perceptual facilities. I concur with his proposal that intrapersonal, environmental, and chance factors interact to produce talent from innate potential. Hence, the training and application opportunity available to a gifted individual is significant indeed. Talents, at mild or extreme levels, range across what Gagné (2005) terms academic pursuits, the arts, sporting, and business realms. I concur with Gagné’s broad canvas of pursuits, which he proposes offers greater flexibility than Gardner’s multiple intelligences. Furthermore, as for Renzull’s personality characteristics, Gagné (2005) considers that socially effective application is integral to talent development. However, he asserts that innate potential remains the fundamental ingredient of gifted productivity.

As McAlpine (2004b) notes, broadening conceptualisations bring ever more responsibility for educators to understand the relationship between gifted characteristics, identification and provision. At the same time, when looking at adults regarded as geniuses, Howe (2004) concludes, “Once we discard the idea of geniuses as a breed apart, we can see that knowledge about formative events in the early lives of geniuses has considerable relevance to the rest of us” (p. 109). My interpretation of the current situation, for gifted education researchers in particular, is that there is a need to be mindful that assumptions and conclusions concerning giftedness theory are increasingly contextually dependent. Secondly, discussions between educators need to

\textsuperscript{23} Gardner’s seven intelligences of linguistic, logical mathematical, musical, bodily kinaesthetic, spatial, interpersonal and intrapersonal are supplemented by a naturalistic intelligence which includes environmental and spiritual response capability in the individual.
take into account a growing insistence for clarification of excellence in an ever increasing range of domains and sub-domains, and that the outcomes have relevance for all learners.

**A conceptualisation of giftedness and talent focused on intelligence may limit what is acceptable as high-level aptitude.**

The measurement and significance of intelligence generates volatile discussion in the international literature on gifted and talented. Tannenbaum (2000) reinforces the socio-political status of intelligence:

Those who emphasise the importance of \( g \) concentrate on human differences in the abilities that relate most strongly to \( g \) and are at the heart of every curriculum in sciences and letters. Whoever excels in these disciplines is deemed most likely to enlarge the world's knowledge bank and to preserve and advance cultural life on the planet. Discreditors of \( g \) focus mainly on diversity rather than just difference and prefer to show that more people can demonstrate excellence in at least one of a variety of aptitudes than in the restricted range of competencies subsumed under \( g \). (p. 50)

Tannenbaum (2000) asserts that an underlying \( g \) factor is a necessity within selection processes. He considers that while alternatives are more egalitarian and may lead to qualifications, they are of lesser significance in outputs of gifted people. Similarly Gagné (2005) argues that intelligence measures are by far the best indicator of academic achievement as they account for five times more variation in ability than any other factor, such as motivation or volition.

Van Tassel-Baska (2005) also describes a lesser role for the environment, and suggests that since non-intellective traits such as motivation, task commitment, and creativity are elusive, they are best evaluated over time, for example through musical performance. She points out that even though intelligence or \( g \) is an accepted premise for the measurement of human facility:

High \( g \) factor intelligence that is not linked well to a specific domain of functioning in the modern world may bring great satisfaction to the individual but make little impression on the society that has spawned it. (Van Tassel-Baska, 2005, p. 361)

Similarly, Piirto (1999) considers that IQ\(^{24}\) test results can be overemphasised in regard to domain potential. For example, she cites Simonton's (1986), suggestion that IQ is unlikely to influence creative achievement above a certain measure. In addition, Deborah Fraser (2004) comments, that if IQ was the only criterion, 70% of creative students would not be selected for gifted programmes. Piirto (1999) makes a further distinction in reminding us that those attributed with high IQ are not the only gifted people. In this regard, while Gardner (1999) supports Sternberg's critique of narrow concepts of intelligence, he criticises paper tests as the predominant means to

---

\(^{24}\) IQ refers to intelligence quotient.
gather evidence about aptitude, and questions the relevance of high IQ\(^{25}\) when people so labelled can “flounder outside of a school setting or [are] those who, at a high school or college reunion, have found their academically average or below-average peers to be the richest or most powerful alumni at the event” (p. 23).

Gruber and Mandl (2000) offer an alternative perspective regarding innate potential. While acknowledging Ceci and Ruiz’s (1992) support of a \(g\) factor being accountable for the largest portion of variance in high achievement, they also note how Mönks (2002), Renzulli (2006) and Vygotsky (1999) determine the importance of non-academic and personality disposition factors in the manifestation of gifted potential. I suggest that because innate and environmental factors form a reciprocal dynamism, psychologically based enrichment theories fall short. Gruber and Mandl (2000) call for accelerated provision in “learning environments that seek to avoid the problem of inert knowledge and that facilitate the acquisition of complex, applicable knowledge and skills” (p. 385). In essence, Gruber and Mandl (2000) seem to be advocating for integration of the two current research avenues, that is, high ability measurement and elevation of applied expertise. I believe they side with literature that recognises expertise as substantially attributable to social conditions Bereiter and Scardomalia (1993), as well as cultural climate (Csikzentmihaly & Wolfe, 2000).

Given all of these considerations, it appears that intelligence can be an inert attribute, therefore unlikely to be a sole predictor of domain ability such as musical giftedness. A more helpful giftedness conception includes personality and situational factors at point of identification. For example, Sternberg’s (2004) model focuses on successful intelligence, or what might be termed as a non-domain specific set of environmental adaptive qualities. These can be summarised as:

\begin{itemize}
  \item achieve one’s goals in life, given one’s sociocultural context
  \item capitalise on strengths and correct or compensate for weaknesses
  \item adapt to, shape, and select appropriate environments
  \item utilise a combination of analytical, creative and practical abilities (Sternberg, p. 329).
\end{itemize}

Sternberg (2000) reasons that the gifted individual demonstrates intelligence (though not necessarily test benchmarked), creativity and wisdom, and that these synthesise in effective human functioning. Sternberg (2000, 2004) suggests that metacomponents, or metacognitive

---

\(^{25}\) Differences in \(g\) or multiple intelligences may be essentially tautological, reflecting the route by which one approaches concepts, rather than significant differences. For example, Van Tassel-Baska questions Gardner’s theory, in that multiple intelligences do not allow for a level of general intelligence, which Van Tassel-Baska suggests may broker the manifestation of specific aptitude within an area of human interest.
learning skills, thinking skills, knowledge and self-motivation facilitate the development and interaction of innate attributes.

According to Van Tassel-Baska (2005), Csikszentmihalyi (1996) places greater emphasis on specific domains being responsible for transforming from “in the mind” to “out in the world”. This requires “the rigor of an organized body of learning [in a domain] to provide the grist for development” (Van Tassel-Baska, 2005, p. 362). In that regard, Gembris and Davidson (2002) note that the extent of homogeneity in a music sub-domain impacts on the necessary or likely influence of the environment. They claim that where there is less homogenous training, as is typical in popular music, “the relative contribution of innate predispositions declines” (Gembris & Davidson, 2002, p. 18).

Roger Moltzen’s (2004a) description of gifted children’s characteristics succinctly summarises the traditional concept of $g$ as the ability to reason, think abstractedly, learn from experience and comprehend and solve complex problems. As I have found in most New Zealand literature, Moltzen (2004a) indicates that a minority of researchers see giftedness as a high score on a test. Furthermore, even if it is a primary characteristic of giftedness, the concept of intelligence can be viewed more broadly. He also suggests that since notions and characteristics of giftedness and talent have expanded, it would be appropriate for approaches regarding identification to be multi-dimensional (Moltzen, 2004a).

In summary, the notion of a $g$ factor remains consistent in the literature as a fundamental attribute of gifted individuals. Under current social conditions, Renzulli’s model identifying above average ability rather than IQ as one gifted attribute offers a balanced and manageable framework for providers (McAlpine, 2004a). Given discussions in previous sections of this literature review, it appears that $g$ does not automatically convert to productivity. I believe that a more useful approach is for $g$ to be seen as interdependent with volition, creative rage, aesthetic predisposition, cultural disposition and intuitive wisdom, and cloaked by chance. It appears that these elements compensate for greater or lesser amounts of intelligence, and importantly are fundamental to motivation and diligence (Howe, 2004), necessary in the production of exceptional outputs. As Sternberg (2005) suggests, tests are one indicator of intellectual skills, but educators need not assume that an individual is not smart because he or she does not score well.

Moltzen (2004a) reflects other New Zealand literature, which suggests there is little will to constrain giftedness to a measure of intelligence. Rather, there is acceptance of particular personality characteristics and environmental influences being fundamental to talent. Gagné (2005) is similarly pragmatic in his approach to identification. He acknowledges field constraint
including examinations, performances, or competitions. He claims, “Measuring talent is a straightforward enterprise: It simply corresponds to outstanding memory of the specific skills of any occupational field” (Gagné, 2005, p. 103). However, I suggest that knowing more about the motivation for an individual’s choices to retain and produce in a domain is an ongoing challenge for researchers and educators.

**Multiple issues affect schools’ ability to achieve a diversity of gifted domain outputs.**

In the current New Zealand socio-political education environment, I perceive a trend toward responding to giftedness through situated and contextual conceptions. Piirto (1999) sees gifted outputs as dependent on a diverse range of affective characteristics including creativity, insight, imagination, intuition, openness, sense of naivety, over-excitability, domain passion, perceptiveness, perfectionism, persistence, resilience, risk taking, self-discipline, self-efficacy, tolerance of ambiguity and volition. Citing Csikszentmihalyi et al. (1993), she notes a dependence on context, but also asserts, that force of personality and an apparently innate ability to optimize productive flow are additional requirements of effective gifted adults (Piirto, 1999, p. 32).

Like me, Piirto (1999) is not anxious to discount genetic factors. In support, she discusses Plomin’s (1997) twin studies which conclude that talent in socially recognised domains is inborn, innate, and mysterious, even though accelerated development toward adult perceptions and predictive domain behaviours are typical markers. Piirto (1999) supports Gagné’s emphasis on intelligence, although she claims that the environment is more significant than in Gagné’s model. Plucker and Barab (2005) go further by stating that where traditional approaches have moved to more student-oriented and self-regulating approaches in fostering effective achievement, the issue is no longer student versus environment but how the two interact. Van Tassel-Baska (2005) aptly describes this integration:

> At a simplistic level, then, giftedness may be considered evidence of advanced development across intellectual areas, advanced development within a specific academic or arts related area, or unusual organizational power for bringing about desired results. (Van Tassel-Baska, 2005, p. 362)

In regard to what keeps learners motivated, Elliott Eisner (2002) places a high emphasis on aesthetic volition. Looking to the future, he asserts that aesthetic engagement is critical in understanding the wide differential between what a child could do at school, and subsequently produces. As Eisner explains:

---

26 According to Piirto (1999), emotional/personality factors take a special place and are recognised as being important newer research fields.
We want to promote that appetite for learning, and it ought to be built on the
satisfactions that students receive in our classrooms. It is the aesthetic that represents the
highest forms of intellectual achievement, and it is the aesthetic that provides the natural
high and contributes the energy we need to want to pursue an activity again and again.
(Eisner, 2000, p. 582)

Parkyn (1975) similarly places gifted children’s aesthetic responses alongside significant scientific
understandings. He emphasises the role of choice in an individual’s intuitive passion to know and
pursue27:

When we say: “I know such and such is true”, we are indicating a mode of experience or
knowledge [scientific] that is different from the one of which we say: “I know or I feel
the such and such is beautiful” [aesthetic]. The aesthetic perception of experience is of
great importance to humankind. It is the basis of some of our deepest responses to the
universe. (Parkyn, 1975, p. 7)

In response to the growing list of gifted domains, Plucker and Barab (2005) suggest that
meaningful responses to children’s aptitude across more components of the school curricula is a
priority, including artistic, social capital and organisational domains. Similarly, Renzulli (2005)
acknowledges the special efforts demanded of educators, particularly where children face
environmental challenges and educational and social poverty, in order for provision to focus “on
the many kinds of aptitudes, talents, and potentials for advanced learning and creative
productivity that exist in all school populations” (Renzulli, 2005, p. 82).

I concur with Moltzen’s (2004a) proposal, again representative of New Zealand research, that
concentrating on potential and actualisation of gifted behaviours rather than responding to a
fixed measure of ability, such as \( g \), means fewer contentious decisions about who is and who is
not gifted. McAlpine (2004b) highlights the importance of clarity of conceptualisation by
suggesting that teachers have adhered to Renzulli’s three ring model28, since it offers a
compromise between too many or too few gifted categories.

However, McAlpine (2004b) cautions that teachers acting as gatekeepers reflect dominant culture
value-orientations. It seems to me, that dominant curricula can also act as effective curriculum
gatekeepers. As Riley (2004a) asserts, matching provision to the child “both as an individual and
member of a group, is central to the curriculum, which ideally is designed to enhance his or her
potential or demonstrated strengths and interests as an autonomous, lifelong learner” (p. 338).

In summary, Freeman (2005) reminds us that there are approximately one hundred conceptions
of giftedness evident in the literature. Similarly, the list of potential gifted abilities is expanding to

27 Clark (2003) predicted intuition to be an exciting dimension for future research.
28 The three rings are above average intelligence, creativity and task commitment.
cater for increasingly diverse intellectual, social, and emotional attributes. According to Renzulli (2005), it is exciting that the growing diversity of gifted domains means more learners are able to move along a giftedness continuum. However I suggest that because of the growing diversity of domain and sub-domains and the swirl of equity debates for the benefit of teachers and schools, calls by researchers such as Mayer (2005) and Moltzen (2004a) for clearer and more straightforward approaches and theories are both timely and important.

In the New Zealand literature cited, I observe a preference for eclectic theories of giftedness, an emphasis on priority curricula, and for most schools, provision occurring through a differentiated curriculum and grounded in generic thinking skills. On that basis, in my view, it is likely that learners capable of significant outputs in domains such as music will be underachieving. As Riley (2004a) states about the diversity of models and approaches to gifted and talented children in New Zealand:

Cognitive objectives, which embed higher level processes in advanced content, and affective objectives, include moral, ethical, cultural and personal goals should be defined…. An eclectic approach, using a mixture of elements from several models, may be suitable; however, in applying parts rather than a whole, the models may lose their effectiveness. (p. 339)

In regard to music, Robinson (2005) is clear about the importance of school provision concerning the child who is capable of learning quickly, is hungry to learn and has peculiar talents, albeit which have yet to be recognised. Authors such as Piirto (1999) and Renzulli (2005a) deliver a powerful message that recognises significant domain attributes may be latent but remain hidden amongst a wider cross section of learners than currently identified. As I interpret the cited literature, this is a clear justification for more inclusive provision.

Following is a summary of parameters that could form a working conception of giftedness:

- Likely to be represented by above average $g$ or ability for reasoning, abstraction, and problem solving. However, the potential ability may remain inert, except in combination with volition, creative urgency, and aesthetic predisposition and intuitive wisdom;
- Subject to dynamic intellectual and semantic debates that are influenced by numerous theories and socio-political parameters. Hence, schools must necessarily scrutinise theory as they endeavour to balance:
  a) perceptions of advantage that giftedness can be perceived to give an individual,
  b) implications for the majority where scarce resources are allocated to a few,
  c) the need for innovative responses that can realise high end outputs commensurate with gifted children’s potential in and across diverse disciplines;

---

• More closely aligned with international domain specific outputs than in New Zealand. In any domain, it appears that high achievers demonstrate actualisation, creativity and speed of process (Van Tasssel-Baska, 2005), capacity of working memory (Gruber & Mandl, 2000), aesthetic sensitivity (Eisner, 2002), determination, diligence and commitment (Howe, 2004; Mayer, 2005). More recently, attention to social capital has become a contributing factor in what is accepted by the field as extraordinary achievement (Gardner, 2007);

• Even if challenging to current community and social values, a conception requires a mandate for sustainable innovation and review in the interests of longer-term well-being which manifest in local, global, cultural and community outputs (Gardner, 2007; Renzulli, 2005a).

• May emerge through product generated outside and beyond the provision capability of schools.

• A useful label for distinguishing high-level learner aptitude, capability, and passion in a domain(s). The intellectual and personality faculties of individuals labelled as gifted remain multifarious, complex and vicarious concerning their nature, actualisation, and application.

**Part D: The nature and identification of high level musical ability**

Music Heartland had unquestioned latitude to foster musical development in what appears to have been a unique programme in New Zealand’s educational tapestry. Yet was there anything different about the musical attributes of the children selected for Music Heartland? I believe that a host of music educators, including Murphy (1999), Paynter (2002) Elliott (1995) and Rohan (2006), and psychologist John Sloboda (2005a) have correctly asserted that every learner offers undoubted musical potential. Hence, literature served to assist the differentiation of Heartland children’s musical outputs and aptitude became significant for this study with the resulting themes:

• The mix of cognitive, intelligence and socio-political theories of giftedness may render the musically gifted learner vulnerable,

• There is fundamental agreement about core musical giftedness attributes, though the mix and balance varies across conceptions,

• While it may be difficult to pull apart attributes of expression, volition, intuition, and aestheticism, consideration of their effect is critical in a conception of musical giftedness.

**The mix of cognitive, intelligence and socio-political theories of giftedness may render the musically gifted learner vulnerable.**

In 1992, Fiske asserted that models of musical cognition must account for multi-cultural musical diversity, rather than assuming that western Classical Music mechanisms are responsible for cognitive insight. His summary of research into cognitive pattern comparison and decision-making mechanisms cited Langer (1942) and Meyer (1956) in support of the claim that music responses have strong parallels with language development. Furthermore, musical aptitude was identified as an intellectual parameter rather than a copy of other abilities (Fiske, 1992).
In Fiske’s conceptualisation, formal structures are musically logical or musically-grammatically correct, but considered non-designative (Fiske, 1992). According to Fiske, cognitive music precepts are not about mechanized and passive perception or stylistic appreciation of elements, such as form or harmony. Rather, “cognition is primarily [a] problem solving ability that for music includes tonal-rhythmic pattern detection, identification, discrimination, and evaluation, and the active comparison of patterns for the discovery of interpattern relationships” (Fiske, 1992, p. 367).

However, Davidson and Scripp (1992) caution against adopting a single attribute such as problem-solving as representative of musical cognition because of the diversity of situations and operations it has to fit. From field research with young children, they deduce that a network of relational knowledge is essential for artistic thinking. For example, the music learner asked to sing the final and first phrases of “Happy Birthday” realises they are different. Davidson and Scripp (1992) suggest that this understanding relies on the integration of a number of independent cognitive skills rather than musical skills in isolation. They indicate that multiple views are required for the reconciliation and mutual regulation of the different forms of knowledge. Similarly, Shuter-Dyson (1981) suggests that research on both whole music sections, as well as atomistic analysis aids our understanding of non-verbal cognition and brain functions.

Significantly, in my view, Davidson and Scripp (1992) propose that accuracy of music rendition may be the least important cognitive attribute. From the perspective of listeners, the absence of coordination and sensitive integration of music elements are the most telling or disturbing factors. Regarding the evidence of musical gifts, Davidson and Scripp (1992) suggest that the nature and degree to which an individual produces, perceives, and reflects is indicative of the type and sophistication of development. They recommend that researchers from psychology, music, or education domains do not carve up the study of musical cognition, and suggest that researchers avoid isolating cognitive or kinaesthetic elements by not assuming these are distinct to intellect or body, or private, social, and cultural settings.

Like Haroutounian (2000), Davidson and Scripp (1992) suggest that the study of components of ability is less important compared to “A comprehensive approach to cognitive skills in music [that] reveals the relation and integration of production, perception, and reflection supporting musical artistry” (p. 411). In my view, this has parallels with neuro-science researcher Richard Edwards’ (2008) position. He describes some researcher’s open amazement at “unexpectedly widespread neural activity observed during music processing” (Edwards, 2008, p. 6), which to him, signals the importance of macro study of the brain’s functions.
Regarding measurement, Christopher Murphy (1999) asserts that there is a proliferation of elitist giftedness identification practices. As a musician and teacher, Murphy suggests that musical intelligence tests have denied access to music learning for children, many of whom confound the evidence by demonstrating high capability in adulthood (Murphy, 1999). He suggests that traditional conceptions of musical ability tell us little about the nature of musical intelligence, or how it develops. Murphy proposes that whether or not musical ability is learned or innate is a rhetorical question, and favouring nurture declares that the priority for educators is to realise all learners’ potential to engage musically.

Similarly, based on extensive research and review, Sloboda (2005b) suggests that estimates of musical hereditability are low, and advocates for the existence of a common musical receptive ability. According to Sloboda (2005b), the environment is therefore dominant, although it appears to produce a “large number of walking wounded” (p. 271). For example, he comments that music is commonly regarded as an effeminate pursuit in Britain, or that children wilt because of humiliating early experiences.

Canadian David Elliott (1995) claims that excluding the presence of congenital deficiencies, every person has the conscious powers necessary to make music and listen competently. He suggests that intelligence and high levels of consciousness are not solely responsible for the growth of musicianship and/or creativity, rather that musical ability hinges on a symbiotic relationship of body and mind (Elliott, 1995). Elliott advocates for a more complete music epistemology in which musical thinking and knowing is not perceived to be about words and symbols, but is manifested in actions. He terms this procedural musical knowledge, and suggests that this practical adaptation to the musical environment can occur long before a learner has the intellectual capacity to verbalise concepts (Elliott, 1995).

Regarding artistry, Elliott, like Fiske (1992), claims that accrued knowledge is the basis of intuition. He states that performers:

[quote]
think partly in relation to sound patterns and action patterns defined by a score (or a remembered performance). But they also think in relation to less clearly stipulated guidelines, including histories and standards of musical practice, possibilities of interpretation, the feedback that arises in a specific context, and their own musical judgments and intuitions. (Elliott, 1995, pp. 60-61)
[/quote]

---

30 In Elliott’s conception, procedural knowledge emerges through the development of four other forms of musical knowledge being, formal (verbal facts, concepts, descriptions, theories – in short all textbook type information...), informal (reflect critically in action...make musical judgments ... understanding of the musical situation or context ), impressionistic (intuition...one line of action is better than another), and supervisory or metacognition (the disposition and ability to monitor, adjust, balance, manage, oversee, and otherwise regulate one’s musical thinking...), each which are situated in a context of history, style or culture.
Elliott (1995) suggests it is this supervisory knowledge which mediates the creation of original musical works and new musical practices within a tradition. In proposing five levels of praxis-based personal musicianship up to the highest level of integrated responses, like Murphy (1999), Elliott suggests these are evidenced by more insightful and creative products with a strong emphasis on problem-solving ability:

The artist’s level of thinking-in-action is so rich that he or she not only solves all problems of musical execution in a composition, she deliberately searches for and finds increasingly subtle opportunities for (or problems of) artistic expression. (Elliott, 1995, p. 71)

On the surface, it would appear that these researchers consider musical ability as an attribute that is available to everyone. However, in probing more deeply into a conception such as Elliot’s (1995), I would argue that the acknowledgement of aural facility, memory, knowledge building predispositions, interdependence of artistry, and a concept of metacognitive supervisory facility imply innate and possibly differentiated individual capacity.

Exploring difference further, Stollery and McPhee’s (2002) approach to musical intelligence or aptitude include capacity for personal level engagement and response. Similarly, citing Schlaug, Lutz, Huang and Stenmetz’s research (1995) concerning right and left brain influences, Stollery and McPhee (2002) advocate for music to be valued because of its stimulation of metacognitive functioning and influence on wider achievement. They suggest that applied musical gifts “indicate a situation where receptive, creative, responsive and technical skills are at a highly developed level” (Stollery & McPhee, 2002, p. 90). From their research analysis of high school students experiencing varied opportunity, Stollery and McPhee (2002) also suggest that differences in excellence lie in technical facility, drive to participate, and sustained effort.

However, Elliott (1995), Stollery and McPhee (2002) offer little guidance as to the relative significance of intelligence and volition in growth towards technical excellence. Instead they espouse curriculum design as the broker but highlight the contribution of metacognitive skills in cases of rapid development. Similarly, their advocating for music as a catalyst in each of Gardner’s (1983) multiple intelligences has inherent implications for cognitive aptitude. As a result, while I concur with their criticism of historical over-emphasis on musical giftedness and intelligence, I suggest, that Stollery and McPhee’s (2002) assertion that differences in musical achievement are manufactured by the situation avoids the reality of difference concerning individual potential. Hence, in my view, their noted themes, for example receptiveness, a scale of  

---

31 Observable in absolute terms or on an incremental scale.

32 Stollery & McPhee suggest desirable curriculum includes experimentation, improvisation and assimilation with real world and experiences that are crystallising rather than paralyzing in nature.
musical capability, metacognitive capability, an indefinable spark in some music learners, and cognitive aptitude aligned with multiple intelligences, all support the presence of an underlying intellectual precocity that is unevenly spread amongst individuals.

Subnotik and Jarvin’s (2005) three level model of musical giftedness better acknowledges the effect of innate facility. Based on examples of classical musicians, their domain-specific conception acknowledges that speed of learning and tenacity are integral with development. Their research suggests there are three non-teachable attributes of musical giftedness; effectiveness of musical communication, intrinsic motivation\(^{33}\), and sufficient charisma to draw in listeners (Subnotik & Jarvin, 2005). Like Howe (1990), Subnotik and Jarvin (2005) make a distinction between \(g\) and musical intelligence. As they say, “in the case of many important domains outside the intellectual and academic realm, general intelligence does not describe the foundational ability associated with great performance or idea generation” (Subnotik & Jarvin, 2005, p. 352). Citing Sternberg (1996) and Csikszentmihalyi (1998), Subnotik and Jarvin (2005) highlight the gifted child’s cognitive advantages in his or her capacity to acquire, store and utilise explicit and implicit domain and field knowledge\(^{34}\) which are implicit in the progression towards expertise.

As previously discussed, Sloboda (2005b) asserts that the concept of talent is a myth. Proposing common musical ability, he considers that social factors are significant and causal, and that deep pleasure sustains an individual’s commitment to learning and achievement. However he does not rule out genetics as a factor as he cites the memory of some performers, and the extraordinary style of performers in sub-domains of music. On that basis, Sloboda’s (2005b) separation of talent and trainable ability deserves careful scrutiny, because in my view there are firm inferences of differentials in cognitive brokering. Writing about the brain and music, Levitin (2006) comments, that “it may result from an innate or hard-wired predisposition in the way their brains formed” (p. 215). He concludes that:

> Although music certainly uses brain structures and neural circuits that other activities don’t, the process of becoming a musical expert — whether a composer or performer — requires much of the same personality traits as becoming an expert in other domains, especially diligence, patience, motivation, and plain old-fashioned stick-to-it-ness. (Levitin, 2006, p. 216)

---

\(^{33}\) Subnotik and Jarvin describe intrinsic motivation as love of musical communication regardless of social barriers such as income.

\(^{34}\) Here field is regarded as the pinnacle of acquired wisdom, skill and knowledge about and within the domain, but seen as passive and not necessarily about new work.
Winner and Martino’s (2000) discussion of cognitive precocity offers evidence of striking musical development prior to formal training as being indicative of innate ability. However they note that many identified children do not persevere, and of those who continue to engage, only creative geniuses, those who are restless, rebellious and dissatisfied with the status quo are likely to change the domain (Winner and Martino, 2000; Ziegler, 2005). Regarding predisposition, like Piirto (1999), Winner and Martino’s (2000) conception recognises the pull of the music domain for gifted individuals, and that on-going and innovative product reflects cognitive proclivity.

In summary, researchers working predominantly in education settings appropriately call for the rich development of all children’s musical ability. The influence of the environment and personality characteristics on musical growth appear to be dominant, hence, are often accompanied by an assertion of music’s significance in school curricular decisions. However, it appears that since authors identify a variety of predispositions, an underlying attestation of nature is likely, even if not stated overtly.

In response to this dilemma, one that I believe all involved in music education grapple with, I propose that there is sufficient evidence to suggest that innate factors frame and perpetuate musical ability without guaranteeing its realisation. While it may be of little consequence in isolation, it seems that innate potential helps explain radically different responses of children to the same musical exposure. Thus, while much of the literature moves difference and predisposition to one side, I believe that without including innate cognitive potential, be it specific to music or in an integrated form, explanations of high-level ability including differences in artistry, speed of accomplishment, aesthetic sensitivity, and potential for domain change remain incomplete.

Evans, Bickell, and Pendarvis’s (2004) research highlights what I regard as the current dichotomy of opinion between innate potential and environment. Their research reveals that musically gifted children recognise innate advantages in their personal musical development, but to a surprising extent feel that family and friends are discouraging. I suggest that this insider perspective signals a responsibility for the environment; to be more celebratory of what only a few children intuitively know that they can produce and model. Furthermore, Haroutounian (2008) cites Bamberger’s (1995) findings of musically talented children, who naturally and quickly move from one intellectual focus to another in problem-solving musical tasks. Finally, as Morrisey (2001) writes about Jimmy Hendrix, “It wasn’t by accident he got that good. Nobody gets that good by accident…. We cannot know for sure if Hendrix had the potential for high academic achievement, but he undoubtedly had an immense innate intelligence.” (p. 10)
There is fundamental agreement about core musical giftedness attributes though the mix, and balance across varied conceptions

Attribute by attribute, high-level musical ability appears to be a relatively straightforward concept. Gardner (1983) comments that there is little dispute about the constituent elements being pitch and rhythm followed by an appreciation for timbre. Piirto (1999) lists spontaneity, focus and preference for music as a mode of expression, alongside aural elements that include pitch and rhythm acuity, phrase structure, and music memory. Similarly, Winner and Martino’s (2000) exploration of musical giftedness begins:

The core ability of the musically gifted child is a sensitivity to the structure of music – tonality, key, harmony, and rhythm. Sensitivity to structure allows the child to remember music, to play it back with ease either vocally or with an instrument, and to transpose, improvise, and even invent. (Winner & Martino, 2000, p. 103)

As additional attributes, Winner and Martino (2000) include greater than average interest in musical sounds, as well as memory and repetition of material of a familiar style. Like Piirto (1999) and Gardner (1983), Winner and Martino (2000) link these characteristics with an appreciation of musical structure. Perfect pitch is added as a possible attribute, although they note that if instruction starts prior to age four, then trainability increases (Winner & Martino, 2000).

Regarding notation, Winner and Martino (2000) consider reading is a skill that can be associated with musical giftedness, although it is not consistently included in conceptions.

Freeman’s (2000) music and visual arts research gave priority to aural or visual memory for identification purposes in a learner accessible manner. For example, to test for aural images of pitch sequences, she sought to minimise the effect of prior experience by using chime bars. Her results showed that the most distinctive characteristic of giftedness was an ability to evaluate and reproduce rhythm (Freeman, 2000).

Haroutounian’s (2000) investigation of identification practices clarified her conception of musical giftedness. Nine participants (teachers, music professionals and administrators) provided data about effective talent observation, and its application to the general classroom (Haroutounian, 2000). Giftedness criteria emerged from the data as a mix of perceptual/cognitive (labelled metaperception), creative aptitude, behavioural and motivational elements (Haroutounian, 2000). Like Winner and Martino’s (2000) concept of sensitivity, the preferred indicators were more about discrimination than a child’s standard of production. Interestingly, the data revealed inconsistent messages about aural acuity as an indicator of giftedness. For instance in formal survey data, Haroutounian’s (2000) research participants rated pitch accuracy as essential.

35 Chime bars are noted as an unfamiliar but accessible instrument type by Freeman.
Without exception however, comments made informally indicated, “this ability though useful to observe in the identification process, should not be a screening-out factor for potential talent” (Haroutnounian, 2000, p. 145).

Regarding order of preference, Haroutounian’s (2000) participant commentary showed that rhythmic facility was more accepted as integral with potential talent than pitch. Further, my interpretation of the data suggests that specific musical acuities, coordination and fine motor skills were useful observations but not necessarily precursors of musical talent. In fact participants suggested that rote coordination was a more likely indicator of giftedness36. However, based on previous research, Haroutounian (2000) commented that regardless of how assured robotic playing might be, it does not suggest a personal connection to the sounds. In a more recent paper, Haroutounian (2008) grouped identification themes around aptitude and ability, creative interpretation and commitment. The aptitude factors included response to pulse, subtle rhythm and tempi shifts, as well as discerning pitch, rhythm and tone colour differences, and differentiation of sounds in music contexts.

Richardson (1990), writing for primary and intermediate grade teachers in the United States, suggests that available identification inventories are appropriate and that teachers “need not reinvent the wheel” (pp. 1-2). Multiple indicators of pitch and rhythmic acuities, along with appreciation of phrase structure and volition complete the identification picture. Emphasis on musical structure, particularly phrase and phrase completion, is evident, and are in common with Piirto’s (1999), and Gardner’s (1983) giftedness characteristics. As Gardner (1983) explains, even learners with no previous musical training “appear to have ‘schemas’ or frames’ for hearing music – expectations about what a well-structured phrase or section of a piece should be – as well as at least a nascent ability to complete a segment in a way that makes musical sense” (p. 109).

Like Richardson (1990), Baum, Owen and Oreck’s (2004) conception is broadly based on Renzulli’s (2005b) three ring model 37. Rhythm (learner replicated and created), perception of sound (pitch and tone matching, replication and independence), and coordination are cognitive factors that integrate with motivation, task commitment and creative potential. However, once again, rhythmic facility stands out as the key element for identification purposes.

In summary, my professional experience had convinced me that a gifted music learner demonstrates potential through quickness and motivated replication of rhythm, as well as pitch.

---

36 Rote coordination identified as the naturalness of scales or other patterned or congruent material such as studies.

37 Three ring model consists interactions amongst above average ability, creativity and task commitment.
patterns, and possibly creative aptitude by use of voice or learner-accessible instruments. In light of the literature presented in this review, while pitch acuity is fundamental to most forms of musicality, it does not consistently appear as a universal early identifier, and some researchers acknowledge that it is developable. Rhythmic acuity, however, is a universally accepted attribute of giftedness, either in replicated or created outputs. Furthermore, most researchers advocate for the inclusion of creative aptitude in identification criteria.

The literature does not appear to support particular standards or benchmarks as signals of giftedness. Current core musical attributes predominantly appear as fluid parameters. I believe this represents a shift from earlier and more rigid conceptions, or measures of musical intelligence. Furthermore, the absence of benchmarks suggests the significance of local conditions, culture and community, and diverse musical genre within an identification framework.

Because music identifiers appear in a flexible framework, cognitive ability and flexibility is valued, rather than musical intelligence per se. In this regard, memorisation of either rhythm or pitch phrases along with appreciation of phrase structures appears to be significant in most gifted conceptions. In my view, this highlights the role of metacognition as integral to musical giftedness. Supporting this, New Zealand writer Chris Archer (2003) lists a variety of cognitive attributes (outside those concerning musical acuities) as identification parameters that are appropriate for secondary school students. Similarly, Reimer and Wright (1992) place musical potential first as they describe educable musical capacity to be “limited by (1) the level of each person’s inherent perceptual intelligence, and (2) the opportunities afforded by that person’s society to actualize his or her potential” (p. 155).

The literature highlights the imponderable influence of previous training or other social motivational factors, even in first identification processes (Green, 2001). In this regard, there is a clear caution about accepting clever rote patterns or technical studies as meaningful indicators of giftedness; educators are to be wary of the effects of previous experience. I believe this also has ramifications for one-off assessment, which is likely to favour children with previous experience.

Finally, I propose that the cited literature supports the premise that high-level musical characteristics are variable and distinguishable amongst individuals. In my opinion, viewpoints such as Stollery and McPhee’s (2002) proposal that 95% of children are musically gifted, and Sloboda’s (2005a) strong advocacy for the environment as dominant in musical ability, require careful investigation.

---

38 Learner accessible instruments such as tuned percussion.
While it may be difficult to precisely unmerge attributes of expression, volition, intuition and aestheticism, consideration of their effect is critical in a conception of musical giftedness. From my exploration of what leads to learner difference and realisation of talent, I suggest that cognition and meta-cognitive abilities integrate with a diversity of significant musical acuities and personality factors. To support this, aesthetic sensitivity and volition have already emerged as important factors in giftedness theory as discussed in this review. In terms of cognitive attributes, I propose, that while all individuals have potential, there appears to be variation in its depth and/or ease of application.

I have already adopted Elliott Eisner's (2002) position regarding aesthetic sensitivity: that aesthetic well-being significantly influences learner decisions about on-going domain involvement. Like Swanwick (1999) and Parkyn (1984), I support a model in which elements of intellect and perception are brokered by what individuals, field or communities conceive as beautiful. By implication, the search for new and outstanding examples of aesthetic meaning becomes a driver for musical innovation.

Clearly this is a complex matter, and at best circuitous in its substantiation. For example, Murphy (1999) highlights limitations of tests to reveal much about musical intelligence: that is, a way of knowing and being able to think musically as a performer, creator or listener. To me, the description’s reference to thinking musically suggests an alignment with aesthetic predisposition. Similarly, concerning the effects of nature and nurture and the effectiveness of testing, Murphy cites Mursell’s (1937) view that innate facility and a gifted learner’s rhythm or pitch knowledge is linked by “an instinctive demand for beauty or simplicity or proportion, for order contrasted with disorder and that this is an innate tendency on the emergence of which, apart from learning, we can rely” (Mursell, 1937, as cited in Murphy, 1999, p. 45).

Murphy (1999) questions assumptions about affective ability being primarily a cognitive function. He supports Hargreaves’ (1986) suggestion that the arts transcend distinctions between affect and cognition because aesthetic objects are the final product of subjective objectivity. Work by Gardner (1983, 1999) and Freeman (2000) affirms the importance of aesthetic predispositions that are evaluated through having children compare the appropriateness of beginning and end phrases of melodies.

Turning to expressive attributes and volition, Gardner (1993) seems clear about the importance of perceptual acuity attributes. However, he also suggests that music’s emotional implications are

---

39 Subjective objectivity refers to the subjective influence of a completed art product in its most definitive and final form.
an inescapable factor within musical ability. He comments that aesthetic sensitivity is where emotional and motivational factors intertwine with perceptual ones (Gardner, 1993). Winner and Martino (2000) agree with Persson (1996), suggesting that what an individual experiences emotionally is important in terms of long-term involvement and commitment to music. Furthermore, their research data indicate that gifted musicians understand that music elements are a tool with an expressive end, more so than the typically skilled musician who focuses more on separate elements. Sloboda (2005a, 2005b) also asserts the importance of a comfortable and non-demanding environment for a child’s continuing expressive involvement. Like Winner and Martino (2000), he indicates that the nature of expressive devices used by a musician gives the best indication of musical understanding (Sloboda, 2005).

In their work about artistry, Subnotik and Jarvin (2005) comment that talented musical artists have uncanny intuitive ability to expand aesthetic and expressive norms, as well as successfully engage with audiences. Even where they have a technical or performance weakness, they can turn it to their advantage by fostering it as a unique aspect to their playing, thereby creating more appeal. In short, after much dedication, the alternative aesthetic serves to differentiate these artists from other performers.

Haroutounian’s (2000) research amongst music professionals shows the significance of volition in identification parameters, even amongst children with little experience, suggesting that “unique words and creative ideas might offer clues to personal involvement with the music, or it might be the product of a student ‘who simply enjoys responding in unique and individual ways’” (p. 146). Haroutounian (2008) comments that the gifted student “performs and reacts to music with personal expression: shows intensity and involvement with the music.” (p. 21). As previously discussed, Piirto (1999, 2002) claims that volition is reflected in a person’s will to produce musically, no matter what.

In summary, I discussed Plummeridge’s (2001) belief that aesthetic sensitivity is a rather inconvenient factor in a goal-driven curriculum frame. Nevertheless, I suggest that the role of volition, aesthetic and expressive potential and intuition in the development of musical giftedness cannot be underestimated. Furthermore, I believe that the gifted child will show these attributes in a more acute manner, so allowing and building their capability seems important if a goal is to encourage self-efficacy and a sense of fulfilment amongst gifted learners.

At a conception level, I suggest that these qualities appear to be substantive, subjective and perceptual attributes. I believe that their function at the root of an individual’s drive to produce and sustain a commitment to music from the early stages of development needs greater
I consider that volition is a critical personal resource for the production of musical beauty and excellence. The need to produce whatever the cost (Piirto, 1999; Sternberg, 2006), supported by a restless but diligent and determined spirit (Howe, 2004; Simonton, 2004; Subnotik & Jarvin, 2005) are the foundation of superior outputs, and essential for building capability to challenge and possibly change the field. Sloboda (2005b) asserts that fluidity and diversity of expression are primarily about the number of exposures and dedication. However I support writers such as Freeman (2000, 2005) and Haroutounian (2000), who propose that indicators of aesthetic, expressive and personality predisposition are evident in new learners. In that regard, my long experience at all levels of brass performance teaching tells me that these qualities are typically evident at an early stage of playing. Furthermore, while growth is always possible, it comes at differential rates and levels of intuitive appeal across individuals.

A conception of musical giftedness that is limited to musical acuities, cognitive capability, and the effects of the environment does not adequately explain the pathway to exceptional and innovative outputs. I propose that an innate basis to the qualities under discussion exists, and importantly, they offer an essential catalytic force in the development of a musically gifted performer. In my observation, seldom does great technique or instrument command shock us, create a genuine sense of difference, or bring wonder, as does an intuitive rightness or nuance in an interpretation. More likely, the ‘moment’ is, as Subnotik and Jarvin’s (2005) describes, artistry; unique and expressive communication which engages the audience.

Of course, this is supposition without on-going longitudinal and ethnographic research into sources of individual engagement and talent. However, somewhat excitingly I think, the answers will remain complex because of the fluid nature of all abilities (Gagné, 2000), music being fleeting and essentially abstract in its pure forms (Swanwick, 1999), and individuals’ development known to seldom evolve in a clear cut and lineal pattern.

### High Level Musical Characteristics

The following table summarises indicators for musical giftedness explored in this review. The indicators are based on Haroutounian’s (2000, 2008) identification groupings. The framework is underpinned by the premise of trainable potential, rather than demonstrated ability.
Table 1: Table of Musical Giftedness and Talent Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception:</th>
<th>Quality interpreted as Perception:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceptually aware of sound: the student is aware of slight differences in melodies, rhythms, tempo (speed) and tonal characteristics. The student who is perceptually aware of sound: • is keenly aware of sounds • listens with focused contribution • can sense sound inwardly and remember it • can hear slight differences in sounds, melodies, rhythms • can isolate and identify individual sounds or musical ideas in a complex musical or sound context.</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as Perception: Introduction: Following are some common predictive behaviours and characteristics of early musical talent based on Richardson (1990). • highly developed ear • memory for music heard • ability to discriminate among contrasting phrases and sections of a song and musical compositions • concentrates on music; stops to listen to music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic Sense:</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as Rhythmic:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The musically talented student responds instinctively to rhythm. The student: • physically responds to rhythm in a fluid manner • can feel and maintain a steady pulse in performance • can internally discriminate differences in rhythms • recognises and adjusts to slight changes in tempo or metre • can repeat and creatively extend rhythmic ideas.</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as Rhythmic: • spontaneous response to rhythm and music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pitch:</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as Pitch:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The musically talented student hears pitches moving up and down in melodies, and can remember this melodic shape. The student: • can internally discriminate</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as Pitch: • love for singing familiar and made up songs • ability to associate pitch with visual symbols • relative or absolute pitch and strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception:</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as Perception: Introduction: Based on Talent Identification Instruments developed for music and dance and based on Renzulli’s three ring model of giftedness (above average ability, creativity and task commitment (Baum et al, 2004) • perceives differences in tone and pitch, responds to dynamics, can match pitches, can replicate melodic phrases, is able to sustain and independent part • responds joyfully, eager to participate, curious, asks questions, is open to unfamiliar styles of music.</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as Perception: • sensitivity to the structure of music – tonality, key, harmony, and rhythm • sensitivity to expressive qualities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Rhythmic: | Qualities interpreted as Rhythmic: |
| A student who can: • perceive differences in tone and pitch, responds to dynamics, can match pitches, can replicate melodic phrases, is able to sustain and independent part • responds joyfully, eager to participate, curious, asks questions, is open to unfamiliar styles of music. | Qualities interpreted as Rhythmic: • puts the beat in the body, is able to sustain an even beat, replicates rhythmic patterns accurately, can play repeating patterns, anticipates, waits for proper moment to begin, can find the underlying pulse or beat. |
| Pitch: | Qualities interpreted as Pitch: |
| A student who can: • perceive differences in tone and pitch, responds to dynamics, can match pitches, can replicate melodic phrases, is able to sustain and independent part • responds joyfully, eager to participate, curious, asks questions, is open to unfamiliar styles of music. | Qualities interpreted as Pitch: • sensitivity to the structure of music – tonality, key, harmony, and rhythm • imitate a song after one exposure. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality interpreted as Perception: Introduction: Based on Talent Identification Instruments developed for music and dance and based on Renzulli’s three ring model of giftedness (above average ability, creativity and task commitment (Baum et al, 2004) • perceives differences in tone and pitch, responds to dynamics, can match pitches, can replicate melodic phrases, is able to sustain and independent part • responds joyfully, eager to participate, curious, asks questions, is open to unfamiliar styles of music.</th>
<th>Qualities interpreted as Perception: • sensitivity to the structure of music – tonality, key, harmony, and rhythm • sensitivity to expressive qualities.</th>
<th>Qualities interpreted as Rhythmic: • where technical skills are at a highly developed level.</th>
<th>Qualities interpreted as Pitch: • sensitivity to the structure of music – tonality, key, harmony, and rhythm • imitate a song after one exposure.</th>
<th>Qualities interpreted as Rhythmic: • where technical skills are at a highly developed level.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>differences in pitch • can remember melodies and repeat them • can repeat and creatively extend melodic ideas • can pick out tunes available on an instrument.</td>
<td>feelings for tonality • ability to match pitch.</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as motivational • focuses intently while engaged in musical tasks • can concentrate for extended periods of time during musical practice • shows persistence and perseverance in musical tasks • enjoys working independently in musical tasks • refines and critiques work of self and others • sets high standards.</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as motivational • Enthusiasm: responds joyfully, eager to participate, curious, asks questions, is open to unfamiliar styles of music. • Ability to focus: directs attention, makes full commitment to the task, is interested and involved in class activities, listens carefully, follows instructions. • perseveres, doesn’t give up easily, improves over time, takes time to think, is able to take and incorporate instruction.</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as motivational • significance of emotional responses as a most important driver of a musician’s involvement and commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivational Qualities</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as aesthetic sensitivity • appreciation of aesthetic structures in music.</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as aesthetic sensitivity • significance of expressive qualities of music evident in the gifted musician above analytical knowledge which is an assumption.</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as aesthetic sensitivity • intense positive emotional or aesthetic state, and shows an indefinable spark • cooperative participation • genuinely expressive qualities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensibility and Aesthetic Qualities In Musical Behaviour and Performance, the student; • shows a natural, physical ease in movement or performance • is eager to express emotion through performance or interpretive response to music • shows evidence of listening and shaping interpretive ideas while performing • communicates a personal involvement in the music to the listener • communicates interpretive sensitivity in performance and in response to music • performs with a fluid touch</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as aesthetic sensitivity • appreciation of aesthetic structures in music.</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as aesthetic sensitivity • significance of expressive qualities of music evident in the gifted musician above analytical knowledge which is an assumption.</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as aesthetic sensitivity • intense positive emotional or aesthetic state, and shows an indefinable spark • cooperative participation • genuinely expressive qualities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sense of rhythmic pulse</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as creative aptitude</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as creative aptitude</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as creative aptitude</td>
<td>Qualities interpreted as creative aptitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• seeks to improve physical performance capabilities.</td>
<td>• love for singing familiar and made up songs.</td>
<td>• expressiveness: responds with sensitivity, performs with energy and intensity, is fully involved, communicates feelings.</td>
<td>• ease of improvisation and invention.</td>
<td>• evidenced by creative products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• composition and Improvisation: improvises spontaneously, takes risks, makes surprising or unusual statements, creates sounds in original ways, makes up songs.</td>
<td>• notes significance of receptive and creative qualities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Creative Elements

In interpretation and created music, the student;

• enjoys extending, manipulating, and experimenting with sound
• spontaneously sings and moves to music
• is sensitive to the mood of music heard and performed
• is eager to express ideas through music
• enjoys shaping and refining musical ideas
• works metaperceptively in revising musical work
• shows a sense of personal involvement in performance.

Qualities interpreted as creative aptitude

• love for singing familiar and made up songs.
• expressiveness: responds with sensitivity, performs with energy and intensity, is fully involved, communicates feelings.
• composition and Improvisation: improvises spontaneously, takes risks, makes surprising or unusual statements, creates sounds in original ways, makes up songs.
• ease of improvisation and invention.
• evidence by creative products.
• notes significance of receptive and creative qualities.

From the above, my interpretation of the cited literature highlights a child who has the potential to learn and apply musical ideas quickly and demonstrate rapid development toward being at ease with what might be termed as the knowns of music. More importantly, I suggest, the unknown is a place of excitement and challenge for the musically gifted child. Therefore, as a tentative conception:

- Gifted musical qualities show primarily through rhythmic fluidity and appreciation of structure. The sense of pitch and related elements, such as appreciation of harmony are less defined initial attributes (Gardner, 1999; Winner & Martino, 2000);
- The musically gifted child will demonstrate meta-cognitive and meta-perceptive strategies in reviewing, improving and developing created or existing works, reflecting an ease in grasping concepts and superior speed of process (Subnotik & Jarvin, 2005);
- Volition for musical immersion is a core personality characteristic, including diligence and determination. Musical activity will absorb the gifted learner’s attention and energy for long periods (Piirto, 1999; Subnotik & Jarvin, 2005; Winner & Martino, 2000).
- The musically gifted child can surprise through unique expressive elements in his or her performances, creative outputs, and aesthetic sensitivity. This includes increasing ease in successfully engaging listeners (Gardner, 1993).
Part E: Identification strategies for gifted learners in international and New Zealand contexts

There is evidence of growing momentum in the willingness of schools to identify gifted learners in New Zealand:

Arguably, as our society and its institutions became more accommodating of difference, the notion that gifted and talented students deserved a curriculum commensurate with their abilities did not seem to appear unreasonable (Taylor, 2004, p. 27)

Concerning policy, the MoE (2004) introduced a requirement for schools to identify and develop learning strategies for gifted and talented students. Funding was initiated for two rounds of three year contestable projects40 from which research evaluation is on-going, see for example, Russell and Riley (2011). Similarly, as well-known Dunedin educator Danny Knudson (2006) states, there is “reason to be optimistic. After years of neglect, gifted education in the new millennium is receiving official recognition from the Ministry of Education and ERO” (p. 211).

However, accessibility constraints emerge in much of the literature included in this review. Firstly, it appears that chance41 is a potentially divisive factor in selection (Gagné, 2005; Gagné & Schader, 2006). Secondly, I believe that the nature of cultural frameworks for groups and individuals as well as domain expectations appear to influence identification parameters used by gate keepers (Bevan-Brown, 2004; Braggett & Moltzen, 2000). Finally, learners gifted in both the so-called intellectual/academic and non-academic domains may have limited prospects. I suggest that this is because gifted children often remain hidden through schools responding to the more palatable task of lifting all children’s achievement levels, or suitable expertise for implementing appropriately challenging programmes not being available in the staffing mix.

When linking these themes to Heartland development and operations, the following became significant:

• Identification of musical giftedness holds a high profile for researchers and commentators in the field of gifted education.
• International identification trends seem to favour multiple, diverse and encompassing approaches.
• The process and approaches to music identification in New Zealand may be disadvantageous to musically gifted learners.

---

40 Heartland was a contestable project.
41 Chance factors include location, family background and support.
Identification of musical giftedness holds a high profile for researchers and commentators in the field of gifted education

As previously discussed, much of the international literature favours domain-specific approaches for identification purposes and provision for gifted learners. For example, Runco (2005) comments that the body of research tends to define giftedness in terms of domain centres. Similarly, other authors frequently cite Gagné’s (2000, 2005) development framework of the movement giftedness to talent in a domain(s).

A surprising amount of domain-centred literature reveals a preference for historical and contemporary musical exemplars, particularly as case studies. It appears that researchers interpolate attributes of giftedness from examination of gifted performers’ and composers’ development. Furthermore, well published researchers such as Gagné (2000) and Subnotik and Jarvin (2005) seem comfortable utilising the blend of intellectual and domain-specific characteristics typically revealed in gifted composers’ and performers’ lives as blueprints for identification, development, and measurement parameters for accomplishment in other domains.

In addition, a high percentage of historically renowned musicians and performers feature as icons in the contemporary world. Their work remains accessible, and consumers are exposed to products in a more overt manner than these of significant producers in other domains. For example, television advertising frequently features the music of extraordinary composers such as Antonio Vivaldi and Edvard Grieg, as well as a profusion of contemporary musicians.

Why might this predilection for music exemplars have occurred? I believe that contributing factors include capacity for lifelong output, the specific and partially distinct nature of musical aptitude, potential for insular individual development, and the readily traceable (Runco, 2005) field-breaking capacity of great composers and performers. It appears that researchers adopt parameters such as determinant themes in giftedness profiles alongside personal factors such as self-determination against field resistance (Sternberg, 2006), and self-denial, perseverance and diligence (M. J. A. Howe, 2004). Furthermore, potentially lifelong outputs offer ready examples of survival through dramatic twists in an artist’s life, renaissance in adopting new creative directions, and engagement in the potentially volatile weaving of innovative aesthetic product and existing field parameters about what constitutes good. Musical accomplishment offers fascinating exemplars that are useful in the analysis and extrapolation of domain potential and development, creative aptitude, and actualisation of purist skills, generally supported by an albeit elusive intellectual prowess (Moore, 2009).

Equally important in the context of this research, musicality features frequently as a specific domain in intellectual schema. These include Gardner’s (1983, 1999) multiple intelligences model,
Piirto’s (1999) giftedness construct, the Munich model of giftedness (Heller, Perleth & Lim, 2005), and Renzulli and Reis’s general performance areas (Renzulli, 2005b; 1985). In my view, this high profile aligns with the perspective of all music educators, that genuine skill-based musical opportunity pays huge and lifelong dividends for children, observable in self-directed learning, personal learning involvement, and often in creative engagement.

Comparing the international prominence of gifted education literature to research undertaken in New Zealand, such as Gifted and Talented: New Zealand Perspectives (Moltzen, 2004b) or Riley et al’s (2004a) significant report The extent, nature and effectiveness of planned approaches in New Zealand Schools for identifying and providing for gifted and talented students, the place of music-related exploration appears less evident in New Zealand. Music features in the context of the arts, or as part of reflection on constructs such as Howard Gardner’s (1983) multiple intelligences. On that basis, it appears that the historical and contemporary fascination with music, along with prevalent interest signalled by the most important interest group, i.e. gifted students (Keen, 2004, 2006), means that this New Zealand study is both timely and appropriate.

**International trends in the identification of gifted children seem to favour multiple, diverse and encompassing approaches**

In regard to the depth of a school population that benefits directly from identification, Mayer’s (2005) meta-review of research leads him to suggest that one in twenty children is an inclusive but appropriate formula for schools’ planning provision. Compared to researchers such as Gagné (2005), this is a generous canvas. However, I support a policy of broader inclusion, not only because it may boost social acceptance of provision, but because gifted children’s achievement and productivity can be lifted by the social impetus generated by the inclusion of children representing a wider ability range (Van Tasse-Baska, 2005). In my view, reciprocal gains for the school community and the selected child at the lower ability fringe include the most overt stimulus of higher achieving students, as well as emerging product(s) becoming achievement models.

As discussed earlier, Joseph Renzulli (2004) is critical of the use of a single score or intelligence measure for identification. He considers that over-emphasising cognitive traits often means that more learners do not get to experience supplementary opportunity, which can uncover gifted potential. He suggests alternative factors such as language, socio economic background, cultural, gender, and ethnic considerations are increasingly influencing identification guidelines to reflect a wish for more socially inclusive conceptions 42. In line with his commitment to recognising a
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42 As noted, in moving to more diverse identification approaches, even about intelligence, Renzulli (2005b) supports greater consideration of cultural and situational factors.
wider range of domains, Renzulli (2005b) calls for synergy between identification strategies and programme purpose(s), as well as processes that will ensure both school and community are comfortable with the underlying conception of giftedness.

Like Walberg and Paik (2005), and Renzulli (2005b), Van Tassel- Baska (2005) challenges reliance on intelligence and achievement tests for identification, and calls for more varied and authentic assessment(s). She claims that this is particularly important for less advantaged and under-represented groups and learners at the lower fringe of gifted aptitude. Proposing that on-going observation of students interacting with a variety of learning opportunities is an effective identification strategy, Van Tassel-Baska (2005) calls on gatekeepers to tap into fluid, rather than crystallized abilities.

Van Tassel-Baska (2005) also suggests that longer-term identification approaches allow for variations in achievement and motivation that a gifted child may exhibit. She recommends regular assessment of students to mitigate for unanswered questions about absolute or relative giftedness, and provide assistance to teachers to help them reveal hidden potential (Van Tessel-Baska, 2005). She also proposes that consideration be given to strengths that emerge in the wider school or community environment. Similarly, Walberg and Paik’s (2005) data reveal that there is more opportunity for artistic students outside school than for science oriented students because arts students can realise fulfilment in sub-domains, since they undertake “more diversified, less concentrated interests and opportunities” (Walberg & Paik, 2005).

Concerning palatability of provision in the school community, I believe the acceptability of provision may be improved by fostering the multiple potentials of young people (Renzulli, 2005a) and utilising broader and more contextual frames for giftedness, Similarly, the already noted recent focus on social capital shown by researchers such as Gardner (2007), Renzulli (2005a) and Ziegler (2005) has potential to improve attitudes about the allocation of resources. I suggest this would occur as communities develop a better understanding regarding the benefits of heightening constructive attitudes about societal and environmental responsibility in the products of gifted children.

However in my view, vigilance against possible mutation of social capital (Renzulli, 2005b) ideals into the realm of social compliance is appropriate, particularly concerning identification characteristics. For example, Sternberg’s (2005) Wisdom, Intelligence, Creativity Synthesised (WCIS) lauds the creatively gifted individual’s determination to surmount obstacles, defy the crowd, and potentially change the field. However, Sternberg (2004) warns about a sense of invulnerability that a few former leaders and international companies assume:
Not only do the individuals think they can do anything, they also believe they can get away with it. They believe that either they are too smart to be found out or, even if found out, they will escape any punishment for misdeeds. (p. 335).

This is a complex social issue, and I believe there may be costs from unthinking encouragement of compliance, as clarified in the findings of Runco (2005). He identifies a move towards conformity amongst creatively gifted children around the age of ten. To avoid what Runco (2005) labels a creative slump, he encourages parents to build their child’s ego and confidence through pretend and role-play experiences, in which children are encouraged to show originality and resistance to conformity. Significant for school identification strategies, Runco calls for authentic self-expressions and spontaneous original actions in the creative acts of gifted children.

According to Gagné (2005), teachers are the obvious arbiters in the identification of talent. Whenever children begin learning a new set of skills, teachers naturally check for a range of aptitude. Thus the gifted child’s outputs correspond to outstanding mastery of specific skills, for any domain or occupational field (Heller et al. 2005). This may be feasible in a studio or specialist teaching situation, however like Sisk (2009), I consider it questionable to assume that generalist teachers have sufficient confidence about musical processes and elements to be able to assess deeper or innate musical potential, both of which Gagné (2005) asserts are significant giftedness catalysts.

Similarly, Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe (2000) make the point that creativity evolves within “cultural rules”, and that experts are critical in the apparently simple act of encouraging novelty. In that regard, I have the privilege of working with many pedagogically wonderful teachers. However I have observed that some struggle with musical foundations and therefore seem less at ease when facilitating creative work. This is not about formulating excellent learning sequences, using an engaging pedagogy, or getting the ukulele band to a successful level. Rather, I suggest that a fundamental conceptual and problem-solving level is required to support the development of creative outputs. Furthermore, as part of Renzulli and Reis’s (1985) identification strategies, their suggestion for first level activity seem to imply short and passive programmes, rather than experiential and authentic learning. Hence, in terms of creativity and identification, I believe there is a need for supportive scrutiny of the credibility of musical experiences that lead to selection. Similarly, given the constraints of time particularly for generalist teachers, identification support would seem to be a priority (Sisk, 2009).

In summary, most researchers cited in this review, such as Tannebaum (2003) and Renzulli (2005b), acknowledge the importance of nurture through calling for identification processes that gather a balance of information about diverse musical and personal potential, as well as
recognisable acuities. However researchers such as Gottfredson (2003) clearly remain more committed to the overall generative effect of \( g \) as the basis of giftedness. Regarding the collection of appropriate evidence, international researchers favour longer-term gathering, authentic and on-going evaluation, and achievement-related data as well as alertness to social contributors. Domain attributes seem to attract dominant interest in international literature, however, since ability can fluctuate, writers such as VanTassel-Baska (2005) encourage on-going evaluation, which I believe further justifies a wider ability band being included in provision.

Concerning levels of inclusion, Gottfredson (2003) suggests that international identification strategies are increasingly framed by social and political forces, as schools respond to demands for all children to reach their potential. He also notes that gatekeepers should seek more subtle indicators of a child's gifts from a wider diversity of sources, which has implications for the whole school learning environment, the community and the child’s social networks. Concerning music, I support Mayer’s (2005) suggestion that around one in twenty children is an appropriate selection ratio. I believe this ratio allows for collaborative learning and projects, effective shared music making, diverse discourse about product, two-way modelling, and offers latitude for applying learning that has occurred outside of the school at various levels of homogeneity and formality. Furthermore, in my professional view, the school offers distinct advantages over studio music situations for collaborative elements of music provision.

Assumptions about teacher capability give cause for concern, particularly given the preference for domain giftedness in international literature. As noted previously, Gagné (2005) appears to consider identification almost a matter of course for the classroom teacher. More supportively, Haroutounian (2008) suggests, that some training for teachers may be necessary, since small group and creative activity can bring attention to gifted behaviours. While I concur with both Gagné’s and Haroutounian’s thinking regarding the significance of the classroom teacher, I suggest that expectations of teachers’ musical expertise are high, as for the time and resources to achieve effective observation. Furthermore, I believe that identifying musically creative aptitude requires particular expertise in relation to teacher confidence and musical understanding.

Sensitivity to gatekeeper preferences and biases is a further consideration. In my opinion, some conceptions suggest gatekeepers make judgments with almost moral overtones, for example, Sternberg (2005). In this regard, the societal considerations for selection described in Renzulli’s “Operation Houndstooth” 43 (Renzulli, 2005b) offer a more appropriate latitude.

43 Renzulli’s Operation Houndstooth seeks to investigate links between giftedness and constructive action toward “greater public good”.
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Finally, from the point of view of a researcher who is not working in the classroom, it is all too easy to be precious, even condescending, about expectations of classroom teachers and the significance of their confidence to select. It is worth remembering, that many gifted musicians emerge without training and through surprising trails of life events. As Ferrari (2004) cites Howe (2004), there are many examples of geniuses who appear to have little to thank their respective school for, and the development of John Lennon has already been discussed in that regard. The diverse nature of formal and informal learning and training for music sub-domains is a consideration in development, and in my view, whatever a school offered to John Lennon would have had a limited chance of engaging his interest. Furthermore, through a reverse lens, music specialism also brings risks, where these teachers are less comfortable with a co-constructive and holistic learning environment. As Edwards (2008) suggests from neuromusical research findings:

> some music educators may be limiting the effectiveness of their instruction if they favor some forms of music processing more than others, especially [by downplaying] the music processes that are shared with the nonmusical brain systems such as language, visual, or psychometric processes. (p. 8)

Taking all of this into consideration, I find it difficult to defend the degree of chance in the likelihood of a child’s identification. Pertinent to the Heartland Project, I believe that assumptions about integrity of classroom programmes and how they might reveal high-level musical behaviour, let alone creative or aesthetic musical intricacies, need further investigation. As Walberg and Paik (2005) comment in supporting product based identification, “without sufficient opportunities, intelligence and motivation may count for little” (Walbert & Paik, 2005). Hence, the availability of support mechanisms and/or teacher expertise appears to be critical in consideration of the effectiveness of identification strategies.

**The process and approaches to music identification in New Zealand may be disadvantageous to musically gifted learners**

McAlpine’s (2004a) comprehensive review of identification strategies in New Zealand describes the use of nomination (primarily by teachers), standardised achievement and creativity tests, rating scales, portfolios and authentic assessment. He notes that the most likely strategies are ongoing teacher observation and longitudinal achievement records. McAlpine (2004a) recommends that identification should begin early in a child’s formal education, be revisited and undertaken in a way which is integral to the institution’s policy for gifted provision, and be responsive to special characteristics of minority groups. McAlpine (2004a) concludes, that “identification is best embedded in everyday learning and teaching” (p. 126), that is, a responsive learning environment. However, he is also clear about the demand this places on teachers:
The effectiveness of the responsive environment approach to identification depends on the ability of teachers to create a challenging learning environment in which the special abilities of children will be manifested. The aim is to offer opportunities for higher level thinking, creative thinking, and original student research. Since it operates in a mainstream context such an approach places considerable responsibility on the classroom teacher to ensure the highest quality learning and teaching across the curriculum. (McAlpine, 2004a, p. 100).

McAlpine (2004a) identifies several issues in New Zealand identification practices, including:

- the quality of links between identification and programme outcomes;
- extent of staff understanding and collaboration with initiatives;
- inclusiveness rather than exclusiveness of institutional policy;
- consideration of minority group interests;
- incorporation of multiple methods for identification.

As Riley et al.’s (2004b) research summary recommends, schools should be working for a careful match between identification and the many areas of giftedness and talent.

The relationship between the basic or core curriculum and the interests, qualities and abilities of gifted and talented students needs examination, for curriculum should have its purpose a closer alignment between individual learners and the teaching and learning activities in which they are engaged. (Riley, 2004a, p. 312)

Such examination of responsiveness of the core curriculum and student parameters is appropriate, because as Riley et al.’s (2004a) data indicate, most identification occurs in intellectual and academic areas. I suggest that this raises concerns around how schools are catering for an expanding diversity of domains. In addition, while only a small percentage of schools report the use of intelligence testing in the influential intellectual/academic areas, the relative priority attached to achievement testing and observation (Riley et al., 2004a) is not available. Is it possible that forms of testing rather than authentic tasks are more common in identification than we realise, or would wish to acknowledge?

Data from Keen’s (2004) research amongst students, parents, and schools shows that the percentage of children identified as gifted increases with age. I would argue that this indicates a low commitment to early identification. Keen (2004) also records similar identification percentages across schools, regardless of socio-economic level, and that schools typically identify a percentage of children rather than work on definitive evaluation of individuals. As to identification strategies, like Riley et al.’s (2004a) data which indicates between two and four
election methods, Keen found a preference for two to three. However, Keen (2004) notes that it is quite common for schools to rely on a single well-tried procedure. His data also confirm the use of observation as the favoured identification method (Keen, 2004).

Significant to Heartland, Keen’s (2004) data indicate that schools value inter-school networking and self-nomination for identification. However, he suggests that there is limited awareness of logistical processes that could assist their implementation. According to Keen, educators are conservative in identification decisions, although he reinforces that financial constraint significantly influences the extent and nature of selection by schools (Keen, 2004). When considering vertical networking, grouping gifted children, and early intervention, Keen notes that a fifth of parents called for more utilisation of these strategies in mainstream education (Keen, 2004).

Citing her 1998 research, Rawlinson (2004) sends a clear message of concern about under-representation of cultural, minority, and lower socio-economic groups in gifted programmes. Bevan-Brown (2004), citing Hattie (2000), is similarly critical, and states, “It is in these schools that we should be placing so much interest. Identification of gifts can be harder, encouragement can be less evident, challenges can be lesser (particularly in the academic domains we value)” (Bevan-Brown, 2004, p. 191). Furthermore, Rawlinson (2004) stresses the importance of learner academic self-concept and the importance of talent being demonstrated as part of identification. She asserts the need for more inclusive strategies including a focus on oral and metacognitive skills, goal setting and feedback, cultural valuing, and she calls for initial gifted provision within the classroom (Rawlinson, 2004). I concur with Rawlinson’s proposal that opportunity may help reveal special ability where a child’s self-efficacy is low:

Giving these children the opportunity to be included in initial enrichment tasks rather than waiting for them to demonstrate gifted behaviour which can unfortunately act as gatekeeping prerequisites. The opportunity for inclusion may be all that is needed to strengthen children’s academic self concept and enhance their confidence to demonstrate special abilities. (Rawlinson, 2004, p. 477)

However, while a concept of identification through provision aligns with the thinking of researchers such as Renzulli (2005b) and Renzulli and Reis (1985) it appears that Rawlinson’s (2004), and Bevan-Brown’s (2004) stance brings the emphasis onto lifting self-efficacy in intellectual/academic areas. My interpretation of Renzulli’s (2005a) writing suggests, that as a school establishes a conception for provision the intention is to achieve self-efficacy through
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opportunity in a wide diversity of domains. Similarly, Rawlinson (2004) calls for as many learners as possible to be included, but I think Renzulli’s intention is more about expanding the concept of gifts, rather than percentages of learners being identified as gifted. As Renzulli (2005a) states, “we speak and write about the development of gifted behaviours in specific areas of learning and human expression rather than a state of being” (p. 81). In my view, when a school is offering effective core music outputs, gifted children become models, thereby positively influencing the learning intentions of underachieving peers. Renzulli boldly sums up the situation for American educators. “You don’t develop the potential of thousands of Leonard Bernsteins, Aretha Franklins, or Miles Davises without providing them with highly engaging opportunities that are typically only available in out-of-school opportunities and mainly to the children of the well-to-do” (Renzulli, 2009, p. 14).

As discussed previously, the framework of Riley et al.’s (2004a) research means that data pertaining to music provision is not isolated. However, identification data concerning the broader visual and performing arts category indicate that audition is the preferred option, next to teacher observation. I suggest that in terms of the high proportion of arts identification\(^{45}\) is a clear signal that schools recognise the importance of capability for children. However, to gauge credibility of school identification practices, further information is needed about the influence of development outside of the school, how potential is considered alongside demonstrated skills, and the responsiveness of the school learning environment, which as McAlpine (2004a) describes, can inform more formal testing.

More recently, Russell and Riley’s (2011) case study reports on a high school Talent Development Initiative \(^{46}\) described as a rich and comprehensive identification model\(^ {47}\). They note that rigorous identification practices support justification of resource allocations for provision, and that successful provision appears to lift nomination rates as well as wider cohort attitudes about achievement. Furthermore, participant comments cited from Riley and Moltzen (2010) suggest that autonomy in personal learning direction enhances student motivation. When relating these important findings to domain development, I note as a music educator, that there is high field regard for the quality and diversity of core and extension music in the particular school. Therefore it is reasonable to assume that gifted outputs feature in the school learning environment. Similarly, Russell is a staff member of the school, therefore is directly involved in the respective Talent Development Initiative. As I see it then, if extrapolating Russell and Riley’s

\(^{45}\) Riley et al. (2004a) indicate that formal identification data shows the arts as second only to intellectual and academic areas.

\(^{46}\) The Music Heartland was also a MoE Talent Development Initiative.

\(^{47}\) Identifiers emerged through nomination, Māori and Pacific concepts, and Purdue Rating Scales.
(2011) findings more widely, a student’s identification prospects are markedly affected by school-leadership, domain profile, and the integrity of a domain’s core programme.

For primary schools in particular, I believe the previously discussed concerns about generalist teacher confidence and integrity of core music programmes creates doubt surrounding the appropriateness of favoured observation and audition strategies. For the same reasons, it is possible that the comprehensive identification profile utilised by Russell and Riley (2011) would not reveal musical gifts. Sisk (2009) highlights the need for training for music identification, and claims that reliance on generalist teachers and differentiated curriculum approaches are myths. In her view, it takes a rich and rigorous core curriculum to lift gifted children’s achievement level. Similarly, and pertinent to music I think, is Riley et al.’s (2004b) caution about observation and product evaluation. As they note, “One of the potential risks involved in identification of this nature is its reliance upon student performance and productivity, especially in relation to students who are underachieving” (Riley et al, 2004b, p. 27).

Another important consideration is how the wider population views school effectiveness concerning musical development. Tracing the musical development of top performers, a number of researchers including Kemp and Mills (2002), Smilde (2009) and Fredricks, Alfeld and Eccles (2010) make little or no positive reference to school contributions. However valid the exclusion and whatever the reasons, unless a child already has confidence, I question why he or she would audition or commit to the classroom programme if there are perceived barriers, or if the programme offers little to ignite musical interest. Haroutounian (2008) claims, that perseverance and motivation are top frequency indicators for musical giftedness. In my view, the continuity and credibility of the classroom programme are therefore critical catalysts for the emergence of musical commitment and contribution to occur.

According to Greenspan, Becca, and Gardner (2004) the development of musical talent requires both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational influences, unlike other abilities that are more reliant on one or other. For example, Greenspan et al. (2004) indicate that sporting activity is often fostered by more extrinsic motivation, and even media type exposure. Hence, it appears that schools which explore bringing children together for more challenging music activity, allow tall poppies to express musically, and encourage cohort well-being from shared activity are more likely to empower learners because of the inherent sense of approval and expectation. However, the effect of grouping is not only important for identification; there are also possible transfer effects from early shared productivity. According to Walberg and Paik’s (2005) data, accomplished groups in
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48 Riley et al.’s (2004a) areas for identification were Intellectual/Academic, Visual/Performing Arts, Creativity, Physical/Sport, Social/Leadership, Culture-Specific.
any field reflect greater levels of involvement at school, and that these students “resemble one another more than they resemble students who are not as accomplished” (p. 408).

In summary, it is reasonable to suggest that music matters, including integrity, visibility, peer modelling, engagement and the tone of music in the school community warrant consideration, alongside the New Zealand issues noted by Mc Alpine (2004b). While schools indicate multiple methods for identification, the dominant methods in the arts, observation and audition, are likely to be effective only as far as the musical understanding of gatekeepers and the credibility of the core programme can effectively stretch. Otherwise it appears that gatekeepers may be simply evaluating the results of what is transpiring in the child’s wider community or family.

Use of even limited provision to assist in identification is particularly relevant in the case of musical giftedness. I concur with writers such as Renzulli (2005b) and Sutnotik and Jarvin (2005) who suggest it allows inclusion of a wider band of children, motivation of underachievers by more advanced peers, modelling of higher end outputs, as well as stimulus for the gifted child from working alongside focused individuals. Similarly, and particularly relevant for lower socio economic, or in some cases cultural situations, I observe that it is possible to create a sense of whanau where provision is an integral factor in identification. While instrumental music may be children’s preference (Crooks, Smith & White, 2009), the voice comes at no cost, and is available for challenging extension in every child.

Finally, the focus on academic domains and thinking programmes discussed previously is a matter of grave concern. To what extent do such policies and practices deny the positive effects of diverse forms of high level and authentic achievement on a school population? Where a school seeks to lift attitudes about achievement, more diverse domain models of excellence could enhance perceptions and acceptance about striving and learning amongst all children. Hence, from a policy and curriculum perspective, responding to the concept that identification is about the child who has passions and capabilities, rather than being summarily gifted would seem to be an important consideration within a school’s conception of giftedness and talent.

49 New Zealand issues noted as matching identification and provision, staff buy in, and inclusive approaches for cultural, minority and lower socio-economic groups.
Chapter 3: Methodology

Introduction

In this chapter I will consider personal and professional influences on my approach to the study, the research design and selection of possible participants, the intermix of my activity as researcher and Heartland director, and reflect on the natural history of the research including my approach to data analysis and theorising from the findings.

The Music Heartland Project played a significant role in my life for nearly four years and will possibly remain the most invigorating experience of my teaching career. From its beginning to the closing notes in 2005, Heartland was personally taxing but never an encumbrance. The entire project was an extraordinary and meaningful musical exploration. This personal sense of importance was compounded by the fact that Heartland seemed to capture the enthusiasm of the eight participating schools and colleagues at my institution, then the Dunedin College of Education. Hence, while it is fair to record that Heartland was my conception, a sense of what could be done rather than what had to be done was consistently shared and fostered by most involved. This included schools, children and parents and indeed those who agreed to be research participants. How fortunate so early in one’s formal research life!

Goodman (1992) asserts that researchers need to declare any positions they may hold on the subject matter to give their qualitative reports greater credibility. Perhaps the most significant issue for me as a teacher educator is the ever decreasing provision of time and resources for students to engage in pre-service training and develop pedagogical confidence in most curricula, including music. Meanwhile, the learning outcomes suggested by programme designers have become increasingly complex in regard to curriculum understanding and application in school contexts. While there are some exceptions, I believe the net result is graduates who have not had sufficient latitude for personal exploration and appreciation of music learning processes with children as part of their course work or practicum. Sadly, however, it would appear that erosion of teacher capability in music has gone unnoticed in wider community and curriculum debate. The situation regarding teacher development seems to me to be represented by Jones’ (1990) and Lewis & Simon’s (1986) scrutiny of feminist debate, “Forms of discourse that do not allow an answer to the question ‘Where is my body in that text?’ silence us” (Jones, 1990, p. 1).

Hence, my personal bias made me alert to evidence which could inform discourse amongst teacher educators and teacher registration authorities about the place of music within teacher development. This lens includes the implications for music education of current curriculum initiatives, such as the Key Competencies (Ministry of Education, 2007a), inquiry learning
programmes, or National Standards. To be better informed about the effect of these matters was a factor in why the processes and outcomes of the children involved in Heartland took on special significance for me.

My interest in the correlation between curriculum priorities and pedagogy inevitably wove into my roles as Heartland’s director and researcher. However, rather than compromising either or both aspects, I believe my desire for Heartland to succeed brought me closer to the experiences of the participants. Echoing Alton-Lee’s (2001a) account of her work in the classroom, rather than a distant observer, I was in a position to receive ‘dear fly’ comments from my participants. The nature of these communications indicated that the participants understood full well that I was discreetly gathering data while watching their music and classroom interactions. In effect, the three years of planning, data gathering and writing that had grown out of the initial commitment to analyse and represent Heartland outcomes became amplified by a desire not to fail the research participants and to represent them well. My position in this respect recalls Janesick (2000), who likens the role of the qualitative researcher to that of a “choreographer . . . in seeking to describe, explain, and make understandable the familiar in a contextual, personal, and passionate way”.

As Heartland’s director, it was straightforward to coordinate multiple forms of qualitative data gathering including observation, document analysis, performance evaluation, and interviews. To better understand my role within Heartland and this study, coined from the social anthropology domain, Hennink, Hutter, and Bailey (2011) and Roulston (2006) describe inner and outer perspectives and influence within ethnographic study being etic and emic respectively. Hennink et al. (2011) highlight these as potentially reciprocal influences, between research participants and those acting as researchers of activity and processes occurring in the community. They describe the researcher bringing an etic perspective to data gathering, that which may be beneficial for the community but nevertheless, to some degree, acknowledged as external to the community. The participants offer an emic perspective, that which highlights the inner perspective, and champions viewpoints which actual members regard as beneficial for the community. For example, in the case of this study, during 2004 various data and internal viewpoints clarified the adequacy of ensembles for child selection purposes, and in 2005 resulted in an increase the intensity (number of hours) for Heartland Year One Heartland ensembles. In that decision, as researcher and director, I was conflicted by what I perceived on one hand as a narrowing of opportunity for children, but also recognising greater effectiveness of initial provision for those selected was possible.
In this manner, I have attempted to be open about my role as director within this report. I have also endeavoured to be open about the interplay of personal viewpoints as director and those of participants. As Findlay and Gough (2003) describe, the coming together of researcher and participants, through interview for example, is likely to bring to light the background and perspectives of each, and therefore both contribute to a co-construction of reality during the interaction(s).

To summarise my role as the researcher, in conjunction with research supervisors, I developed the research questions, researched, and designed the method as an ethnographic single case study (Yin, 2003), and completed participant invitations and arrangements with school settings for data gathering. I was fully engaged in all aspects of active data gathering over 20 months, completed the initial analysis, then undertook the subsequent and deeper layers of analysis for key and cross themes leading to conceptualisation, while concurrently undertaking a review of literature pertaining to both the music discipline in the *New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007) and gifted education. I began the initial report writing and consideration of findings late in 2006. In adopting a qualitative relativist view (Stake, 1995), I operated on the belief that the value of interpretations vary – relative to their credibility and utility. As to lens, my dual role as director and researcher meant that I was constantly challenged endeavouring to fulfil the multiple functions of “teacher, participant observer, interviewer, reader storyteller, advocate, artist, counselor, evaluator, consultant and others” (Stake, 1995, p. 92).

**The Design of this Study**

From first thinking about gathering information, it was my intention to interrogate relationships amongst the participants and indicators emerging from musical events (learning and products). As epistemology, “the origins of knowledge and the construction of knowledge” (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994, p. 4), my background as a musician and novice researcher have served to heighten a will to explore interpretive and underlying themes that lie within the music, or in the case of this study, gathered data. As example of my approach, a one paper research project (Moore, 2000) which was completed as part of a Post Graduate Diploma, explored the interplay of subjective and criterion based assessment used by adjudicators of musical competitions. In a summary statement, I noted:

> The recognition of aesthetic confidence, rather than comparative review, could generate a refreshing sense of quality and integrity, I suggest. I acknowledge the risks are perhaps daunting to those readers who prefer the application of critical standards. However, I am excited by the possibilities of standards and integrity, born out of performers ‘expressing’ their own ‘life sense’, and travelling the road on a more independent basis, would we dare let them. (p. 123)
While *When Music Speaks* (Moore, 2000) eventuated as a literature based study, I think the quote reflects genuine interrogation of concrete constructs associated with adjudication. Here I offer an analogy with novelist Anne Michaels’ (1996) description of man. Perhaps the music is correct in the form of mirrors and slides, however, to appreciate/adjudicate its true landscape requires a more courageous and exploratory approach, an ontology not necessarily dominated by the known of a particular domain.

Hence, in considering the design of this current study, it seemed critical to work with a model by which I could explore interrelationships of people and musical events in a particular setting (Stake, 2000). Furthermore, by implication, such a study would necessarily be framed by interpretive and ethnographic data gathering. I felt assured that standing back or providing for significant amounts of tallying and statistical analysis of products and behaviours would tell me little about individuals, their stories, and implications that might connect with similar circumstances occurring in music education. As Hennink et al. (2011) state:

> The interpretive approach acknowledges subjectivity. It acknowledges that the perspectives of study participants reflect their subjective views of their social world, and that researchers also bring their subjective influences to the research processes, particularly during data collection and interpretation. (p. 19)

Similarly, as Stake (1995) suggests, to be typical of qualitative research, “research questions typically orient to cases or phenomena, seeking patterns of unanticipated as well as expected relationships” (p. 41).

The evolution of the research design from this starting position was relatively straightforward. I reiterate the personal circumstances of 2003; I was seeking a research project for study purposes and I found myself as director of a gifted and talented project in which early products appeared to be unique. Heartland was not something that I was just interested in. It was exciting, and was already informing my teaching. In that regard, Stake’s (1995) encapsulation of researcher intrinsic interest in a setting sat well with me. However, my suggestion of uniqueness about the Heartland as a case study setting warrants explanation. In brief, as I began planning this study, hints of several possible distinctions from generalist or specialist music programmes emerged during 2003, and these helped me clarify Heartland’s worthiness for a single case study investigation (Yin, 2003). From diary notes recorded in preparation of the Ethics proposal, I recorded special characteristics to be:

- intention to select children for provision based on indications of potential as well as obvious musical skills,
• allowance of a programme in multiple schools in which a child’s continuance would be dependent on progress and attitude,

• adequate funding for delivery of focused music education to middle, upper primary and secondary students (project based) from a wide socio-economic range of schools in a distinct city area, each of which offered forms of classroom music or better,

• support from committed schools for quite intensive music education for a selection of their pupils over three years, for example:
  o allowance of predominantly in-school time tuition and ensemble activity
  o cross school and vertical groupings of children in school time
  o willingness to be part of an evaluation of individual and wider outcomes of this in-school gifted and talented initiative
  o through the goodwill of a classroom teacher (Liaison teachers) undertaking school-related administrative functions.

• an ensemble programme, albeit frequently observable in New Zealand schools, but in Heartland’s case underpinned by instrument learning and integrated project-based creative activity,

• tutors and schools that seemed open to collaborative reflection about a music programme intended to suit the needs of selected children and framed by the New Zealand curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007),

• sufficient resources to cater for tutor development, instrument acquisition, reporting and administrative systems (internally and to the MoE), transport and venue support, school and child family liaison and consultation.

Yin (2003) writes of a researcher’s choice of case study research:

the distinctive need for case studies arises out of the desire to understand complex social phenomena. In brief, the case study method allows investigators to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events – such as individual life cycles, organization and managerial processes, neighbourhood change, international relations, and the maturation of industries. (pp. 1-2)

Furthermore, in considering method, my aim was to try to achieve a thick description of events, and report the data in a manner that might allow readers to induce findings, as well as my own. In that regard, Stake (1995) utilises the words of Debussy in connection to La Mer to capture the idea of more vivid realities acted upon than seen, and cites Denzin and Lincoln (1994) in stating, “‘Thick description,’ ‘experiential understanding,’ and ‘multiple realities’ are expected in qualitative studies.” (Stake, p. 43). I hoped for a rich exploration of the case, its “boundary and working parts” (Stake, 1995, p. 2), and to achieve circumspect but applicable principles as an outcome of theoretical conceptualisation about a programme, which to my knowledge was without precedence. For example, in New Zealand, while there are many examples of specialist music programmes, by my observation, they are more prevalent at Year 7 & 8 Level, and seldom
include the support of instrumental or creative components. As core elements of Heartland’s instrumental development and creative activity, I could not locate other New Zealand investigations of the implications of these manifesting in product from a sustained learning programme. Hence, I anticipated theoretical implications could emerge as concepts induced from findings (Hennink, et al., 2011) about the learners involved, given the level of intensity offered by Heartland.

As Silverman (2005) notes, “grounded theory studies do not start with a theory – they end with one” (p. 159). In that paradigm, one intent for a study becomes applicability, new theory that could be limited to similar settings but likely to “have strong implications for effective practice” (p. 159). Similarly, in regard to qualitative inquiry, Robert Donmeyer (1990) writes “Practitioners in fields such as education, counselling, and social work, however, are concerned with individuals, not aggregates, and, for them, questions about meaning and perspective are central and ongoing.” (p. 182) In the case of this study, I find this a more optimistic approach than that of Stake (1995) who suggests that a case study may refine, but will seldom offer new understanding.

Later in this chapter, I provide a natural history (Silverman, 2005) for this research study and its eventual analysis pathway. However, as an initial frame, Table 2 outlines my activity as researcher/director, and the potential for interrelationships of data sources that were intended through the study’s design. In this regard, I am in accord with Stake (1995) in asserting the need for thorough preparation so as to be able to restrict and focus the expanse of data while being equally alert to the unexpected that might show deeper or alternative layers of the case. Similarly, Yin (2003) calls for a clear definition of the case but cognisance of the certainty that sub-units, or, as I prefer to think, subdivisions of unanticipated interest may contribute to enriched analysis. For example, initially I chose a diversity of participants because of my desire to fairly represent children involved in the project, their schools, tutors and families. However, as I undertook ongoing and successive analysis layers I came to understand the potency of multiple triangulation mixes, while acknowledging the tentative nature of even that device in seeking credibility, “Most qualitative researchers not only believe that there are multiple perspectives or views of [the case] that need to be represented, but that there is no way to establish, beyond contention, the best view” (Stake, 1995, p. 108). In support of my tentative claim of preparedness accompanied by openness to possibility, Table 2 also traces my activity in the dual roles of director and researcher.
Table 2: Outline of research design and key research/director activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronological Process</th>
<th>Researcher/Pertinent Director * Activity</th>
<th>Outcomes of Activity/Subdivisions of Interest</th>
<th>Research Implications of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td><strong>Music Heartland begins generating a need for much momentum in my role as director.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Researcher realisation of Heartland’s potential as a single setting for investigation.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Development of proposal to the University of Otago Ethics Committee.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Early reading of gifted and talented literature in particular Renzulli &amp; Reis (1985), Piirto (1999) and Gagné (Gagné, 2003).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Research questions developed as singular to the Heartland setting (Yin, 2003) along with possible implications intended as applicable (Silverman, 2005) to schools wishing to enrich music programmes and theorists in music education.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Video data stream authorised for sake of MOE: reporting and child/family reporting.</strong></td>
<td><em><em>Engaged in IEP</em> (See Appendix 3) and child self-evaluation (See Appendix 4) data gathering for MoE reporting.</em>*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Developed reporting format for Heartland families in response to children’s instrumental learning (See Appendix 5).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Quality and substance of creative activity took all by surprise, hence, projects reinforced in 2004 planning.</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Each implemented once or twice 2003 - 2005.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td><strong>Continue role as director until the end of 2005.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Music Heartland introduces instrumental programmes, other than keyboard/piano.</strong></td>
<td><strong>University of Otago Ethics Committee approval gained April 2004.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Creative projects diversified and extended. Fulfil roles as director as for 2003 in a more informed manner.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Consideration of what would count as evidence as part of ethics proposal development.</strong></td>
<td><strong>In pursuit of credibility of theoretical credibility, the study is underpinned by range of participant voices</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Decisions in favour of twelve to fifteen child participants selected in bands</strong>:*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• School Year 4-6 children participating in Year 1 of Heartland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• School Year 4-6 children participating in Year 2 of Heartland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• School Year 7-8 children participating in Year 2 of Heartland</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50 IEP refers to Individual Education Plan, which in the case of Heartland included the perspectives of the child’s school, classroom teacher and music tutor(s).
Chronological Process | Researcher/Pertinent Director * Activity | Outcomes of Activity/Subdivisions of Interest | Research Implications of Activity
---|---|---|---
Development of semi-structured (Hennink, et al., 2011, pp. 112-114) interview questions for child participants, parents of child participants, liaison teachers, and tutors. Set up timing, logistics of transport, venue, and video recording facility. Randomly select participants from the respective categories/bands ** of participants. Invite and follow up on invitations to be involved (See Appendix 6 for invitations). Undertake interviews with three child participant groups, two parents, tutors and liaison teachers in school settings, | Decision in favour of: • 4 child participants’ parents as participants • 3 school Liaison teacher participants • 3 Tutor participants Decisions to incorporate document data (Outside range 2002 – 2006): • MoE: contracts, negotiations reporting • Information disseminated to schools, families of participating children and tutors • Minutes of all meetings connected with Heartland (Tutor development/administrative meetings, management committee meetings, school liaison teacher/tutor meetings, advisory board (discontinued past mid 2004)) • Heartland planning, policy and reporting documents, including child self-evaluations and IEP’s. (23 participants in total). | and intent to use significant voice in conceptualisation of grounded theory (Hennink, et al., 2011). Allowed for researcher as biographer, advocate and evaluator (Stake, 1995) in the choice and interpretation of data. In particular, it allowed for tracing development and shifts in policy (Stake, 1995, p. 68). Data selected was considered for match with data collation against its original purpose (Yin, 2003). Video data allowed a different form of voice for child participants, their music. Children involved in Heartland had become accustomed to AV recording from beginning of 2003 (Hennink, et al., 2011) Linked question themes allowed more natural early grouping of interview data, in particular toward grounded theory (Silverman, 2005, p. 214). The mood of interviews reflected all participants being accustomed to me in

Themes developed against the three research questions and programme components, and were fundamentally the same for all participant types (child, tutors, liaison teachers, parents). Question bands can be summarised as: • Enjoyment and indications of commitment/belonging • Understandings about what was being learned musically • Longer term intentions in regard to music • Social and wider curriculum responses connected to Heartland in school and home • Ability/musical giftedness • Provision for musical giftedness and breadth of access/involvement. (See Appendix 7 for question banks.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronological Process</th>
<th>Researcher/Pertinent Director * Activity</th>
<th>Outcomes of Activity/Subdivisions of Interest</th>
<th>Research Implications of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>each of 40-60 minutes.</td>
<td>Develop observation instrument for music and classroom lessons.</td>
<td>Undertake three classroom observations and four music lesson observations of students reflecting a range of ability/progress to that time and instrument types. Write up anecdotal notes from music and classroom observations.</td>
<td>the role of director. Gave some confidence in adopting Gubrium and Holstein's (2003) perspective of interview being a familiar form of cultural production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field notes summarised in close proximity to observations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Coded observation system allowed systematic inclusion of informal and formal events within the observation (Hopkins, 2008, p. 99). Observation matrix included learner and tutor initiated conversation/activity, learning strategies, depth of musical activity, ability signals, and recorded over time segments.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange video of lessons and rehearsals, sharing times for MoE reporting and research data.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Offered insights about child participants in different learning settings to assist credibility of later comparative data analysis (Silverman, 2005)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange full transcripts of participant interviews to be completed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Full transcripts allowed more study time to watch and learn about mood and personal respondents alongside the transcript (Maykut &amp; Morehouse, 1994, pp. 126-149; Silverman, 2005, pp. 183-185).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete first formal drafts of literature review, especially that pertaining to quality music curriculum, and international gifted and talented education.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Some emergent epistemological conceptualisations formed. For example, that relating to integrity of differentiation, teacher confidence, pertinent identification for musical giftedness, and holistic musical holistic development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engaged in IEP (See Appendix 3) and child self-evaluation (See Appendix 4 data gathering for MoE reporting).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Feelings of bewilderment at the significant amount of data from all categories of collection. Decision to engage through the voice of participants, rather than product, in the first instance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation of numerous creative and ensemble products through the year.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Continue role as director until the end of 2005.</td>
<td>Access to product representing heightened resources.</td>
<td>Realisation that expectations and intensity could be setting the learning processes apart from what might be expected</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clear focus on achieving greatest support for most gifted children from the Heartland adult community.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chronological Process</th>
<th>Researcher/Pertinent Director * Activity</th>
<th>Outcomes of Activity/Subdivisions of Interest</th>
<th>Research Implications of Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developed instrument for evaluation of Heartland performance and creative product (See Appendix 5).</td>
<td></td>
<td>Beginning of constant comparative approach (Maykut &amp; Morehouse, 1994)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete arrangements for focus group child participant interview (Hennink, et al., 2011, p. 104). Selection of child participants based on a range of learning responses to Heartland opportunity, and first interview confidence. Complete arrangements for second parent participant interview.

Arrange full transcripts of the child participant (focus/repeat interview) and second parent group interview to be completed.

Undertake repeat interviews with four child participants in one group, and two parents each of 40-60 minutes in school or home (parent) settings.

Parent and child participants (focus/repeat interview) gave opportunity to repeat key questions from 2004 interviews, as well as explore any shifts in learning independence, ownership of learning, school implications and predictors of longer term involvement.

Arranged for music rehearsals and performances to be videoed.

Engaged in IEP (See Appendix 3) and child self-evaluation (See Appendix 4) data gathering for MoE reporting.

Generation of numerous creative and ensemble products through the year.

First level data analysis of interview data begins from pattern matching (Yin, 2003, p. 116) and constant comparative activity (Silverman, 2005). See Appendix 8 for emerging groupings of data for successive and comparative analysis.
The Selection of Participants

A variety of factors influenced the range of participant types in the study. In the first place, one research question directly called on perspectives from children involved in Heartland, their parents, tutors, and liaison teachers. This reflected my wish to tease out credible viewpoints from a range of participant types and underpin implications and applicability of theory generated about the identified children’s music learning. In the second place, theoretical conceptions surrounding quality of provision in music, generalist teacher capacity, and what might constitute deep musical development for musically gifted children in mainstream schools had become important themes, even in the initial review of literature during 2003. In that regard, I was able to trace little New Zealand literature which explored musical giftedness. Hence, a greater range of actors, people able to look out from and into Heartland as it operated in mainstream New Zealand schools, seemed appropriate so as to bring the findings to bear on literature perspectives that I reviewed. Finally, I felt that matters of music credibility in a school setting and indicators of child self-determination and attitudes about learning might carry greater weight by virtue of corroboration from several perspectives, that is, people providing, and those who were in some way recipients of, Heartland’s resources. Yin (2003) describes the notion of a credible data flow which allows the reader to “follow the derivation of any evidence, ranging from initial research questions to ultimate case study conclusions” (p. 105).

In regard to decisions about possible participants, Maykut and Morehouse (1994) reinforce the importance of sustaining a researcher diary, and a summation of my notes from April 2004 that predicated decisions can be found in Table 3. Essentially, a variety of snowballing strategies (Berg, 2001; Hennink et al., 2011) led to the creation of purposive pools of participants from which random selection of potential participants could occur. Furthermore, my early 2004 notes recorded the potential data threads for respective participant types.

Table 3: Background to participant selection and data threads

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Planning Notes and Data Generation Intentions: Mid April 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This will be a purposive sample, with deliberate linkages between participants to enhance comparability of data (Maykut &amp; Morehouse, 1994; Tolich &amp; Davidson, 1999).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Children – 9 – 12 intended from the pool of children participating in Heartland.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The research intention is to keep the highest focus on the children as participants. Hence, three groups of 4 children are planned. Heartland Year One children to be invited will be randomly selected from those attending a range of socio-economic schools. Heartland Year Two children will be invited similarly, however, the Heartland Year Two representation will consist of a group from School Year 7 and 8, as well as one made up of School Year 4 to 6 children. Tutor links with these students (ensemble, keyboard, creative, instrumental [e.g. guitar, cello, trombone]) will influence the choice of schools from which random selection of child participants will be invited to participate in the study. This is intended to enhance comparative data from multiple data sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child participant data will come from interview, video records of rehearsal and performances and interviews, and documentation such as self-evaluations (See Appendix 4) and reports (See Appendix 5) from child participants’ ensemble participation and instrument learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Heartland tutors – 3 intended from a pool of 4 core tutors.
Tutor participants for the study to include two tutors returning from 2003, purposively to be chosen as having most active links to all or some of the child participant schools. One will be a new tutor from 2004. On that basis, Kathleen Jenkins, Amy Johnson and Helen Aldridge (pseudonyms) will be invited to participate.

Data will come from interview, ongoing informal dialogue, video records of rehearsal and performances, and documentation such as formal child learning reports to families (See Appendix 5), meeting minutes and correspondence.

School liaison teachers to Heartland – four intended from a pool of eight Liaison teachers to Heartland.
The school liaison group will include three teachers and one school principal, chosen purposively for a role as a management person and mentor to the project. Liaison teachers will be randomly selected from the pool of schools chosen for child participant invitations in order to enhance comparability of data with other participant groups.

Data will come from interview, ongoing informal dialogue, and documentation such as meeting minutes, correspondence and contributions to MoE milestone reporting.

Parent Group – four intended
Parents will be randomly selected from the families of child participants. Some consideration of advice from school liaison teachers about suitability and/or recognition of families which have offered feedback in administrative returns to Heartland will influence the pool from which selection is made.

Data will be gathered through a single interview in 2004 or 2005, as well as informal communication and documentation such as responses and requests of Heartland.

Table 4 shows potential linkages amongst the purposive groups for the purposes of triangulation.

Table 4: Available formal and informal connections amongst categories of study participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schools</th>
<th>Child Participants</th>
<th>Family Participants</th>
<th>Tutors</th>
<th>Tutors/Liaison Teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 7 &amp; 8 School</td>
<td>Year 7 &amp; 8 Children Invitations to four Heartland Year Two children from an intermediate school who reflect a range of progress and commitment.</td>
<td>One parent from Year 7 &amp; 8 participant group.</td>
<td>Amy Johnson and Kathleen Jenkins invited as a returning core tutors.</td>
<td>Liaison teacher from Year 7 &amp; 8 school. Liaison teacher from one of School B, School A &amp; School E. The four schools above are the home of the child participants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4-6 Schools</td>
<td>Year 4 - 6 Children Invitations to four Heartland Year Two children who reflect a range of progress and commitment.</td>
<td>Three parents from School B, School A &amp; School E participant group.</td>
<td>Helen Aldridge invited as a new tutor in 2004. All tutors working with several child participants.</td>
<td>Liaison and mentor person from School C. School from the first planning stages of Heartland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 4 - 6 Children</td>
<td>Year 4 - 6 Children Invitations to four Heartland Year One children who reflect a range of progress and commitment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Anticipating that some children would not wish to participate in the research, 14 invitations were extended to randomly selected children from the pre-determined schools. All but one responded positively to an invitation to participate. The exception indicated that he was moving to another centre with family. All adults invited to be part of the research agreed, except one liaison teacher who cited work overload as the reason to not participate.

**Background to child participants.**

I was fortunate in that background information for child participants was immediately available through existing documentation for Heartland (detailed in Table 4). This included initial expressions of interest, IEP records and administrative documentation from 2003 and early 2004.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Participant, ethnicity, &amp; year of Heartland selection (Shaded according to school groups)</th>
<th>Predominant socio-economic band of school</th>
<th>School Year in 2004</th>
<th>Instrument learning outside Music Heartland</th>
<th>School Achievement as shown in IEP documentation</th>
<th>Keyboard &amp; Theory Year One</th>
<th>Heartland instrument learning in 2004</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helen</strong> (European) Heartland entry: 2003</td>
<td>Middle socio-economic band</td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>Level 3-4 Slightly above average</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Violin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Josh</strong> (European) Heartland entry: 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>Trombone</td>
<td>Achieves well across the curriculum; high level thinking</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Ainsley ** (European) Heartland entry: 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>Clarinet</td>
<td>Level 3-4 Excellent language skills</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Allen</strong> (European/Maori) Heartland entry: 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>Level 2-3 Language stronger than mathematics</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Keyboard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Michael ** (European) Heartland entry: 2003</td>
<td>Upper socio-economic band</td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>Level 2-3 across the curriculum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Serena</strong> (European) Heartland entry: 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 4-5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Li Xiang</strong> (Chinese) Heartland entry: 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Violin</td>
<td>Level 4-5 across the curriculum; very competent.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Jo</strong> (European) Heartland entry: 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Level 2-3 Very competent.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trombone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>**Heidi ** (European)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>Violin</td>
<td>Level 3 Very Capable-High</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cello</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Participant, ethnicity, &amp; year of Heartland selection (Shaded according to school groups)</td>
<td>Predominant socio-economic band of school</td>
<td>School Year in 2004</td>
<td>Instrument learning outside Music Heartland</td>
<td>School Achievement as shown in IEP documentation</td>
<td>Keyboard &amp; Theory Year One</td>
<td>Heartland instrument learning in 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland entry: 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Achiever</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Matapo</strong> (Pacific Island) Heartland entry: 2003</td>
<td>Lower socio-economic band</td>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>Level 3 heading to Level 4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anna</strong> ** (European/Maori) Heartland entry: 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Level 3 across the curriculum (hearing impaired)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tuleva</strong> (Pacific Island) Heartland entry: 2004</td>
<td>Lower socio-economic band</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Level 2-3 across the curriculum</td>
<td>Withdrawn post Year One Ensemble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maia</strong> (European) Heartland entry: 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>Level 2 Average progress across the curriculum</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = Child of parent participant in this study

**Ethical considerations**

Yvonna Lincoln (1990) suggests that researchers work in a responsive manner, in the knowledge that their participants understand the need to record, write up, and possibly publish their observations. Such a mode of inquiry allows for egalitarian and authentic exchanges of information to take place. In line with this, participants involved in this study would often ask “How is the research going?” Similarly, indicating knowledge of their place in the research, child participants would whisper, “He is here to look at me” when I appeared in the classroom. At the same time, Alton-Lee (2001b) affirms the right of any participant to withdraw from a research project and is particularly assertive about considerations pertaining to children. As assurance to the reader, throughout this project all participants expressed an evident willingness to participate in interview situations and numerous other informal communications.

In practice, participants were formally invited by letter (See Appendix 6), and advised that publication of findings was a possibility. As the following indicates, I endeavoured to make the purpose of the study clear (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994), and informed about intended data collection methods, including the use of video (Silverman, 2005).

What is the Aim of the Research?
The project will investigate the progress and achievement of a group of children in the Music Heartland project. As well the research will investigate the perceptions of their music tutors, parent/guardians and classroom teachers. I will look at how the children feel about being in the project, how important their musical progress is to them and if there is connection to their learning progress and self-direction in the other school programmes. As a Music Heartland tutor or classroom teacher of the child participants I would value your insights as part of the research data (Invitation to Tutors and Liaison Teachers, 2004).

On reflection, by the end of 2003 there was a shared mood of wanting to acknowledge what could be learned from quite a large music undertaking amongst the school communities, acknowledgement that more development was to come, and recognition that the approaches might aid understanding about gifted and talented provision. Hence, the snowballing selection processes for adult participants were interactive involving liaison teachers and tutors in particular. It was not only about gathering pools of participant types, but also helped draw my attention to valuable settings for data collection, such as potentially rich data from performances. As Maykut and Morehouse put it, “As the study proceeds the researcher may involve study participants by asking for assistance in locating certain other individuals or settings that are emerging as important aspects of the phenomenon under study” (p. 71).

As a result, I believe that Hennink et al.’s (2011) requirement of voluntary participation without coercion to be involved were met.

The participating schools were already accustomed to information gathering since this was part of my work negotiated with the MoE. Schools were very obliging about the use of facilities for those roles which included IEP’s and child self-evaluations. Interview arrangements were formally made through the school, and all but two interviews took place in a school. The exceptions were a parent interview that took place in a home at the request of a parent, and the tutor interview which was completed at the College, our customary team meeting venue. The choice of schools as the predominant interview site was to assist comfort and familiarity for participants, in particular child participants. A central school was the choice in the case of the liaison teacher interview. Child participant observations were also formally arranged with respective schools. It is worth noting that in addition to my director and research roles, some children were familiar with me working in their school as a visiting lecturer for College of Education students. Hence, greetings from children when at schools were frequent.

Participants were offered the opportunity to request data pertaining to them in the letter of invitation. No requests were received, and nor did I pursue it. In the first place, the first meaningful readings of interview data began late in 2005, by which time Heartland had ceased operation. More significantly, I felt a reassuring consistency between the commentary and mood of the interviews, and subsequent regular formal and informal communications. On occasion,
participants would revisit ideas discussed in interviews, and even child participants would ask hopefully, “what is happening next year?”

McIntrye, Pedder, & Ruddick’s (2005) caution about child diffidence in interview situations and ethical matters of voice were considered in the planning. However, children appeared to find the interviews affirming, something like a guided reading group. Perhaps the dual role of inquiry and friendly engagement (Yin, 2003) was achieved. They seemed at home with the process, going round the circle for ideas, and infrequently jumped the queue and, as video records confirm, were silent out of acquiescence rather than fear of speaking up. Perhaps predictably amongst adult participants, there was more interplay amongst the individuals, as well as greater periods of silence as people thought about questions and their personal or professional perspective. For all participant types, I had developed an interview briefing (see Appendix 7) which I read and discussed with the participants prior to the interview, along with fresh explanation of the purpose and study context of the interview. I was similarly alert to the possible effects of the camera. However, in all cases, while there was initial byplay about its presence, I believe no adverse communication effects transpired once the discussion had begun. This was exciting to me because the adult participants in particular could have adopted a guarded stance, since the comparative element between school practice and Heartland frequently came up in the conversation. As for child participants, I think the use of video from the beginning of 2003 for MoE data gathering purposes meant it was no longer a novelty or a matter of concern to them.

Transcripts and video tapes are set to be destroyed on the completion of the study. These have been stored securely with access only for me or supervisors, should they have requested it. Professional employees of the College, well attuned to confidentiality (Silverman, 2005) completed transcriptions.

The issue of anonymity was given particular consideration owing to the close communal nature of the Heartland project, and the fact that interview data was often gathered in a group setting. As Tolich and Michaelson (1999) point out, anonymity and confidentiality are particularly important in New Zealand contexts as it is seldom difficult to identify participants from within our many small communities. Alton-Lee (2001) has suggested a number of measures to preserve the rights of students, including the use of pseudonyms, allowing students to turn off recording equipment should they wish to end the process, and an unquestionable right to withdraw from the research. As to process, Hennink et al. (2011) discuss a separation between confidentiality and anonymity, highlighting matters such as risk of overhearing other participants, removing identifiers, and sustaining a file of substitution names. In that regard, I have endeavoured to sustain anonymity for participants and institutions involved in the study. I also declare that
because each person involved in the study was of great professional significance to me, name substitution was a final act in the writing of this report.

It is also noteworthy that my perception about interaction during interviews, subsequently confirmed by analysis of the recordings, was one of banter and apparent comfort with the situation. Interviews were punctuated by laughter, taunts about sharing food to get answers, and informal comment amongst participants. Hence, while confidentiality and anonymity have been constant priorities, I believe that the quality of discussions reflected the willingness of participants (children and adults) to have their voices and views heard, rather than being concerned about personal embarrassment or harm should unpredicted events have caused accidental disclosure.

A further ethical matter relates to my views about the quality of music programmes in schools. Prior to beginning the research process I was concerned that my healthy scepticism about school music programmes would influence the data gathering, and even impact on the participant’s willingness to talk. However, following Goodman’s (1992) proposal that the examination of expectations can illuminate the lived experience, I took care in any comparisons between Heartland and school music programmes. Rather than accepting facts about music accomplishment or its absence, I consistently reviewed any musical data alongside deeper contextual questions. As Maso (2003) comments about drivers for establishing research questions:

Both the limitation and the openness of a true question must be reflected in the attitude of the researchers. The limitations researchers impose upon themselves should be flexible: no information should be excluded as long as there is a chance that it could be relevant to their research. (p. 48)

In the end, the participants played the greater role in defusing my initial concerns. Given the confirmation of video data credibility, and ease and comfort of access for observation and Heartland administration, I was reassured that all participant types were comfortable in sharing impressions of school music programmes, open, and willing to interact collegially, without fear of compromise. In hindsight, it would appear that the participants saw Heartland and school music programmes as parallel realities and not really comparable, which in itself I found of interest.

A final ethical concern related to the manner in which to represent the data and the nature of the report. To attain an accurate representation, I endeavoured to evaluate the Heartland project in a manner which offers transparency of epistemology, methodology and, as Lather (1986) states, an awareness of the degree to which the project empowered the researcher. Here I concur with Denzin and Lincoln (1994) who consider research to be akin to an art form. From this
perspective, “the methods of qualitative research thereby become the ‘invention’ and the telling of the tales - the representation - becomes the art” (p. 584). Having acknowledged very positive personal professional gains from Heartland, my goal has been to bring the diversity of participant experiences and outcomes alive for the reader, so that the implications of their journeys might carry appropriate weight in ongoing discussion about classroom theory and practice.

An application to the Otago Human Ethics Committee was made and approved in the first part of 2004. This included approval of the information sheets and consent forms for all categories of participants (See Appendix 6 for participant invitation examples). The following extract was tabled to the committee:

The research will investigate the progress and factors influencing that progress of children who are identified as musically gifted and are participating in a music extension programme in South Dunedin primary and intermediate schools. The student researcher will look at how children, music tutors, teachers and parent/guardians view the learning, how this learning compares with national and international perspectives on musical giftedness. It will seek to enhance guidelines that assist schools and music tutors optimise work with musically gifted children. (Ethics proposal, 2004)

The study began as a partial completion of requirements at Masters level. However, after five years of part-time study the thesis was approved for an upgrade to doctoral level. This was due to the extent of literature investigation and the quite substantive findings available to inform theoretical and conceptual discussion. Throughout I can advise that the requirements for confidentiality, participant communication and participant safety laid out in the proposal have been adhered to. This applies to both the preparation of this report and derivative publications. (See Appendix 6 for copies of participation documentation.)

**Natural history of the research**

*The lead to research questions*

“By asking [the reader] to engage with your thinking in process, they are in a far better position to assess the degree to which you were self critical” (Silverman, 2005, p. 306). Throughout my career I have spent many hours with friends and colleagues debating how much students could achieve in a broad, well-resourced music education programme; one which focused on skill development, was fully integrated into the school week, and gave opportunity for learners with like interest to work across schools. This fascination grew while working as the director of the Out of School Music Classes in Invercargill from 1983 to 1988, and the community music centre, The Music Place, in Dunedin from 1994 to 1999, as well as from research in community music

---

51 The Music Place was a private Dunedin based community music centre offering classes in instrumental and voice work for early childhood to seniors. At its peak, Music Place provided classes for up to 250 clients a term, of whom
centres in Norway and Sweden\textsuperscript{52}. In each case, provision occurred out of school time but with the institution’s complicit support. Instances of dramatic improvements in musical ability and learning are commonplace in these environments. I see this as somewhat remarkable in New Zealand’s case because the achievements derive from relatively minimal per capita government investment compared to European models (Moore, 1997).

In 2002, equipped with a postgraduate diploma, including papers on the teaching process, music aesthetics, and a research project investigating musical performance adjudication, I felt I had sufficient background to investigate aspects of musical development in schools. As part of that readiness, I had become interested in the significance of qualitative research processes for teasing out issues behind the more overt markers of the growth and quality of musical performance. In particular, the qualitative research paradigm had reduced my disquiet about being the passionate observer. As Guba and Lincoln (1994) state, the inquirer’s voice is that of the ‘passionate participant’:

actively engaged in facilitating the ‘multivoice’ reconstruction of his or her own construction as well as those of all other participants. Change is facilitated as reconstructions are formed and individuals are stimulated to act on them. (p. 115)

Coincidentally, at this time my involvement in the regional arts professional development programme was ending. I was accepting of that, although I was personally and professionally disturbed by a change of MoE direction which appeared tinged by financial expediency and with potential to degrade meaningful advisory relationships with schools. I was also suspicious that, in part, my role ended because of strong views about what constitutes effective teacher professional development. My 20 years of school support activity included consistent examples of excitement at teacher understanding and practical musical confidence translating to more effective teaching and learning. In contrast, it seemed that the MoE’s thrust had become an almost immediate, and hardly credible, focus on children’s classroom involvement and achievement, whatever the confidence level of the teachers.

The readiness for research was perfectly timed with the publication of an advertisement in the Education Gazette in 2002 seeking proposals for projects aimed at lifting the achievement of gifted and talented children. I summoned the energy to write, consult about, and deliver the funding proposal, at least partially motivated by the knowledge that success could provide a rich opportunity for research. This perception was further encouraged in the mutually positive

\textsuperscript{52} The research reported on levels and sources of funding for community music training in Norway, Sweden and England in 1997.
atmosphere in negotiating the contract for Heartland with the Ministry of Education. In short, based on the contract and its intent, Heartland came into being framed by an exciting potential to produce quality learning from a structured programme which gave value to genuine skill, creative and ensemble development, and to be delivered across multiple schools as part of selected children’s regular school day. Further, the framework for research was encouraged by the Ministry of Education’s parameters for milestone reporting.

As director, I had extensive influence over philosophy, pedagogical processes, children’s pathways, administrative logistics and resource allocation. These functions offered a particularly data rich environment for ethnographic research. As such, I celebrated my involvement as an interventionalist but accepted the responsibilities summarised by Adler (1993) as “questioning, deciding, analysing and considering alternatives within an ethical, political framework” (p. 167). At the same time, throughout much of 2003, I was consumed by the complex organisational and logistical roles of being the director53. As such, my role included all conceivable aspects of the project, from employment of tutors to school liaison, alongside the primary aim of fostering excellence in children’s music learning54.

By the end of 2003 it had become rivetingly clear that much could be learned from the perspectives of all involved in the project (the children, teachers, parents, and the part-time music tutors), as well as from the children’s musical outputs. I decided that the essential aim of my research would be to offer results and examples that could serve teachers in their planning, praxis, and evaluation of music provision for gifted children. Hence, rather than adopting a particular theoretical stance, I sought to be open and grounded in the questions I would ask of the data. Goodman (1992) provides solid justification for such an approach, suggesting that “Although the development of a theoretical framework is necessary to comprehend social life, theory must be placed in proper perspective. Not to do so presents an image of the researcher as one who has special insight into truth” (p. 123).

In saying that, despite my enthusiasm for both Heartland and the prospect of research, I was besieged by doubt about whether Heartland represented a personalised and navigable path toward musical excellence, or if it was fundamentally an elitist, perhaps unethical model for music extension programmes. What spurred me on, throughout this and ensuing periods, was the

53 On any one day my roles might have included discussions about logistical support for children to practice at school, booking buses for a pick up around the eight schools, drafting notes for tutors and schools about selection for the next level of the Heartland programme, and reworking the budget in the face of a blow out in children’s transport costs.

54 I note the splendid logistical and collegial support of Queens High School and the Dunedin College of Education during the operational period of Heartland, without which Heartland could have imploded.
apparently positive effects of tutors and the learning activities being woven into the respective school programmes. The outcomes and feedback seemed overwhelmingly rewarding.

In consideration of the research questions, I decided the first reflected a focus of the MoE on wider achievement, as well as inform exploration of diverse viewpoints on this topic evident in the literature. This question also took the interest of one of my supervisors, though we both acknowledged that identifying and documenting wider achievement would be difficult. Because Heartland would not be providing classroom teachers with extra resources, evidence about wider achievement would need to be discerned from participant perceptions or written records such as Independent Education Plans (See Appendix 3).

The second question aimed to explore the Heartland community’s expectations about the wider musical and social effects of enriched music learning. The idea of enrichment arose on receiving numerous overtly positive responses from schools and parents after the music sharing at the end of 2003, the time when I formulated the research questions.

The final research question centred on participant empowerment. In order to explore empowerment fully, critical reflection on my own perceptions about quality and motivations for music learning was necessary. In this I adopted the critical theory approach to qualitative research which aims to unravel entrenched beliefs and the acceptance of long standing practice. As Roulston (2006) states, “Like the work of researchers pursuing emancipatory goals, deconstructive work challenges many of our taken-for-granted assumptions about what music educators do, and how the work of music teaching and learning might be studied” (p. 163).

Perhaps this is consciousness raising (Korth, 2002) by another name, and here I acknowledge myself as actor in the data along with the participants. To reduce the possibility of collusion in acts of research imperialism (Adler, 1993), I took care in scrutinising personal prejudices. Moreover, I channelled my scepticism about school music programmes into a more open frame of critique about assumptions which underpin music education, curriculum and creativity discourse in New Zealand. Another potential bias was my belief that the long term integrity of music learning is jeopardised where the learner is not developing an acoustic instrument and theory skill-base. This construct about the nature of musical integrity was a latent false consciousness in what might be considered good learning in Heartland. While not oppressive in the form of social empowerment, as described by Goodman (1992), awareness of the bias meant

---

55 Lather (1986) and Goodman (1992) describe false consciousness as an unconscious support of established attitudes or practices identifiable in the act of researching or the subject of research itself.
I was indeed careful about application of Heartland’s principles pertaining to students’ progress (See Appendix 2).

In light of these points, I decided that my research processes would be more robust if grounded in critical analysis. For example, was my scepticism about music in the curriculum essentially a form of passive acceptance? Was Heartland merely a reflection of my assumptions and best guesses about music learning? Did Heartland lead to greater urgency in music learning or was it a barrier for so called musically gifted and talented children? Most importantly, however, I was intent that answers to such questions would ultimately come from the participants. As Sears (1992) suggests, qualitative inquiry requires “a willingness to engage and to be engaged” and “the ability…to engage reflectively in a search for the meanings constructed by others and ourselves” (p. 152).

Hence, after having engaged with the children, parents, schools and teachers involved in Heartland for a minimum of six months, the research questions for this report became:

- What discernable effects does the programme have on gifted children’s achievement and self-efficacy?
- How is enriched music learning viewed by child, parent, teacher and community?
- On what basis can communities, schools, and other providers legitimately define and adopt programmes for musically gifted children? What are useful processes for scrutinising process effectiveness and child efficacy identifiable as the result of any unique approach?

The means of gathering data

Given my access, the range of participants and the energy of the overall community within Heartland, as well as affirming feedback from the MoE, as noted, a process for gathering data came relatively easily. In response to my supervisors’ suggestion to heighten the voice of the child participants I opted for an initial interview, followed by a re-interview of a smaller, more purposive sample a year later. I anticipated coupling the interview data with reflections on each child participant’s creative and practical music outputs. Although it was also recommended that the children keep diaries or logs, I favoured using the interviews and data from children’s self-evaluations (See Appendix 4) that I had already devised for MoE milestone reporting.

I also had approval to incorporate the Ministry’s Individual Education Plans as data. These included wider achievement and social progress indicators that has been developed with Val Rowe, the leader of gifted and talented initiatives at Queens High School (See Appendix 3). This data was collected from classroom teachers and music tutors who reported on the child participant’s music progress, social attributes and application. In addition, the research data included video recordings of child participants’ performances and observations that had initially
been recorded for the purposes of Heartland MoE milestone reporting and Heartland community archives. The final layer of data, involving the parents of child participants, school liaison teachers and music tutors, was intended to contextualise the learning and social responses of the child participants. The data collection from these groups was planned as single interview, as well as preceding and subsequent informal communications.

Interestingly enough, the completeness of data concerning individual child participants was constrained by Heartland’s selection and re-selection process. In only one case was there data from every source, the child, a parent, music observation, classroom observation, tutor, classroom teacher, a school liaison teacher, as well as video and Individual Education Plan records. However, I believe that the two full years of data gathering, plus elements of some child participant’s third year participation, where it occurred, assisted reliability.

As Locke, Silverman and Spirduso (2004) suggest, sustained ethnography means the researcher is more likely to identify contradictory participants and distortions in data, and encounter any personal biases. While nervous about my dual roles as director and researcher, being in the field for nearly four years allowed me to better deal intellectually and emotionally with issues or benefits emerging in one or both of the roles. Similarly, the two years of data gathering seemed to bring more clarity about trends when interpreting contradictions between child commentary and other data, particularly in the case of one child participant. Perhaps most importantly in terms of my dual role, the length of time in the field meant emerging data played a role in making changes to Heartland operations. In this I was encouraged by Denzin and Lincoln’s (2000) idea of consequence, described as the relation between an earlier action, text or viewpoint and any subsequent consequences.

As a way to bring clarity for the reader, a supervisor’s suggestion to incorporate case study material and work examples was adopted mid way through the writing of the findings chapter. Citing Richardson (1994), Janesick (2000) states that, crystallisation befits the contemporary researcher’s zeal to recognise the many facets of social life as a fact of life. In line with this, I was keen to seek out contextual patterns from child participant data and in that adopted Denzin and Lincoln’s (2000) assertion of credibility from exploring unique characteristics of one participant in data analysis. This intention was balanced by Atkinson and Coffey’s (2003) description of data as a complex weave of information which even by implication involves other individuals as actors. They recognise that to treat data as anything but problematic and non-transparent represents an attempt to apply a form of more traditional triangulation. As I interpret it, while each individual’s data may proffer the clearest picture, their information is inseparable from the complex social weave occurring in other data collection. As Atkinson and Coffey (2003) state
about interviews, “We cannot approach interview data simply from the point of view of ‘truth’ or ‘distortion’ and we cannot use such data with a view to remedying the incompleteness of observations” (p. 116). In the end, because of the complexity of data sources and cross over, partially completed case studies were abandoned in favour of quite a large number of tightly themed findings throughout which individuals appeared prominently in multiple places.

I saw this as the most helpful strategy for improving the clarity of findings, and furthermore, as Silverman (2005) describes in relation to qualitative reports, credibility, or validity as he calls it, derives from data analysis processes, comprehensive data treatment, deviant case analysis, and some tabulation of data to clarify trends, rather than expecting the reader to simply take our word for it. For example, it felt important to explore the stories of children withdrawn in Heartland. Silverman (2005) summarises by suggesting that the cornerstone of validity is dependent on the audience being fully aware of the process(es) followed. Similarly, Patton (1990) asserts the importance of transparency in the interests of replication of qualitative research:

There are no formulas for determining significance. There are no ways of perfectly replicating the researcher’s analytical thought processes. There are no straight forward tests for reliability and validity. In short, there are no absolute rules except to do the very best with your full intellect to fairly represent the data and communicate what the data reveal given the purpose of the study. (p. 372)

However, Atkinson and Coffey (2003) remind us of the challenge in qualitative research, that pieces of research data cannot be simply added together to create either a coherent picture or to guarantee credibility. Rather, they suggest that researchers need to treat data from different sources as representative of natural, real world interactions. They also caution that the presence of the researcher should not be overstated any more than understated. In my view, here Atkinson and Coffey are suggesting that after fifty years of interactive research and media practices, the research community and many participants have become attuned to probing and question oriented processes. In general, participants are less fazed by the presence of curious, perhaps slightly nosey people, the kinds of questions they ask, and the technologies commonly associated with research, such as a video camera. This felt a reasonable framework for this study, because, as noted, by the time the research had formally begun, the children, parents and teachers involved were accustomed to me gathering information and popping up when Heartland activity was afoot. They appeared more concerned about events I may have missed than my presence on any given occasion.

In regard to the selection of participants, as noted, it was decided early on that data from involved children, parents, tutors and school liaison teachers would be of interest. In essence, as Maykut and Morehouse (1994) suggest, I was seeking to gain multiple views on common themes.
As described, in selecting child participants, I sought children between Years 4 to 8\textsuperscript{56} who had been involved in Heartland for periods ranging from four months to more than two years, as well as a mix of ethnicities and school socio-economic status. Reflective of my application of snowballing techniques (Berg, 2001; Hennink et al., 2011), the desirable mix of children influenced my choice of the four schools from which participants would be invited, along with consideration of the range of responses schools had demonstrated to Heartland during 2003. In this, I sided with Berg (2001):

> When developing a purposive sample, researchers use their special knowledge or expertise about some group to select subjects who represent this population.… Snowballing is sometimes the best way to locate subjects with certain attributes or characteristics necessary in a study. (pp. 32-33)

After selecting schools, fourteen child participants were selected randomly by an independent person drawing names from a hat. As noted, each was formally invited and gave consent except for one child who was about to leave the city. From the families of child participants four parents were then randomly selected. Of these, one family did not respond to mail or three phone communications, and another indicated imminent departure from Dunedin. Early in 2004 I noted concern at having only two parent participants, and as a result invited two further families to participate. The invitation to families requested the involvement of a parent or guardian but in all four cases it was the mother who agreed to participate\textsuperscript{57}.

Three tutor participants were randomly invited from Heartland’s bank of part-time tutors, all of whom agreed to take part. One school liaison teacher was purposively selected to participate because of a key school management role; a decision which I felt could result in wider insights than those of classroom teachers. The other two liaison teacher participants were teachers at the schools attended by the child participants. As noted, a fourth teacher declined because of work commitments. Thus, in total the participants consisted of thirteen children, four parents, three tutors and three school liaison teachers. In retrospect, the lack of itinerant music teacher representation was an omission that possibly limited the findings, because interesting comparative data emerged about the parallel work of itinerant and Heartland tutors.

As Denzin and Lincoln (2000) suggest, the researcher is best placed to choose the appropriate actors, given the purposes of the study (p. 391). Who to select was difficult process for me because Heartland’s giftedness focus created strong temptation to invite the most exciting learners to participate. In retrospect, I am delighted I did not succumb to the possibility because

\textsuperscript{56} Year 4 to 8 describes children in their fourth to eighth year at school. In this band children are typically age eight to twelve.

\textsuperscript{57} As an aside, throughout the project the vast majority of phone calls to families concerning Heartland or this research study were passed over to the mother of the child participant.
as the research evolved, it became increasingly clear to me that the diversity of participants was adding to the richness of data, contrary data and comparative possibilities; therefore potentially aiding the integrity of this report.

Another design option suggested by a supervisor was the possibility of including a control group for comparing the musical development of the child participants. However, after some deliberation I decided this would not have been an ethical strategy. As Reid (2004) asks, “Who are to be the gifted non-participants? There is simply no way that parents would agree to have their children excluded from a gifted programme so as to provide the evaluator with a control of comparison group” (p. 433).

I also felt that with children and liaison teachers involved, comparative data concerning school and Heartland music outcomes would be forthcoming.

Data collection strategies with the 23 participants reflected my hope for an ongoing flow of communication. Interviews conducted in a group environment were the first field-active aspect of formal data collection process. Some consideration was given to the use of group interviews as much literature highlights potential dangers of a crimping or sanitizing effect on data as a result of group formats (Fontana & Frey, 1994; Tolich & Michaelson, 1999). However, Fontana and Frey (1994) suggest that group interviews offer a number of advantages, including possibilities of them being data rich, stimulating, aiding recall, and giving cumulative and more elaborate viewpoints than individual interviews. Furthermore, Fontana and Frey suggest that group interviews can help the researcher identify participants who could reveal more as key informants (p. 365). As Hopkins (2008) describes, “Like other researchers, however, I increasingly find group interviews with three or four students the most productive. Far from inhibiting each other, the individuals ‘spark’ (emphasis in original) themselves into sensitive and perceptive discussion.” (p. 110). Considering a mix of confidence also played a part in choosing child participants for second interviews in 2005, along with matters of gender, age, musical progress and cultural diversity.

Gubrium and Holstein’s (2003) suggestion of interviews now being a familiar cultural process, as well as reflecting a broad commonality within the lives of participants led me to adopt closely related question themes for each participant type. While the perspective of each type would be different, as noted, I hoped that the respective views would allow scrutiny of events and opinions for the purpose of assisting integrity, and later the drawing of implications and applications. In effect, the interviews, about which I concur with Gubrium and Holstein’s view of an accepted form of cultural production, had already become part of Heartland’s shared experience. I believe
Gubrium and Holstein effectively describe the dynamic flux of interviews (interviewee and interviewer) in contemporary terms as “Recognizing how interviewers reformulate questions and how respondents frame answers in terms of their reciprocal understanding as meanings emerge during the course of the interview (2003, p. 35).

On reflection, as previously noted, because of my dual role as researcher and director, matters of interest in interviews had, on occasion, far reaching effects with viewpoints influencing changes in Heartland’s ongoing programme. As a similarly reciprocal benefit, I support Alton-Lee’s (2001b) view, that when conducted with care, data collection can have meta-cognitive benefits for children’s awareness about their learning. This was often evident in interviews as child participants seemed to gain confidence in talking about the impact of different aspects of Heartland and in subsequent communication. In addition, the general confidence of child participants in interviews also offered reassurance about my estimation that it would not be necessary to differentiate interview themes across participant types, and particularly maturational differences represented in the study.

Because of the quality and extent of interaction that I perceived prior to the start of the research process, I anticipated open conversation in the interviews. On that basis, I felt it safest to adopt a semi-structured interview approach to help focus the discussion. Following the lead of Denzin and Lincoln (1994) and Fontana and Frey (1994), I endeavoured to act, not as a neutral collector of data, but as an involved and adaptive participant. Furthermore, Tolich and Michaelson (1999) point out that group interviews can produce unwieldy data and mute the opportunity for probes and follow up questions. In response, I was grateful for the participants’ time and energy and tried to communicate this by bringing a sense of clarity and purpose to the interviews through planning them as semi-structured situations. In hindsight, I found that in most cases, peremptory and spontaneous thoughts were not glossed over because the previously circulated themes were available to us to be returned to and explored later in the interview. Bier’s (1999) concept of drawing data resonates with me. “The ‘data’ of interviews are not inside the head of the respondent waiting to be ‘picked’ but are created in the sense of being organised out of existing knowledge and experience, during the interview” (p. 112).

Specific interview themes were derived from the research questions, along with multiple questions and prompts. This was a demanding process requiring many draft attempts. For example, how to explore the meaning of music achievement and its wider ramifications was a real challenge in light of my bias toward musical performance in curriculum. Hence, developing questions required much soul searching as my professional experience merged sometimes awkwardly with literature. The resulting interview themes have already been summarised as:
• Enjoyment and indications of commitment/belonging
• Understandings about what was being learned musically
• Longer term intentions in regard to music
• Social and wider curriculum responses connected to Heartland in school and home
• Ability/musical giftedness
• Provision for musical giftedness and breadth of access/involvement.

The final interview structure for each category of participant consisted of stated question stems with a range of contributing questions to follow. For adult participant interviews, a wider range of open questions followed the stem (See Appendix 7).58

Most interviews and observations took place around the middle of 2004, while the second parent group and repeat child participant interviews occurred in 2005. As intended, the latter interviews gave participants the opportunity to look back on the evolution of Heartland. As previously noted, all interviews, except one of the parent interviews, were conducted in education settings. I transported child participants to a central school, a practice they were already used to as part of Heartland learning. Interviews were videoed, which resulted in them being punctuated with predictable ragging about being movie stars, from children and adults alike. In the case of child participants, energy sweets were provided although the uptake was modest, perhaps because of concern for their teeth, or because they had different tastes from my own.

Following the completion of each interview I made informal notes regarding the mood and particular standout issues. As indicated, video tapes were transcribed in full over an extended period of time by professional typists at College. Looking back, I interpret general affirmation of the framework for the interviews because participants were generous in their contributions, and appeared natural at the time and in review of the video records. Furthermore, various participant types appeared to focus on particular interest points, for instance, the tutors had particular concerns about music in schools, the liaison teachers about the resources available for school music, while the child participant had much to say about choices of instrument. However, my notes and video records give me some conviction that the environment in which the interviews took place was simultaneously purposive and light, and while moderated by me, was dominated by what Fontana and Frey (1994) describe as natural communication. In retrospect, I know that at times I talked too much, answered a question before catching the reply, and even put words out there which a participant adopted. Nevertheless, in analysis, the weight of data had a genuine feel, and Wolcott’s (1990) tactic of appearing a little naive in hope of further explanation appeared to have been quite useful.

58 Appendix 7 contains themes, interview questions and initial prompts for all participant types.
My long teaching experience also stood me in good stead in defusing occasions where one participant dominated an interview, as well as being able to encourage a participant to express and sometimes develop a viewpoint (Fontana & Frey, 1994). Once again, grouping people for interviews emerged as an advantage. Eder and Fingerson (2002) note, that group interviews, especially those with children, provide a means of reducing sensitivity to the researcher’s presence or what they term the ‘power differential’ (p. 183). I found that to be so, as information readily emerged in the commentary of child and adult interviews, along with two way exchanges and reality checks (Scheurich, 1995). As Gubrium and Holstein (2003) delightfully put it, at times there was a swirl of viewpoint formation.

The development of the field observation method was significantly influenced by Eisner’s (1990) concept of the self as a research instrument. There was ample and possibly sufficient data emerging from the Individual Education Plans and tutor reports on musical growth. However, in light of Eisner’s (1990) premise of engaging with and making sense of data, I decided that personal observation could assist interpretation of what was being said and written about child participants’ learning. I understood that observations would be contrived to some degree, but I hoped they would allow me to better understand the child participant’s responses in classroom and music lessons, including engagement with teachers, influences on their motivation, and attitudes toward the learning environment.

Where I departed from Eisner was in my reservations about how I would effectively observe without guidelines. I was concerned that I would be drawn to a narrow focus and thus fail to record significant events or deeper social aspects. Another important consideration was that although I have a good understanding of classrooms and music tuition practices, my expectation of music learning is greatly influenced by eventual product. Hence, while steeped in the education culture, I risked blurring what Bier (1999) describes as the distinction between the discovered and imagined. In the twenty five years away from classroom teaching my focus is now predominantly on student teachers’ engagement with the learning environment, rather than on the specifics about the success, challenge and empowerment of an individual child. Accordingly, I felt a need to utilise criteria to reduce the potential for assumptions as well as improve the likelihood of comparable data.

With that in mind, I developed a tight structure for field observation. Maykut and Morehouse (1994) compare observation to the researcher describing the view of the inside to those on the outside. Similarly, along with set timings for data collection so as not to be continuously recording, thereby possibly missing social threads, I felt the need for multiple categories within headings (Open University, 1976. As a result, in hindsight, I consider that the observation guide
(See Appendix 9) enhanced this form of data collection because the potential for abbreviated recording generated by the guides’ headings and categories allowed more time for anecdotal comment. Moreover, for the participants, since I was not constantly recording, I was more likely to have appeared detached, and possibly just daydreaming.

As to the question of what to observe, Tolich and Michaelson’s (1999) advice to transfer themes from the interview guide to field notes, and to focus on what was being said rather than why, was most useful. It seemed important to be able to evaluate questions and processes holistically as well as through data focused on specific events, particularly for the one to one instrument lesson observations. However, I wanted more precise data than I felt a broad account of events would offer, as well as improved credibility of later interpretation and grounded conceptual theory (Hennink, et al., 2011) through the support of low inference observation data. Because of the range of social and musical criteria employed, I regarded this as meaningful subjectivity, rather than low inference recording for the purposes of objectivity, as recommended by Taebel (1992).

The observation criteria finally selected were: mood indicators, the nature of communication, nature of the learning/practice (music or other) activity and ability signals, and clearly more definitive than jottings suggested by Tolich and Michaelson (1999). I developed the observation grid so that data could be recorded for each of the headings at one or more points of 10 minute segments throughout the observation. As Appendix 9 shows, the observation guide included classifications within each criteria, as well as an intensity rating. For example, mood indicators ranged from enthusiastic to resistant (Flanders, 1970).

In the latter part of 2004 seven children were observed participating in a music lesson for between thirty and fifty minutes. Five of this group were also observed in general classroom situations. Decisions about which child participants would be observed were made purposively. As in the case of selection of child participants for repeat interviews in 2005, I attempted to reflect the attributes of the wider child participant group in the choice of who to observe (See Table 5. My notes record that my presence was never a secret, occasionally I added to distractive behaviours within the classroom, and that I was communicative at times. Nonetheless, the recorded data was invaluable in helping me better understand individual child participants and thus hopefully build a more effective representation of their lived experience. Indeed, knowing more about each child participant, and them about me, felt essential in the interests of the study’s integrity. Looking back, in my view, the observation guide allowed better consistency in recording, and coupled with immediate brief reflections about of what I had witnessed, made filtering and sorting data a more genuine process.
**Approach to data analysis**

Data analysis was based on a constant comparative approach (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994):

Inductive approaches to data analysis takes quite a different path [than deductive analysis]. Data are collected that relate to a focus of inquiry. Hypothesis are not generated a priori and thus the relevant variables for data collection are not predetermined…. Rather, what becomes important to analyze emerges from the data itself, out of a process of inductive reasoning. (pp. 126-127)

Freeman (2004), citing Miles and Huberman (1994), describes the qualitative analysis of crystalline musical experiences as the aggregation of data following the coding and identification of themes. According to Anderson and Burn’s (1989) summary of research in classrooms, this approach can be described as interpretive inquiry which seeks to discern particular qualities within the data, such as inner perspectives and the subtle meanings attached to words. However, as in accordance with Stake (1995), in this study the process had no real beginning or end, hence, initially and throughout the study, data frequently took me by surprise or felt too unruly to place.

For this study, the largest focus on data analysis began late in 2004 and continued until the middle of 2006. In hindsight, the length of this process partially echoed Yin’s (2003) caution about planning the analysis processes prior to collection so as to avoid the study stalling, since I had limited previous experience. However, I would like to think that a more important influence on the extended analysis period was being willing to engage with the voice of participants again and again.

The first step was multiple readings of the interview transcripts and video responses, mulling over the words of the various participants and types. As text sang to me, or more clinically seemed of significance, I began to copy and paste interesting, conjoint and/or disjoint parts into a new word file, and colour coded it to represent the source, for example Child participant Year 2 etc. Without doubt, as Stake (1995) describes, “qualitative research champions the interaction of researcher and phenomena” (p. 95). In this case, my mood, one close to ebullience about the kinds of music being produced by children, doubtlessly influenced my selections of pertinent voice.

As to focus, Maykyut and Morehouse’s (1994) suggestion that the early inductive processes of coding through repeated readings without consideration of the research questions was adhered to. This first level of analysis included much that would never be incorporated in the findings. However, it can be said that all material was considered as data (Eisner, 1990). After discussion with my supervisors, I re-examined this grouped data, but now with a slant toward the research questions. Hence, in subsequent clustering and thinking about the commentary I utilised a mix of
deductive and inductive strategies (Hennink et al., 2011). For example, some of the codes that finally eventuated (See Appendix 8) for second and third layers of analysis were deduced from the research questions and linked interview themes (Hennink, et al., 2011), while others were induced from the repeated readings of the transcripts. As I noted about the latter during 2006, in many instances, what I termed as big brush collection points developed naturally around particular questions or topics connected to viewpoints found in literature under review at that time. Similarly, I was also alert to unanticipated clusters of data that had appeared (such as the response to creative work in Heartland or views about working across schools).

At this time I worked on metres of marked and coded paper over a six month period as the colour coded interview data was placed alongside collations of observed data with some initial interpolation or checking with documents and review of performances. This served as a partial credibility check for data placed in respective headings induced from interviews. As Hennink et al. (2011) describe inductive codes must be “shown to be valid, robust and useful to be included” (p. 220). In 2006 the final key headings eventuated as:

• Catalysts to music learning
• Value assessment of Heartland
• Exploring creative outputs
• A gifted programme within the school
• Child participant growth pathways
• Heartland relationships (See Appendix 10).

Each of these headings generated one or two sub-levels of themes to a total of fifty seven. At this degree of compilation there was much duplication of data. In addition, seven of the sub-themes primarily focused on aspects of self-determination attracted no further data, and the relationships heading included data from mostly observational and Heartlands records. It was a time intensive process to reach this point. However, I believe the advantage of the duplication was that more reliable finding and linking of pertinent data was made possible, often by use of Cntrl F in Word. Similarly, contradictory data and explanations (Yin, 2003) remained in the compilations under respective headings. Furthermore, when collating supposedly like data, I took great care about placement and clustering into sub-themes, mindful of Ackroyd and Hughes’ (1992) warning that social information as data should not be sliced and carved as if it is the subject of an experiment.
My research notes recorded many issues and doubts during the analysis period. I knew the importance for credibility of multiple data sources but merging the several types of data (including the written data, such as the Individual Education Plans, observation field notes, product analysis, and Heartland’s administrative records) was a difficult intellectual process for me. A particular challenge arose as I planned the evaluation of musical product (performed and creative). I considered a numeric system for grading the work. However, the number of variables created by the sheer diversity of child participant experiences and responses dissuaded me from taking this approach. Furthermore, as represented in the study for *When Music Speaks* (Moore, 2000), my thinking about assessment of performance had moved away from quantifiable criteria being applied to musical elements. The conclusions of that study questioned practices where errors or stylistic conformity appear to arbitrarily impact on numeric assessment ratings and a case was made for local factors around instantiation to be more overtly considered, particularly in the case of younger performers. In that report, coupled with the effect of my teaching experience, I have formed the view, that except perhaps for those who demonstrate excellence within or close to the more tightly defined Classical Music paradigm, the growth of a child’s musical ability and recognition by others is more likely to be sporadic and less readily categorised.

Citing Berger (1998), Silverman (2005) states, that how data is shaped and organised is a researchers’ personal preference. From this vantage, I felt that quantitative evaluation would have conveniently allowed me to sidestep investigation of the drivers behind the qualities of the product. Denzin and Lincoln (2000) talk of qualitative researchers’ belief in their ability to get close to the actor’s perspective. For example, applied to music research, Steier’s (1991) evaluation of children’s hand-bell playing asserted that musical features and relationships were not able to be made explicit until the researchers understood the children’s reference points. Only then were they:

> able to see in the player’s moves the often unplanned, unexpected emergence of these tacit criteria for making sense of the materials. This transaction between finding and making – finding in the materials what we already know and simultaneously making something new of them – is a process perhaps most familiar to the creative artist. (Steier, 1991, p. 208)

Hence, following the lead of Heartland’s internal reporting procedures, in this research assessment involved descriptive ratings for multiple categories. I endeavoured to ascribe the
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59 Somewhat optimistically, in *When Music Speaks*, the quantification of assessment data was described as an example of false consciousness, if the assessment’s purpose was to capture more genuine meaning when assessing a performance.

60 Examples of numeric translation of errors to grade points can be found within community examination and ensemble competitions.
ratings and commentary to what the child participant could do, which I anticipated would offer a subjective, but nevertheless distinct, enhancement of local conditions and the child's wider learning in the evaluation of musical product and learning.

As explanation, my literature-based project, *When Music Speaks* (Moore, 2000) and an assignment for EDUC480 (Critical Analysis of Teaching) both explored the influence that interpretation, individual uniqueness and the local environment have on performance. From this, it might be said that the idea of evaluating performance in a frame of that particular experience, and the implications for growth of that learner, encourages a more phenomenological assessment lens. Just because a learner’s performance fits the criteria of excellence does not necessarily mean a match with a prescribed ideal, because to assume such a correlation could mean we have merely stopped noticing the differences. As Skarda (1989) puts it, performance implies “a specific epoch, a prevalent form of spontaneity, a specific form of self-experience, a specific form of sociality, and a specific time perspective” (p. 91).

To recognise such specificity I felt the need to look for unique qualities in child participant’s work. This echoed the goals of the Heartland programme which were intended to be broader than fast tracked instrument learning, an expectation I have observed as typical in families of musically gifted children. For example, while detail about the level, fluency and cohesiveness of performance would be important, attempting to clarify the expressive and social aspects of the children’s music making would also be critical elements. Even at beginning levels, a sense of communication plays a significant role in confirming an aesthetic horizon beyond cognitive responses (Motycka, 1989) and flow complements evidence of skill and the ability to meet challenges (Csikszentmihalyi, 2002). The importance of this more holistic lens in evaluation is supported by McPherson and Thompson (1998), who suggest that the initial evaluation of performance should move from the whole to elements, rather than from the elements to the whole.

As a result of preliminary thinking, I adopted the Ministry of Education’s Music Exemplar (2003b) headings. These were published to support teacher understanding of musical development, offer the following principles as a guide to evaluating progression: Complexity, Control, Depth, Independence and Consciousness (p. 1). While, as I read the exemplars, the integrity of the guidelines application in the published exemplars is debatable, the principles provide helpful parameters for considering the development of broader and more independent learning qualities. A further influence was the structure used for evaluating music products in the National Education Monitoring Project (NEMP) profiles (Flockton & Crooks, 2005). Hence, the strategies in these two resources influenced my development of an instrument for evaluating
creative and performance product in this study. After trialling several variations of an assessment matrix, I decided on the following headings for the purpose of evaluation: involvement, musical style, ensemble, technical expertise, accuracy, challenge, cohesion, reading and recording, and independence (See Appendix 11).

Another important quandary was how to portray the weight of opinion from or across different participant types. To deal with this matter in a consistent manner while endeavouring to sustain individuals at the core of the study, I developed a crude counting system (Silverman, 2005) for textual qualifiers, as follows:

- Few = Less than 33% of the participants addressed the topic or question.
- Some = 34% to 50% of the participants addressed the topic or question.
- Majority = 51% to 64% of the participants addressed the topic or question.
- Prevalent = More than 65% of the participants addressed the topic or question.
- None or All = Ends of the continuum but allow for some inconsistency in participant comment(s).

Finally, in working with complex arrays, and quite extensive data that I had the privilege of analysing, clustering, and ascertaining links and implications, I came to more fully appreciate the challenge of trying to share more than personal realities, to be outside myself. As Mooch (2000) suggests:

I have come to feel more caught within myself. I am struck increasingly with the impossibility of getting outside my own skin. The more I try to grasp someone else’s experience, the more I am impressed with how hard it is, how much beyond me that experience really is. (Mooch, 2000, p. 129)

The lead to writing the report

In pressing for higher quality analysis Yin (2003) describes the importance of all data being considered, allowance of rival explanations, attention to research questions and application of researcher knowledge on the subject. In that frame, as I explored relationships and patterns across sub-divisions of data (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994; Yin, 2003) and moved toward conceptualisations (Hennink, et al., 2011), I began to feel more encouraged about the veracity of findings concerning children’s musical and wider achievement. This was primarily because the range of evidence types typically revealed a high level of congruency about specific sub-themes. From the conceptualisation occurring the middle of 2006, questions about fundamental precepts of musical giftedness and achievement in music found in the literature were taking a keener shape.

Heartland was a project based in mainstream New Zealand schools rather than in a Corelli School of the Arts or a Bergen-style conservatoire. Further, initial reading of the literature
revealed concepts of musical giftedness which I perceived as biased toward acuity and particular field dominance originating from intense early in life experiences, thereby perhaps more connected with training than potential. In contrast, in consultation with supervisors, I felt encouraged to consider the most meaningful ways I could represent child participants (development and music products), and bring clarity to their viewpoints through their voice and product examination being prominent in the findings.

By early 2007 I had completed the analysis of the music examples and case studies. Once these were woven with the observation and interview data, the basis of an initial findings chapter was formed. In regard to plausibility, the range of data sources had become a definitive positive (Silverman, 2005). After two drafts and consultation with supervisors, in a bid for clearer representation, I chose to truncate the size of the findings by focussing on three key analysis headings rather than the initial five. I also hoped that the change would give more latitude for charting the most significant causal and theoretical implications of the findings. The three focus headings became identification and access, music learning within Heartland, and integrity of involvement and community effectiveness.

As successive drafts were written, I was aware of diminishing participant voice. However, I strived to encapsulate fairly and sustain balance through participant commentary. Here in particular, I felt the need to be conscious of the value laden lens with which I approached the amalgamated data (Goodman, 1992). The data reflected predictable variations in perceptions of the four participant types, hence weighting the different perspectives presented a continual complexity. For instance, aspects of parents’ comments about their children’s learning were effectively hearsay, since they were seldom observers in the teaching sessions. Hence, such evidence required sensitive treatment and weighting.

Another issue that arose was how best to sustain the integrity of participants iterations. As noted, based on the atmosphere of the interviews, the data seemed genuinely credible and showed little evidence of being contaminated by the dominance of particular participants. However, as transcripts, this frequency meant splitting up long participant statements with characteristics like mixed ideas in sentences, breaks for breathing, or sometimes the initial topic being lost. While mindful of the need to not distort the original (Eder & Fingerson, 2002) to give weight to the views of participants, I admit that I engaged in careful punctuation and sometimes truncation of sentences. This was of course based on notes and my repeated viewing of video interviews for indicators of mood and body language alignment of these with my interpretations. As noted, I also considered subsequent conversations with the participants, as well as the significant amount of documentation and observed data. As Findlay and Gough (2003) suggest, researchers need to
be aware of anything that may contribute to answering their question, however, above all I endeavoured to be sensitive in decisions about participant voice. At the same time, as I tentatively suggest credibility in the ongoing blending and seeking links from multiple sources of evidence, I concur with both Silverman (2005) and Atkinson and Coffey (2003). They suggest reflexivity is more about building a comprehensive data management process than retrospectively skewing the results to favour one source of data over another.

The findings of this study were drafted prior to the completion of the full literature review. In fact, stumbling across less familiar territory in regard to analysis or musical achievement was significant in guiding the direction of further reading and précis work. Here I note that a bonus of being a full time teaching staff member with diverse music education roles, as well as being a student was that much of the literature I encountered was relevant and an inspiration for course work. Discussions with students about readings proved helpful too, but I acknowledge that Locke et al’s (2004) premise to choose literature which yields the most benefit for the smallest investment of time eluded me.

Holland and O’Connor’s research report, Like writing off the paper (2004) provides an example of the influence of wider professional experience on the methodology for this study. Discussing the four arts disciplines, their research investigates distinguishing aspects of arts learning from that in other curricula. On its release (2004), the claim that a key strength of arts learning is the capacity to generate and apply, refine and connect and transform generated much debate amongst fellow professional music development facilitators present. Firstly, I question these qualities being considered as unique to learning in the arts. However, more importantly I think the description of the arts as being chaotic cycles of action and reflection, which may not occur in traditional transmission models (Holland & O’Connor, 2004), seems to assume that cycles of production in respective arts disciplines are directly comparable. In reference to this study, what would be the significance of transmission of underlying musical skills, fostering knowledge of musical product, gaining tactile control of instrument, and growth of auditory skills, development of product and its evaluation in creative programmes? Accordingly, one goal of my literature exploration became to tease out and evaluate research focused on qualities of musical production.

A further framework emanated from David Elliott’s (1995) summary of potential pitfalls in cross arts and integrated inquiry models, sometimes espoused as natural development pathways for all subjects.

It is highly doubtful that there is any such general capacity as aesthetic sensitivity. Multiple intelligence theories and contemporary studies of creativity argue against the possibility. In short
to understand and enjoy music requires a specific kind of situated cognition that will not develop from the study of elements or issues across different kinds of situated artistic practices. For those contexts are, by definition, not musical. (1995, p. 131)

Finally, I came to realise some parallelism between review of music, and gifted and talented literature. In that regard, I could not escape the need to scrutinise theory about connectedness between general conceptions of giftedness and those associated with musical giftedness. Furthermore, in light of the more consistently domain focused epistemologies found in international literature that I reviewed it felt important to reflect on the robustness of approaches to giftedness and talent provision in New Zealand.

In developing the discussion components, implications and applications (Silverman, 2005) for the study, internal and external recognition of Heartland’s success and resulting profile brought quite sharp reminders about the need for caution in both analysis and theoretical conceptualisation. As examples, I was asked to write an article about Heartland for a New Zealand MoE Education Gazette (Moore, 2004), the Minister of Education Trevor Mallard listened in person to Heartland children performing early in 2004, and the project was acknowledged in two separate ministerial addresses. For example, Steve Maharey (2006):

> Dunedin primary school children with musical talent have the opportunity to make and play music through an innovative programme offered by (Queens) High School and the Dunedin College of Education. There has been enthusiastic response from students and parents…. The College’s head of music, Errol Moore, says he set up the project because research shows that musical programmes extend gifted children and encourage them to develop a sense of independence and self-direction (p. 2)

Authenticity of success is determinant on criteria used to evaluate the product. However, as the director, knowing the energy and commitment given by all those connected to the project, due recognition seemed appropriate and deserved. I did not want to fail people involved. On the other hand, in preparing this report I made efforts to prevent a rosy hue from clouding my educational, musical, and critical lenses. As Hennink (2011) puts it, “Grounding a theory means demonstrating how the theory ‘emerged’, how the data support the theory and where the theory ‘fits’ the data (p. 262). Furthermore, in line with Denzin (1992), I have endeavoured to be upfront about anything that could have impacted on my objectivity. In matters of credibility, such as the breadth and diversity of participant voices and multiple data sources, I endeavoured to be true to Locke et al.’s (2004) evaluative guideline, “Am I persuaded that the author did not sweep anything under the rug (either data itself or alternative interpretations of the data) but gave everything encountered in the course of the study full and honest consideration” (Locke et al., 2004, p. 169).
Finally, I have to celebrate the wealth of privilege and experience that the children and I gained as participants in Heartland. It had not been imaginable. Now, seven years after the last official note sounded, this is still reinforced frequently as I encounter the once child participants, now as older students, demonstrating prowess and pride in musical accomplishment. Their on going journeys are surely a subject for further research. As for me, I believe the nature, breadth and length of the Heartland experience and the special nature of the relationships formed within this study helped attain some surety about the findings (Korth, 2002) and conceptualisations which have been drawn as a result.

Bennett Reimer (1995) wrote of the power of qualitative research to investigate higher order responses, giving heightened respectability to the term qualitative. Roulston’s (2006) overview of qualitative research offers what I would say is Reimer’s seed in a germinated form; a propensity for imagining and re-imagining the world differently. As Greene (2001) states, “It is imagination that discloses possibilities – personal and social as well as aesthetic. By imagining, we are enabled to look at things, to think about things as if they were otherwise” (p. 65).

How wonderful it would be if through this study report the reader could feel a little of the potency of the children’s musical learning and development 2003-2005. It has been a lived process, and has certainly motivated me to further explore ways of fostering talent in musically holistic ways.

I lived the research process in a way none of the decision-making models nor ‘plans’ for research can convey or capture. This is not to claim an ‘heroic’ research act but to intimate the layers of consciousness which are at work in undertakings when we involve ourselves in them. (Fulcher, 1995, p. 12)
Chapter 4: Frameworks, Findings and Implications

In this chapter, the results of data analysis and reflection on possible implications from the observed, recorded, and documented data are presented. A quite substantive picture of the Heartland project became available from longitudinal exploration from 2003 to 2005. As noted, a breadth of data was achieved through a diversity of voluntary participants engaged via interviews, child participant observations, video analysis (performance, rehearsals and interviews) and investigation of administrative records, as well as documentation such as data compiled in the preparation of Ministry of Education milestone reports. Here, it is appropriate to remind the reader that strikingly, collaborative participants lie at the seat of any claim to this study being a comprehensive investigation of Heartland’s effectiveness and potential implications for education and music learning emerging as a result.

As described in Chapter 3, four levels of analysis were undertaken and fifty-seven major and sub-analysis themes were adopted for data coding. Three major themes emerged as the basis for presenting findings and beginning the process of explaining trends and drawing implications. These were:

- Identification and child access to the Music Heartland Project
- Music learning evidenced within the Music Heartland Project
- The integrity of child participant involvement and the effectiveness of Music Heartland’s operation as a community of learning.

The reasoning behind their selection was that when bringing documentation, video, and observation data (third level analysis) to bear on first and second level clusters (primarily interview data), these three themes were both sufficiently focused and flexible to allow me to meet the challenge of compiling multiple pictures as the fourth level of analysis. That is, while possibly discrete, a heading in one of themes could be influential, or partially dependent on the content of another heading. In essence, after some twelve months, and having re-centred my focus on the primary research questions, the three themes above seemed best fit for manageable exploration of relationships and patterns across categories (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994; Yin, 2003). As Maykut and Morehouse put it, “It is time to carefully and systematically squeeze the
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61 As part of Heartland’s contract with the Ministry of Education, Heartland was required to gather Independent Education Plans and evaluative data. Similarly, video data of performance came about by virtue of children and family interest, as well as Ministry of Education reporting functions.
bellows (the data) together to create a sight and sound somewhat different but accurately reflective of the data with which you started” (p. 142).

Appendix 12 shows how the analysis themes, those that attracted meaningful data during the period of first and second levels of analysis, eventually permeated across the major themes, therefore becoming the basis of third and fourth level analysis.

As a framework for this chapter, Part 1 reports on Heartland’s initial and subsequent identification processes, including the ramifications of being identified approached from the perspective of respective participant types. Part 2 presents the results of the child participants’ music learning and considers the effectiveness of the respective programme components. In this section I draw implications from the balance and depth of the Heartland programme components, singly and holistically. Part 3 predominantly utilises participant voice to report on themes concerning the integrity of music learning and community fabric of Heartland which can be summarised as:

- Relationships within the project and children’s self-efficacy
- The effectiveness of Heartland as a music learning community in relation to other music providers and school music programmes
- The influence of tutor and administrative practices brought to bear in heartland.

The drawing of implications begins through summaries respective to each component of the findings, the result of data checking, pattern, and relationship matching (Maykut & Morehouse, 1994). About the progression toward drawing theoretical implications, Hennink et al. (2011) highlight the importance of concepts and theory being well grounded in the data:

> It should go beyond description to develop a new explanation or framework to account for, better understand and explain the study issues. An adequate theory should also offer more than participants could have reported themselves, therefore it involves categorizing, conceptualising and theorizing. (2011, p. 265)

In third and fourth levels of analysis and drawing implications, I remained mindful of Yin’s (2003) caution that propositions may propel the researcher away from key centres of interest, that is, research questions. In particular, I note the weight of evidence about pure music learning might have overwhelmed the focus of the study; there was enough to talk about in the sense of the music made and the skills the child participants demonstrated. While Part 2 is the largest section of the chapter, in the latter stages of data analysis and reflection, I ensured the influence of key literature themes pertaining to creativity, aesthetics, culture, curriculum relativity, and insight to conceptions of musical giftedness prevailed in Part 3, where deeper connection to the research questions was deliberately developed. As Yin (2003) describes about explanatory case
studies, “the causal links may reflect critical insights into public policy process or social science theory” (p. 120). For example, provision through withdrawal was possibly the most sensitive data set to explain and theorise. This was because all adult participant types appeared to appreciate that current MoE policy favours differentiated programmes in classrooms. Hence, from early data analysis, I recognised a need to explain children’s apparent ability to cope effectively with withdrawal and classroom learning was an important theme for reflection and theorising.

As to the presentation of this chapter, the analysis of the musical qualities of performed and created work by children is based on the tool which I developed for the purpose of product evaluation (See Appendix 11). However, in this text, the tool’s headings, such as involvement, are embedded in normal font because, while significant as entities, they were gleaned and considered interdependently as part of the tool’s total framework. Secondly, where a child’s school year is being referred to in the text, it is written as ‘School Year Two’, for example, whereas the default for length of Heartland participation reads Year Two or Yr 2. Finally, the reader is reminded of the use of simple counting (Silverman, 2005) in the reporting of these findings, for example, about interview commentary or self-evaluation ratings. Hence, the textual qualifiers I have applied are as follows:

Few = Less than 33% of the participants addressed the topic or question.
Some = 34% to 50% of the participants addressed the topic or question.
Majority = 51% to 64% of the participants addressed the topic or question.
Prevalent = More than 65% of the participants addressed the topic or question.
None or All = Ends of the continuum but allow for some inconsistency in participant comment(s)

**Part 1: Identification and access to the Music Heartland Project.**

**Introduction**

The eight schools committed to Heartland had a total enrolment of approximately 2000 students, with the eighty children selected to participate in 2003 representing 4% of the total rolls. By mid 2005, less than fifty children were involved in Years One, Two and Three of Heartland, representing around 2.5% of the school populations. Heartland records show the project received approximately one hundred nominations in each year between 2003 and 2005. By 2005, the number of children selected through group audition had reduced from eighty to forty.
Several factors contributed to the drop in selection numbers. Records indicate that the number of intermediate school participants increased disproportionately in 2004 and 2005 due to the progression of contributing school children, which suggests the first sweep of 2003 identified most of the potential in the Year 4-8 band. A second factor was administrative. Heartland’s conception offered an increasingly complex programme for children in their second and third years of participation. While flexibility was a goal, the cost of these later components or sub-projects (e.g. creative extension 2005) became significant in decisions about the number of students the total project could effectively support. Finally, and perhaps most significant in an educational sense, an increasingly overt view emerged, particularly from tutors, that the most musically gifted children should be receiving the benefit of the largest proportion of available resources. Linked to this, records indicate a willingness from both schools and tutors for the programme to be increasingly responsive to the diverse nature of children’s musical potential. This was most evident in the diversity of ensembles and creative projects undertaken in 2004 and 2005.

The first contact for a child was most likely to occur through a school newsletter. This was an open invitation, with nomination possible by child, parent, teacher or family member and supported by the school principal. Nomination was by way of a form with check boxes to indicate the candidate’s range of musical and volition characteristics (See appendix 13). No judgement was made about the suitability of the individuals who evaluated a child’s musical potential and completed the nomination. Following receipt of nominations, an audition involving informal group music making and discussion was held. Those selected from the group audition were offered participation in a Year One Ensemble. After initial selection, continued child participation was on the basis of recommendation from tutors who provided formal and informal information in the reporting and meeting processes sustained in Heartland.

The application to the Ministry of Education (2002) describes the intention of Heartland as to encourage the development of skill, musical knowledge and creative outputs, and to foster collaboration and commitment amongst children. I believed that, for the most part, children’s school music programmes offered limited opportunity for definitive skill or knowledge development relative to the diverse abilities of musical children. Hence, it was hoped the identification procedures, in particular the initial group audition and involvement in the Year One

62 Records show the transition from group to individual instrumental tuition generated nearly 1000% more cost through salary, travel, equipment and resource factors

63 The format of the nomination form evolved over Heartland’s duration, with a broad range of information sought about levels of interest, activity and overt indicators of musical ability.
Ensemble, would allow children who did not necessarily have established skills to show high level musical attributes.

Another justification for this intentionally inclusive approach to identification related to the wide range of socio-economic backgrounds (Socio-economic Levels 3 – 964) represented across the eight schools. It quickly became evident that there was wide diversity amongst the musical aspirations of the children identified. For many, the idea of personal commitment to music was “a strange bird indeed”, so I and the tutors took the view that initially lower levels of personal volition should not be considered as a sign of low musical ability, in fact, far from it. Similarly, Ministry of Education and Heartland staff were committed to having a substantial number of children involved. Most programme components, such as ensemble and group creative projects, required a critical mass of children to be effective. Had Heartland chosen to test nominated children more precisely, the critical mass of children needed to generate group momentum might not have eventuated. Potentially musically gifted children, who in Heartland showed increasingly obvious skills and application, could have been excluded before their musical attributes had a chance to emerge. Furthermore, children with established musical habits might have dominated Music Heartland, which was not the case.

I anticipated broadly similar numbers of children being selected across the eight schools, proportionate to size. It was assumed that factors such as school music programmes and socio-economic levels would have minimal influence on the pattern of selection across the schools. In 2003, the selection of children proved in fact to be broadly proportionate. However, children fell away dramatically in a few of the schools through non-attendance, or being withdrawn by Heartland because of a lack of application. Further, in 2004 and 2005, the number of children nominated and selected from schools with higher numbers of withdrawals over 2003 was fewer than the selection numbers in schools with smaller fall offs. The number of self-withdrawals did not appear to be connected to the socio-economic level of schools. Heartland attempted to address fall off by offering additional support, including targeted taster projects of up to twelve hours. These were intended to build momentum within the school, encourage staff support, and build child confidence. Ironically, this provision proved to be ineffectual in changing the selection pattern across schools. Rather it tended to excite interest in schools already demonstrating higher levels of momentum.

The audition process resembled a classroom music lesson of about an hour. The most significant components of the audition were observing children’s responses to music and endeavouring to

64 The New Zealand socio-economic status of schools is known as a decile level. The range is from one to ten with the most affluent schools known as Decile 10.
ascertain a broad sense of aural acuity. Children undertook listening, rhythmic, pitch and creative tasks, working as a whole group, in pairs, or as individuals. Schools were asked to restrict the size of groups to fewer than eighteen children. However, due to logistical difficulties, such as school camps or tight schedules for the tutors, there were occasions when an audition involved more than twenty children.

In 2003, a single tutor facilitated the group audition process in a school, while in 2004 and 2005 the tutors worked in pairs. This change was welcomed by tutors and participating schools. Tutors were united in their will to provide children with an enjoyable learning experience, no matter what the outcome was for an individual child. They felt that the fact a child had allowed their name to go forward already made them a little unique, and deserving of respect.

The identification guidelines were summarised early in 2005. Children were identified for the following reasons:

- They sang in tune and showed they enjoyed using their voices.
- They responded well to the opportunity to create or improvise rhythms or short melodic patterns.
- They imitated patterns with accuracy.
- They showed potential to learn quickly and committed themselves to tasks.
- They seemed to enjoy talking about musical ideas and what makes music work (Heartland Tutor Minutes).

Identification of children for Music Heartland could be described as a movable feast, and it is for this reason that identification is discussed before the data about learning. While initial nomination and group auditions were conducted at the beginning of each year, the pathway of an individual child selected from the audition could comprise of a full three years involvement (if selected in 2003), or less than a term if progression from a Year One Ensemble was not recommended by the ensemble tutor. Success and application meant ongoing inclusion and progress to further stages.

**Access to opportunity in Music Heartland**

Access to opportunity was a key element commented on by all the participant groups. All thirteen child participants reported enjoyment and pleasure in being involved in Heartland. This response was typified by a comment from one of a group of Year Two Heartland children, “It’s probably changed my life” (Yr 2 child participants, 2004). Or, from a group of school Year Seven
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66 Selection was moderated at monthly, or more frequent tutor meetings, and meetings of school liaison teachers and tutors occurring at least once per term.
and Eight students, “And then we had, like the audition thing and then we got picked for it. Wow!” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

The four parent participants were also positive with a typical comment being, “It was really nice, it was a real big compliment …. I felt really good for all the kids that actually got involved and not just my own, it was really neat” (Parent Yr2 child participant, 2004). Similarly, the school liaison teacher participants made comments such as, “Our parents were very pleased their children are in” (Liaison teacher, 2004).

In noting much positive feedback, the liaison teachers commented that the 2003 activities had a carry forward effect, in that awareness and confidence was observed to spread to other children, “Suddenly, because it was high profile in the school last year, they thought, “Ooh I could have done that. And that’s always going to happen isn’t it?” (Liaison teacher, 2004). They seemed to value the opportunities Heartland gave children to foster individual strengths by “acknowledging that some children have aspects of their personality and skills repertoire, which are special and unique” (Liaison teacher, 2004).

The tutors offered a cultural perspective on access:

I think that it’s quite hard, children are sort of in different cultural groups and the way that we see children will depend on the group that we come from as well and our experiences. And some kids don’t fit into that same mould. So I think we have to be a little broader than maybe we may want to be, just to catch some of those ones that aren’t fitting into the normal school model at all, or culture. (Tutor, 2004)

They agreed that responding to knowledge of the child could be important:

I think he is talented but what I’m saying is that if you were doing the identification and you didn’t have lots of background about him…. You wouldn’t see him because he wouldn’t want to stand up and blow his own trumpet, so to speak…. But it’s not all culturally determined as in being Samoan or Māori or whatever. Matapo and Marianna are both Samoan, but they function really differently [Matapo as a preferred aural learner and Marianna as a music reader]. (Tutor, 2004)

Amongst the parent participants, surprise was the prevalent response to their child being given the opportunity to partake in Heartland, whether or not the home offered previous music experience. If asked to qualify their child’s musical ability, parents often used phrases such as, “not particularly” (Parent Yr 2 child participant). As expressed in one case, “I seriously thought that you’d gotten the wrong kid, [it] blew me out of the water. I didn’t even think she was anywhere near interested in anything musical” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004). The child participant in question thrived in Heartland and was one of a group invited to perform at the Ministry of Education hui (2005) in Wellington.
A few parents noted earlier music learning experiences that had motivated their child, although one intimated the family had given up (Parent Yr 2 participant, 2004). Others had not attached great significance to their child’s behaviours at a young age:

I’d bought her a little toy piano [electric]…. I bought her one of those for Christmas. She used to just sit there and donk away on it, but that’s it. I had no idea that she was even interested in music. Like I said none of us are musically minded, so I had no idea that she was. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

However, parents were at pains to not overstate evidence of musical giftedness, in relation to either their own child or the other children in general. The prevalent response suggested that parents had recognised an interest and willingness to be involved in music in their child’s activity. For example:

He started when he was seven. We persuaded his guitar teacher to take him that young because he just was determined he really wanted to play it. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

That’s why I said about the piano lessons, because she started to make up songs on the piano and just play. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

Parent commentary suggested caution about the use of the term gifted, agreeing that use of the label may create a dilemma. Although labelling may have resulted in a child standing out or being excluded, to not have identified giftedness would have meant the loss of an opportunity for musical children. However, a comment from a parent participant whose child had been withdrawn by Heartland a few months earlier represents the broad sense of accommodation I encountered. “You think well are they or do they just try really hard? So I’m just a bit wary of that label. But the fact that they were deemed suitable for such a cool opportunity was wonderful” (Parent Yr2 child participant, 2004).

Responses to children not selected or withdrawn from Music Heartland

Strong interest in Heartland meant that between twenty and fifty children were not selected for the Year One Ensemble from the audition process each year.67 Except for one case, the prevalent mood of child participants talking about those who were not selected reflected understanding and acceptance:

She told me, like agreed that she would do it but she decided not to do it. I didn’t mind because it, like I said it was just her. I am doing it! (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)
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67 The study’s child participants were invited from the pool of children who had been successful in the audition process. No data was collected from children who had not been successful at the group audition.
Oh well too bad for them...yeah.... Need to work harder. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

Sort of sad...they are sort of sad cause they didn’t get in as well. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

I think it’s pretty bad by golly cause I thought I would be working with my friends. (Yr 1 child participant, 2004)

While none of the participants talked of receiving active support from peers in the 2005 repeat interview, all concurred with the neutral view of one participant, “Most of my friends aren’t that musical…. They don’t actually mind…they don’t think it is not cool or anything” (Yr3 child participant, 2005).

Tutors faced the effects of non-selection on an ongoing basis, for example, “There was (deleted by author) going through from (school) from last year, but then I didn’t select her in for keyboard, and that seemed quite awkward...but you know, today she pokes her head in the door and says, ‘Hello Mrs Jenkins’”(Tutor, 2004). They also recognised that some schools responded to individuals who had not been included, “They also have this dance group and they’ve got the choir thing happening. The ones that don’t get in, Janice gets them aside and has a yarn and keeps them in different ways. Louise takes a recorder group and stuff like that” (Tutor, 2004). However, one tutor questioned if alternative provision within a school was unsupportive of children in Heartland:

Like one school was getting a ukulele group. But the thing being with that was that they were going to highlight some of those kids that hadn’t gone on to be the role models.... Even though Heartland highlights these [musically gifted] kids, the schools should be highlighting these kids as well. (Tutor, 2004)

All tutors were most concerned about the wellbeing of children who had not been selected or had been withdrawn at some point. For example, one tutor commented about children not selected to progress from Year One Ensemble to Keyboard and Theory, “I wonder whether, for one thing the kids are left in a kind of ambiguous position, like ‘Oh, we were told we were good, and now we’re not” (Tutor, 2004). At the same time the tutors acknowledged that in the interests of the most musical children, the non-selection or withdrawal of children was a necessary strategy:

Perhaps we might worry about it too much.... Then we had to cut back on the numbers for performance thing, and re-auditioned at that point. Even though there was maybe about twenty that got left out, they’ve kept in touch.... And it was interesting because it didn’t sort of send them off in a huff, it lifted the group that was left. (Tutor, 2004)

When discussing inclusion, parent participants noted the impartiality within Heartland’s selection processes. One parent stated that, “it was really nice to see that there is other people, right across the board, that were getting recognition. So, it was obviously for their own recognition, not
anything else, not who you know or what you know” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004). This parent participant also commended the fact that selection was done in such a way that children were not singled out and did not perceive any stigma attached to selection.

School liaison teacher participants noted the interest of families of children who were not selected, and one commented, “we haven’t had any sort of negative feedback from parents who felt their children had missed out” (School liaison teacher, 2004). They spoke of difficulties in dealing with the number of nominations and the barriers for children new to the school, at intermediate school level in particular. However, they acknowledged that the quality of musical learning was a justification for the earlier selection decisions. “But having said that we’ve got some very talented children who have been chosen and who are loving it” (Liaison teacher, 2004).

**Perceived musical profiles and characteristics of children selected for Music Heartland**

The child participants offered a range of comments on what they felt they were already musically good at. While a few stated they did not know, the prevalent comments highlighted practical attributes. Comments included being able to read, sing, play an instrument, keep the beat and stay in time, and occasionally acknowledged another participant’s practical strengths. One child participant spoke of a sense of feeling unique, “Sometimes, it makes you feel special that you can do things that other people can’t” (Yr 1 child participant, 2004).

Amongst the tutors, the prevalent views of musical giftedness reflected application, or wanting to be there, as much as initial musical characteristics. “Often when you see a gifted child, they’ve got components in each of these. Ability to read music quickly, to sight read, and their pitch and their rhythm and their creativity, it’s all kind of there” (Tutor, 2004). The significance of creativity grew during the conversation:

There needs to be a holistic approach. I particularly think the creative component’s a difficult one to measure. I think that’s really important in music-making now, especially when you can develop into careers that are quite creative in a music context without actually being a technically skilled instrumentalist. It could be quite a broad approach. And I think that’s the way things are going and so being a creative musician, the success rate and attainment level in the future is promising. (Tutor, 2004)

However, most of the comments centred on the production of music:

There definitely needs to be an ability to make music to a certain level. Just to understand how it works in the physical aspects and the reading music and all of that – it all adds together to give a definite level. (Tutor, 2004)
When specifically asked if they considered any of the children to be musically gifted, all of the tutors perceived “one or two” of the children they worked with (usually between ten and twenty) to be gifted. At the same time, they reinforced the need for ongoing evaluation and input to locate diverse musical qualities in the children without having to define absolute standards. For example:

Interestingly though, the kids that got the letters [commitment reminders] and they were on this colour paper. It was like a ‘Dear John’ letter part one. The kids that got it were some of the kids that are still in the project, like (deleted by author)…. But they were actually kids that are quite clever and potentially gifted. (Tutor, 2004)

Comments from the liaison teachers tended to focus on practical issues, such as dealing with the size of the group nominated or children missing out because they were new to a school. For example, they agreed the increased staffing for group auditions was worthwhile:

The selection process was a little bit better this year. We could get more people at the initial session and with the two people [rather than one] coming in and listening to the kids and trying to make a decision that was much better. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

The liaison teachers were not specific about the qualities of children selected. Rather, they acknowledged musical interest and activity and their comments revealed that overt qualities were desirable. For example:

So he picked himself in some ways. That was the clue, that he was always humming or quite often in class there were times when it wasn’t suitable but that was disappointing to him. And there are other kids who sort of stood out where they were singing or class singing. So it was really only one of the children that was actually learning a musical instrument. The rest were basically beginners before that. But no surprises! (Liaison Teacher, 2004)

The parents were more openly assertive about the expected musical characteristics appropriate to the label of gifted:

I expected gifted children to able to perhaps play with scales by ear. That was just what my perception of gifted would be…. I thought surely if they were gifted (violin teacher) would have spotted that by now. I think Nigel Kennedy is gifted and I expected that they would be playing by ear and doing wonderful things. (Parent Yr2 child participant, 2005)

At the same time, with reference to the significance of the school setting comments also suggested the parents thought that it was somebody else’s job to identify if a child was gifted. Like tutors, parents saw interest as a strong indicator and appeared to regard musical outputs as indicative of normal behaviour rather than something of significance. As noted in one case, “We never thought it was anything very, particularly. I mean it was good – we thought it was normal that kids did that, but I don’t think it is” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004).
Year One ensembles as a selection tool for Music Heartland

The foci for this section are the manner in which the participants perceived the effectiveness of the identification process, the role of ensemble in identification, the equality of selection amongst children and the ramifications of selection through ensemble participation. Heartland’s records show an inclusive approach was intended not only for identification purposes, but also in regard to allowing access to ongoing involvement. This intent was not about giving opportunity to lots of children. Rather, given the limited resources, the inclusiveness reflected a will to foster promising children beyond the first impressions gained in the group auditions. From my perspective, an identification model based on a more rigorous individual testing of individuals demonstrating obvious ability would not have been appropriate, particularly because one aim was to identify those children with high musical potential who did not present as achieving or having the advantage of previous learning.

All tutor participants agreed that the question of when to take an identification snapshot presented a challenge. “But as to your question about selecting them, because there were so many variables, where does it all begin? Where there’s kids with raw talent, it comes out later on after some training” (Tutor, 2004). The compromise adopted in Heartland was to utilise the Year One Ensembles as the means of identifying the children of greatest promise. However, while acknowledging that leeway and flexibility were essential, the tutors were clear that a wide range of ability, and sometimes group size, meant less attention could be given to individuals. They agreed that children at the extremes could be disadvantaged:

It’s the range of abilities within that can be really difficult. And I worry too that those who have just had the ensemble programme don’t get that one-on-one, the keyboard and the theory, therefore that extra avenue – that broad base is not explored that much. And maybe they just got into it. They’re just finding their feet. They’re in a group amongst other people who are a bit more advanced and they’re not given as much opportunity actually in the end. (Tutor, 2004)

So the size of them potentially restricts the development to a certain extent – those that can be extended and those that need more help. (Tutor, 2004)

The tutors also agreed that musical experience did not set a child apart in the long term. As one put it, “I felt that it was really keen kids in the ensemble initial stage – that had played a bit of music and that. But they didn’t necessarily stand out as being those talented ones later” (Tutor, 2004).

To allow those with less musical background an equitable opportunity to succeed, and to not simply cater for those who would “do it anyway”, one tutor suggested that we stream the ensembles:
I just felt I needed to spend one-on-one time with some people and I just couldn’t very much, because what do you do with the other nine…. And there’s socio-economic factors as well. One of them, his mother is a music teacher. So he’s been brought up, been given a head start. I think that defeats some of the purpose again. (Tutor, 2004)

In this, there is the sense that Heartland could have focused more effectively on the children who were disadvantaged, or have given an opportunity to those who may not have otherwise received musical training. However, while the Heartland staff and I shared a strong sentiment for equity, a sentiment that was also evident across the cluster of schools, we were committed to the goal of musical achievement, as negotiated with the Ministry of Education, with possible parallel implications for wider academic achievement. Furthermore, in the discussion the tutors were clear about the need to recognise untrained potential and this overrode concerns about group numbers. The group approach was perceived to give children who did not possess existing identifiable skills access to the programme. For example:

I was just thinking honing in on a tighter identification and smaller number of kids. It would be really difficult to do that on those students that had had no musical background. And, they’re probably the ones that are not going to get selected and like to me that’s almost the sort of the spark of the programme. (Tutor 2004)

The liaison teachers were specific about the capacity of the Year One Ensembles to distinguish children’s ability and long term commitment:

I think it’s a really good way of looking at the kids first up, because knowing they’ve got to basically make a decision to commit to the music. And it’s another way of refining there are kids who enjoy music. And then, you’ll want to get to the kids who are especially talented in music. There’s quite a difference sometimes. I mean a lot of the kids, our first lot of ensemble kids, a lot of them were kids that really enjoyed music, but when it actually came to a sense of rhythm, or you want to keep the beat, they didn’t really shine out. But, other kids actually sort of stood a shoulder above them, in terms of what they could do, or, what commitment they could make to it. So, we find that all the kids that have gone onto the individual one [keyboard] have been a hundred [percent]. You don’t have to chase around asking them to practice. They’re basically beating down the door to get at the pianos and things and practising at home. I mean you’re getting kids that are not only talented but are really quite are self driven. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

Furthermore, the liaison teachers agreed that the ensembles were a resource-efficient selection tool. As one stated:

It’s like first cut isn’t it…. I think as a screening method it’s very successful. I mean it’s always nice if the resource is bigger, the day was longer. And it’d be lovely to have more time. And more children could be involved, that would be excellent. But I think for the purpose that it’s intended for, which is as a screening vehicle, then there is enough opportunity isn’t there for the tutors to see them at close hand over a period of sessions and say yes, this child does have a wee bit of something. (Liaison teacher, 2004)
Ongoing selection for further levels of the Music Heartland programme

Ongoing selection is a rather nondescript term for the processes the children had to endure to be selected, not just for Heartland as a whole, but for each particular component or year and to progress to subsequent components. The records show examples of children being withdrawn then re-selected. Similarly, a few children were brought into the programme following school and tutor recommendation later in the school year. From my perspective, these events were consistent with a policy that allowed demonstrable musical potential, progress in learning and level of commitment to be evaluated according to a broad range of criteria. At the same time, selection or retention variations revealed a number of operational vulnerabilities in Heartland’s administration, which in itself produced important data.

To begin, tutors expressed genuine concern about children who were no longer part of the programme. “I’ve had several occasions where the kids have said to me, ‘Why isn’t KJ doing keyboard when are we doing Music Heartland?’ with these sort of injured expressions on their faces?” (Tutor, 2004). However, owing to administrative error, a number of accidental lessons were learnt about the patience disadvantaged children require:

Instances of children who were not meant to carry on in the project, they just didn’t have it. But because of administrative mistakes did so. But they were actually kids that are quite clever and potentially gifted…but they just didn’t have [maturity]…. When you get to know the children, you know, reflects on the other circumstances. And so when you see it like that – that they’re dealing with quite complicated social situations. They’re switching houses and stuff, not getting enough sleep, not getting good health, and so it’s affecting how they achieve. And I think potentially, one of those was to be kicked out, except that Errol didn’t send a letter. We had a whole series of problems, but when you look and see all this other stuff that these little kids are dealing with…. Why should they miss out on perhaps the very thing that’s going to give them pleasure, because of whatever? (Tutor, 2004)

Errors also served to highlight a need for flexibility across cultures as well as individuals, and that genuine progress often justified tentative selection decisions. “So [yes] it’s across cultures, but it’s just the individual response to different situations. So I think we have to gather them a wee bit broadly, and give them a bit of time to show in different settings” (Tutor, 2004).

While some tutors supported having more invisible identification processes to maintain social equity, the prevailing view was that we should employ a wait and see approach to provision,
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68 This is described in respective sections of Part 1 of these findings, successful involvement consisted of being selected from the Year One Ensemble to proceed to Year One Keyboard and Theory and then further selected, based on tutor recommendation, to proceed to instrumental learning in Year Two.
particularly in the case of children who had entered Heartland with few musical skills or work processes:

And the ones that really wanted to have kept in touch and have actually come back into the group, several weeks or months down the track. So, I think in some ways, you’re wanting to see a bit of that. You want the kids to hang in there, and kind of make some sort of commitment themselves, to music in general; maybe the dance group or choir, or the recorder thing. So, I think it gives them a chance to show a bit of individual something. (Tutor, 2004)

Tutors acknowledged that withdrawing children at different stages could have possible detrimental effects. However, the fact selection was an open procedure, with provision for ongoing evaluation and selection, was also seen to have a distinct motivational effect. As one stated:

It creates a bit of a, some marks for the kids. Because they know they might get selected or they might not – selected in or out. And then they really love it, don’t they, when they get chosen. So I guess the downside of that is that if they don’t get chosen, even though they might be very musical, then the worry is that they don’t stay involved in music. So that’s probably the only negative part of that. But for the others it provides a real challenge each time, and they often say ‘am I in year two or year three, or’, they want to know exactly where they fit in on it. (Tutor, 2004)

With older children, or those who had joined Heartland in 2003, ongoing selection was seen to encourage self-fulfilment and to diminish the need for external reinforcement about where a student fitted in the programme. In the words of one tutor, “but by the time they get to intermediate. Those strengths of those kids that are showing that more extreme talent have got involved with some kind of music somewhere because they love it” (Tutor, 2004).

The liaison teachers appeared more matter of fact about the processes of ongoing selection, withdrawal and alternative identification. For example:

the kids who have actually been dropped out of certain parts of the programme have in fact almost made that decision themselves by failing to turn up or failing to be committed or whatever…. It’s been the commitment side of things that they’ve lacked rather than anything else. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

They also seemed positive about the effect Heartland had on the children as a more flexible approach to identification was adopted:

even though some didn’t quite make it through into the individual programme we actually had three more kids picked up this term. And if you were walking down the hallway you would have actually heard the piano going cause one of the girls there’s been on the piano every single break. (Liaison teacher, 2004)
Similarly, reporting on conversations with classroom teachers, the tutors reinforced the idea that the children were coping with withdrawal decisions:

about one [withdrawn] child I said to the teacher, “She seems really disappointed, have you picked this up?” And she said, “Oh, she’s always like that, you know”. And she wasn’t dismissing her, but she was in a sense, “Don’t worry, she does that”. So I haven’t picked up really negative things from the teachers about the kids being really worried and upset. (Tutor, 2004)

Further to this, the parent of a child who had been withdrawn acknowledged a maturation in the child’s response to an unsuccessful re-audition:

even being knocked back from that is a learning process for him to realise you know. He was disappointed. He was determined he was going to have another shot and he accepted…got the impression that it was up to him…. And you know, it didn’t go his way, so he is sort of carrying on with what he has got happening. He was knocked back at the start but he is looking forwards all the time. (Parent, 2005)

In relation to the largely positive views the participants had of the ongoing process of selection and withdrawal, the tutors were clear about the importance of being inclusive and patient. As two observed:

That’s what’s quite good about the project. Some people can come and go from it. We’re quite open-minded in that. (Tutor, 2004)

Because it leaves a catch-22, like you’re saying, we want to identify these kids’ talent, but we need to give them music for a while before we can fly their colours. (Tutor, 2004)

The role of the school within Music Heartland’s initial selection processes.

Final decisions about school nominations were made by the school principal or a delegated representative. In most cases, all of the children nominated were able to go through to audition69. During this process, a number of themes emerged concerning the schools’ capacity to identify musically gifted children and their links with Heartland as an external provider. As noted, parents and children preferred impartial selection, and shared a sense of excitement that people had come to audition them.

Liaison teachers agreed it was appropriate that teachers from the school were not making decisions about selection. “We put a lot of kids forward for the selection process and there were a number of people who came to me and said, ‘Why wasn’t my child included?’ It was quite good to be able to say, ‘Well I’ve done everything I could’” (Liaison teacher, 2004). This had been highlighted at an earlier debriefing with the Ministry of Education, where the liaison teachers
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69 No data was collected about children who did not go through to audition.
commented they appreciated identification being in the hands of tutors. They felt those doing the selecting needed to have the necessary musical skills and that Heartland had a buffering effect on their decisions. In an interview, this was expressed as, we were just able to say, ‘Well Heartland you know, they are the experts making the decision.’ That was really good because you don’t get that pressure” (Liaison teacher, 2004).

Liaison teachers noted there were few surprises about which children were selected and that they supported ongoing evaluation and selection, “the decisions that she’s come to were ones that I’ve been very happy with. And certainly I would endorse them. We’ve never disagreed on where we think children are going” (Liaison teacher, 2004). At the same time, classroom teachers’ familiarity with children was identified as an important factor. In the larger schools, decisions had to be made about which children to put forward for nomination. Accordingly, a teacher’s knowledge of a child’s strengths was seen as important. For example:

Most of our selections this year were actually from year eight kids. And, that was I think, partly because the year eight children we put forward were ones that teachers had known for a year, and they had shown themselves as being musically talented. And so we put them through. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

The tutors also valued the school input. However, they also called for greater communication between Heartland and the schools, and for the schools to share more of the responsibility:

So in a sense even though Heartland highlights these kids, the schools should be highlighting these kids as well. And so I think if perhaps we could link a bit more just with communication. Not that we don’t promote it, but it’s just…that we don’t want to be a disjointed thing from schools. (Tutor, 2004)

As to the school’s ability to identify musically gifted children, the tutors provided musical insights about the children the schools nominated:

I was looking through some of the things and some of the stronger [children] the teachers have picked. I hadn’t seen it as a strength. But then those teachers are just looking, perhaps at somebody who likes playing an instrument full stop. So that’s seen as a real big strength. They might carry the recorder around with them and play recorder tunes all the time when most of their class don’t. And so, that’s probably like from the general classroom teacher they would be looking at perhaps just sort of overall thing rather than attainment level within the music. (Tutor, 2004)

In line with this, the tutors again highlighted their belief that Heartland should be an amplification of a secure school programme. As one put it:

I think one way around it is taking a more integrated process with the schools. And the aim would be to get the schools a little more in a supporting role so that we’re
highlighting the kids that have got strength in music, so that [Heartland] should be the icing on the cake with the school programmes running. (Tutor, 2004)

They also all agreed that classroom teachers were capable of being more alert to a child’s musicality and thus of playing a more integral role in the selection process:

Could the schools be involved a bit more in the id process, if on a longer term basis a couple of people were a bit more trained to – or musical people perhaps – to recognise the kids so that we weren’t coming in again, doing what we can, but sometimes not working on a lot of information. Perhaps if the teachers had some more background, they’d be more part of the process. (Tutor, 2004)

Summary of themes for Part 1

The previous sections offer the following important perspectives on the selection patterns and processes of the Heartland Project:

- The participants conceived musical giftedness as a broad mix of abilities, with an emphasis on practical demonstration. From a theoretical perspective, the tutor participants appear to have attributed the term giftedness to the combination of a child’s output, creativity, music learning responses and potential, rather than to a precise picture of musical acuity. Where specific abilities were described, they were consistently linked with attitudinal and commitment factors.

- Musical reading literacy did not feature significantly in descriptions of musical giftedness, though it was perceived as a contributing long-term skill.

- A starting point for musical giftedness appeared to be relative to the holistic qualities a child brought to identification. Hence, as well as demonstrable musical acuity, previous learning, cultural perspectives and socio-economic considerations were identified as integral.

- There was an evident caution about overstating gifted ability. Nonetheless, child, family and school liaison teacher participants were overwhelmingly positive in their reaction to children being selected. The extent of the positive reaction came as a surprise, because I am aware of the long standing equity issues relating to giftedness.

- While it was agreed that a group ensemble process would be an effective resource for screening musically gifted children, this brought significant challenges for tutors. These included the size of the groups and the range of abilities, skills and understandings they presented. It is possible that some children did not receive the support and patience they needed for their potential to emerge, even though Heartland was a comparatively resource rich programme.

- The tutors thought that a longer selection process was appropriate, in particular if the goal was to identify children with potential, rather than only those with the advantage of previous music learning. It appeared that with ongoing musical experience the children’s motivation to achieve and to be involved moved from external to internal sources.

- While socially detrimental factors potentially were evident for children who were not selected or withdrawn, these seemed to be more significant for tutors and liaison teachers than for the children themselves. Child participants reported no significant problems for peers who were not selected or withdrawn, or changes in friendship patterns.

- A distinct difference emerged between the views of the liaison teachers and the tutor participants about the school’s role in identifying musically gifted children. Tutors saw a
need for schools, and particularly classroom teachers to be more involved in the identification processes, along with more provision for project/school consultation. Liaison teachers considered the initial nomination processes to be effective, with tutor expertise remaining the clearly preferred basis for selecting children rather than classroom teachers, for social and musical reasons.

- From a school policy perspective, tutors, parents and school liaison teachers asserted the need for high levels of sensitivity when approaching identification. At the same time, the specific identification of musically gifted children was accepted as an appropriate practice within the school environment.

**Part 2: Music learning evidenced within Music Heartland**

**Introduction**

The following sections present data relating to musical learning within each of the Heartland programme components, including the range of ensemble, instrumental learning and creative projects. The aim of these sections is to reveal the musical and social growth that occurred during the components, as well as the attitudinal responses of the participants.

**Music learning within Music Heartland ensemble projects**

Over the course of Heartland’s development, four forms of ensemble work evolved, reflecting the policy to foster individuals’ musical development through group learning. These can best be described as:

- Year One ensembles to introduce the children to an intense musical programme. These were also integral to identifying those who would progress to further stages of the programme.
- Extension and maintenance ensembles to develop a sense of community, respond to child interest, sustain levels of involvement and foster learning towards Heartland’s identified goals.
- Creative ensembles to foster creativity and musical ownership as well as expand children’s practical music development and theoretical understandings.
- Other ensembles served as enrichment modules for children who had moved onto high school and were no longer learning through Heartland.70

Heartland administrative and programme records reveal a number of attributes common to the different ensembles. These were:

- The ensembles varied in duration according to their purpose and the complexity of the anticipated learning.
- A standard of equipment that was almost certainly superior to what most Yr 4 – 8 students would be likely to come across in school music situations.
- All the ensembles were made up of cross school, and typically vertical, groupings of children, unless the number from one school meant this was unnecessary for logistical reasons. Because the ensembles often included children from up to four different schools, many children were new to each other.

---

70 A series of holiday based secondary school student modules produced exciting results. However, these were short, out of the context of student’s school music programmes and while two research participants were invited to take part none did so. Hence, data has not been included in this report.
All the ensemble modules were conducted with the expectation that they would end in a performance or a recording.

**Analysis of learning in Music Heartland year one ensembles**

Over successive years the size and number of the Year One ensembles reduced. This is attributable to the more refined audition process and the flow through of children to Year Two and Three, which absorbed more of the available resources. In 2003, there were ensembles of ten to eighteen children in all eight schools, each engaged for between fourteen and twenty hours in total.\(^7^1\) In 2005, there were two ensembles, made up of around twelve children. The following learning goals of the ensembles were developed collaboratively with tutors early in 2003:

- To play 1 – 2 tunes on a melodic instrument in groups or individually.
- Create an 8 beat rhythm appropriate to a style.
- Demonstrate understanding of rhythm values, pitch movement (aural) and extension to pitch placements on the staff.
- Create an 8 beat tune (pentatonic or diatonic) with a sense of direction and close.
- Play a harmony line or a tune in time with others.
- Demonstrate independence and commitment to rehearsal and group tasks.
- Interact positively with a variety of music forms and their context. (Heartland, 2003)

These learning outcomes were intended to sit comfortably with levels three and four of the music discipline in the *Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum* (2000). Video data shows that the most fluent ensemble playing eventuated from the Year One Ensembles that operated intensely over three weeks or less, rather than ones meeting less frequently over longer periods.

Four School Year Four to Six child research participants were part of the same Year One ensemble in 2004.\(^7^2\) Apart from one participant named Tulevai, all were recommended for progression to keyboard and theory. The three who progressed had some previous musical experience, i.e. Jo played recorder, Li Xiang violin and Maia the flute. The report following their experience of the ensemble states:


*Jo:* Also very promising. Confident performer. Excellent pitch; clear true singing voice. Sense of style. Rhythm generally good – needs to listen carefully. Learns music quickly.

---

\(^7^1\) From 2004, there was agreement that more hours would be allocated to the larger groups.

\(^7^2\) Appendix 1 shows a typical programme planned for the Year One Ensembles.
Looks for a challenge. High-spirited, can be distracted easily, needs good structure. Excellent ideas about music; visual associations.

Li Xiang: Quick learner. Confident soloist, tuneful voice, good pitch. Grasps musical ideas quickly. Looks for a challenge. Rhythm can be erratic – needs to listen: tends to complain, but also eager to learn. (Yr 1 reports, 2004)

These suggest a wide spread of skills and confidence, with Li Xiang and Jo appearing more confident and alert to challenge. Anecdotally from conversation, I recall the tutor’s delight with these two children and the inclusive way she described their growth and musical ability. The comments also intimated that there was a relaxed relationship between the tutor and the children and acknowledged the child participants’ positive social attributes and attitude.

The tutor’s notes recorded confidence in Jo, and the pitch acuity of Li Xiang and Maia, though their sense of rhythmic security was seen to be variable. All the Year One ensembles learned several arrangements, including *Lean on Me*, which was for massed performance at a Heartland sharing time. Other arrangements, which were drawn from the well known sources of Jon Madin and Janet Shannon, were learned mostly through approaches using repetition and memory. Concerning literacy, the tutor recorded a wide discrepancy within the group and highlighted what I have found to be a common outcome in percussion ensembles. “All had some basic ‘symbol’ reading – note symbols, pitch and rest and timing symbols which quickly turned to memorisation” (Yr 1 report, 2004).

In 2003, the tutors expressed that some of the children needed extension so more improvisation was introduced to the 2004 ensembles. In this case, a tutor noted that some of the children had been able to improvise over an ostinato and that some were also developing harmony for known songs. The summary tutor response was:

I feel pleased with the progress made in covering each outcome. Each child definitely achieved, to a greater or lesser extent, elements of each outcome. Strengths were playing melodic tunes in time, in harmony with others; understanding of rhythm values and pitch movement; interaction about music; and for most, commitment to group tasks. Weaknesses were composing and creating and writing music – which to an extent will be covered more in the creative ensemble. (Yr 1 report, 2004)

I interpreted the reports as showing that a range of material was being taught and that there was some intensity in the learning. The group gained musical skills and confidence in instrumental technique, style and ensemble playing. Moreover, the breadth of the tutor’s description indicates a genuinely musical frame for later development. Of significance to Heartland’s goals, the tutor also highlighted creative work as a future learning goal. Finally, the evidence suggests that the
children’s musical experiences had appreciably more depth than the simple playing of pieces without reflection.

The video data supports the tutor’s assessment, showing a surprisingly high level of ensemble performance. In terms of technique and accuracy, the child participants confidently played multiple classroom instruments. Some played non percussion instruments with moderate to high proficiency, producing several secure harmony lines. These were more complex than the three note harmonies which, in my experience, are typically associated with introductory ensembles. While the tutor’s comments about rhythmic variation are borne out, the group appears alert to this. That is, the children are listening and thus adapting to keep the ensemble cohesive. In essence, especially considering the module was only sixteen hours long, in my view, the product is representative of clear musical gain. While the contribution of the three child participants indicates previous music learning, they appear to have experienced affirmation and broadening of musicianship skills, and demonstrated sustained music focus and application.

Moving to a broader exploration of Year One Ensembles, there was much diversity in their outputs, even though the intended learning outcomes remained constant. At a logistical level, in 2003 there were rare instances of groups being unable to share work because of a long delay between the last lesson and the sharing time. Also, in 2003, in a few cases the large size of the group made it a challenge to bring the children to a point that they could perform. From a purely musical perspective, the most successful ensembles of 2003 were made up of school Year Seven and Eight children, or ensembles that included children from the few schools that already sustained ensemble programmes. The school Year Seven and Eight ensembles included a larger proportion of children with existing instrumental skills, and the learning outcomes were readily achieved in these instances. As one tutor participant reported, in a manner that reflects musical depth, i.e. looking beyond a child’s mastery of a core skill such as playing in time:

There are varying degrees of ability and strengths among these students but all of them display skills and significant potential to achieve highly. During the programme the students played many pieces of music and contributed to the arrangements of the more practised pieces. Students showed particular progress in their ability to play together as a group and develop new skills in improvisation and experimentation. Many students also experimented with various instruments, which required significant commitment due to the time constraints. (Tutor, 2004)

The comparative effectiveness of the 2003 and 2004 modules is also of interest. Once funding had been allocated in 2002, significantly more attention was directed to Heartland’s programme philosophy, content and logistics. Even so, 2003 was a year of trial by practice, of which the Year One Ensembles were the first substantive component. From the first sharing time in 2003, it was clear that the large group size placed much pressure on the tutors and that the number of
children withdrawn before the next stage (Keyboard and Theory) would be very large. This presented a dilemma as our teacherly instinct to be as inclusive as possible conflicted with the need to be faithful to the principles of Music Heartland. At that time, I was also concerned about how the ensemble products would compare with the results of the other Ministry of Education contestable projects. In the event, the Year One Ensembles of 2004 and 2005 did develop a more consistent quality of music. This improvement was largely due to the following factors:

- More sensitive group audition processes.
- Planning for typically smaller ensemble groups.
- The tutors knew the journey and the children had observed others perform, albeit from a distance.

The schools and the Heartland administrators had the benefit of experience and were more proactive in communicating with each other:

Schools understandably have requested earlier notice of events and meetings, and date reminders. Logistical arrangements will be further addressed by the programme director and management team in 2004. (Ministry of Education Milestone, 2003).

The overwhelming perception of success following the completion of the 2003 programme gave confidence to all involved and confirmed Heartland’s goals. This clarity aided the growth of more effective relationships and the participants’ developed a stronger sense of community.

Accordingly, the March 2004 milestone report to the Ministry of Education was able to report:

- It is intended that the 4 ensembles will total 48 children over the 8 schools. In term 3 when keyboard begins for these children approximately 32 children will continue. The focus on gifted children needs to be adhered to. (Heartland, March 2004)

**Summary for Year One ensembles**

The Year One ensembles continued to evolve over the duration of the Heartland project. At the same time, however, the Ensembles did not appear to capture the imagination of all the children selected, which possibly led to some inconsistency in the levels of commitment displayed by the child participants. The Year One research participants did not rate their involvement in the ensembles highly and all agreed that it was little different to what they experienced at school. Nonetheless, the participant reports and the video recordings of the ensembles evidence four significant threads relating to the learning that occurred during the ensemble work:

- The grouping of gifted children demonstrated a speed of learning and an early sense of security in sharing work.
- A sense of commitment to a group with a common interest was quickly established, despite the fact that a high percentage of the children were unfamiliar to one another.
• The music learning appeared to affirm and broaden skills, even in children with a musical background.
• The ensembles demonstrated high levels and breadth of musical quality after a few hours tuition.

**Analysis of learning in the Music Heartland extension and maintenance ensemble modules**

The range of the short and extended projects that were classified as extension and maintenance modules was more diverse than anything I had imagined at the inception of the Heartland project. This diversity emerged for a variety of reasons in addition to programme planning, including the tutors’ musical interests, goals initiated by the schools and cross curricula initiatives.

The extension and maintenance modules included:

• Taster projects for schools (introduction and motivational).
• Year Two Ensembles (skill building and community maintenance).
• The Ministry of Education Wellington Hui project (creative and performance Year Two and Three).
• The Southern Symphonia School Concert project (creative and performance Year Two).
• Music IT Projects (creative and recorded performance).
• Instrumental group projects (creative, skill building and performance).

The following sections focus on the two Year Two Ensembles taught at the beginning of 2004. The function of these ensembles was to enhance the sense of community amongst the children that had been evident toward the end of 2003. They also fulfilled an important bridging role, as the second year children’s instrumental learning did not start till the beginning of Term Two. Hence, the Year Two Ensembles were also conceived as a way of sustaining the momentum of the thirtyfour children involved.

**Year Two ensemble example one: Analysis of learning**

The first of the two 2004 ensembles involved seventeen children who had been selected for Year Two of Heartland, three of whom were child participants in this study. The analysis is based on observation and video analysis of a performance arranged for the then Minister of Education Trevor Mallard. At the time, the children’s prior experience in Heartland consisted of their participation in the Year One Ensemble, around twenty half-hour keyboard and theory lessons and a cross school creative project of approximately eighteen hours. Each of the three child participants had previous music learning experience: Michael had learned guitar for a year, Heidi the violin for two years and Serena mentioned having had some percussion experience at a previous school. By the time of performance, the group had practised as an ensemble one to two hours an afternoon over ten days, for a total of around fourteen hours.
The instrumentation consisted of glockenspiels, alto and bass xylophones, electronic keyboards, guitar and conga drums. Within the five pieces the ensemble played, Serena played xylophone and keyboard, Heidi played xylophone, keyboard and violin and Michael conga drum, guitar and xylophone. The first piece, *Lean on Me* was familiar to the children from the Year One ensemble. However, this arrangement featured technical requirements of a more complex nature. The children were accompanied by the tutor on guitar to assist cohesion. Their playing showed good ensemble skills in response to slight tempo changes, including a rallentando. *Lean on Me* was the most successful piece in the programme in terms of style, which I put down to the cumulative effects of the work from 2003. The mood was relaxed and most parts were played with a high degree of accuracy.

Technically, *Wimoway* was the most difficult piece. The recorder was used as the main melody instrument and, except for Michael, the child participants changed instruments. Although there were cohesion issues around the sustained note in the chorus, the ensemble showed sufficient flexibility to cope. A highlight was the cross rhythm conga drum in the chorus against which the group sustained rhythmic security. The second verse contained a more technical and independent high register harmony that was mostly secure. The arrangement was long, which might have been a challenge in terms of cohesion, but the group was again responsive to small variations and achieved appropriate accuracy. Good cohesion was also most evident in the last chorus, which introduced the challenge of layering in all of the parts. Good ensemble skills were again evident as the piece slowed to a close.

The other pieces were *Scoo Be Do Be Doo*, *Rock Around the Clock* and a blues chordal sequence over which children improvised. The last featured conga drum, recorders and glockenspiels, none of which the child participants played. Their role was chordal and, in this, they were accurate and rhytmically secure. In *Rock Around the Clock*, Heidi played the melody on violin, along with recorders. I could not hear the violin well but her bow movements suggested she was challenged rhythmically, though she kept with the ensemble.

Throughout the performance, the child participants utilised a mix of reading and memory playing. Michael showed the least reliance on notation. Heidi and Serena used music when they needed to, and made sure the music was available for others. In terms of involvement, the three child participants sustained excellent focus. Similarly, when the tutor talked to the audience, they were attentive and responded well if asked to demonstrate. In terms of independence, they listened carefully when they were not playing in pieces and were positive about re-entry. Also, they were quick to move as needed for the different pieces and helped others organise their
instruments. Overall, the three child participants were not stand out performers. However, they were enthusiastic about the situation and mostly sure in their musical contribution.

**Year Two Ensemble Example Two: Analysis of Learning**

The second Year Two Ensemble involved eight children from three Heartland schools. The children had rehearsed for a total of around nine hours\(^\text{73}\) in preparation for a twenty-five minute performance at a community care facility. Similar to the other Year Two Ensemble, the instrumentation for the group consisted of alto and bass xylophones, glockenspiels, electronic keyboards, and recorder. Most of the children played different instruments in successive pieces. The arrangements they played as an ensemble were from Jon Madin’s publications while solo and duet features on keyboard were drawn from resources such as the Bastion Piano Series.

Because of the group size, the role of individuals was more apparent. Thus, it was easier to explore the contribution of the two child research participants, Anna and Matapo. Neither had experienced music learning prior to Heartland although both expressed a personal passion for listening to music. “I listen to music all the time…. I’ve got my music on me now!” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

Anna played glockenspiel, xylophone and keyboard. On tuned percussion, she played both middle harmony lines and melodic parts that were challenging relative to her experience with good accuracy. She chose to play *Lightly Row* as a keyboard solo. While the single hand arrangement was simple, spanning only a fifth, she showed a firm touch, positive rhythm and read the music. Her hand movement was poised and while it was early days for style to be a significant factor, she showed good fluency. Her contribution to the ensemble was similarly rhythmically secure, showing dexterity with the beater as she met the technical demands of the music. As with the keyboard, there was a high level of accuracy in her melodic work and, although the ensemble pieces were based on melodic ostinati, Anna’s approach was anything but rote like. Her attention to cohesion and ensemble were excellent. She listened and responded well, showing independence as she contributed effectively to the style of each piece.

In my interpretation of Anna’s work, all of the above contributed to a high level of personal involvement. Factoring elements of concentration, interaction and wanting to participate in the estimation of involvement, Anna clearly enjoyed the experience. While her confidence was tested in the solo keyboard piece, throughout the group work she was interactive and responsive as each piece evolved. Her facial gestures reflected a wry and unassuming manner as well as a clear sense of personal significance and belonging.

---

\(^{73}\) There were fewer hours because of the smaller group size.
Matapo was a School Year Eight student who had already splayed in a Year Four to Six Ensemble. He was included in Heartland because of the significant relationship he had with his tutor, his school’s recommendation that he would be more productive around children who were familiar to him, and as his school was the rehearsal home of a Year Two Ensemble. It is also noteworthy that Matapo was reported to me as living in difficult circumstances at home, where he was offered little support for his endeavours in or out of school.

Matapo remained on keyboard through the performance. Technically, in *Boris the Bassman* Matapo began the piece with a right hand chord sequence that provided cohesion throughout the piece. As in all of his playing, he was accurate, which was important when the timing of other children shook. The style of his playing was impressive. Even though he was playing a learner level electronic keyboard, his touch appeared coordinated, strong, and naturally sustained. This was reinforced during the observation of a piano lesson later in 2004. Although Matapo read when he could not remember the music, he showed excellent memory skills.

In the ensemble, the technical expectations consisted of complex single line harmony parts and two hand chordal accompaniments. All of the above technical, style, accuracy and ensemble features were encapsulated as he accompanied his tutor playing a flute melody. He began the piece with the same surety as with the ensemble, giving a clear tempo and good accuracy in an appropriate style. Although this performance came after just twenty half-hour lessons in 2003, the tutor and he were clearly enjoying each other’s playing. This was no more evident than when the tutor made errors. Matapo would raise an eyebrow, be sensitive to the change but not falter. In terms of cohesion, he ended before the tutor and took refuge behind the keyboard with a large grin. His tutor advised the audience that she had been the problem because she had not stood where they could make eye contact.

The above represents a high level of involvement. Matapo was more obviously centred on himself than the other child participants in ensemble situations. Nevertheless, he remained responsive to the needs of the group. From video analysis, the first attitudinal impression I had of Matapo was one of nonchalance. However, as the performance unfolded I came to see him as relaxed and quietly confident. Significantly, I think his confidence produced a natural leadership in terms of playing and demeanour, as well as excellent musical consistency. This was confirmed in the performance of a song created by his school group at the end of 2004, where Matapo was clearly the anchor man on piano. Matapo might never have said, “I really enjoyed that”. Neither was he particularly assertive about Heartland, as borne out by the response “I don’t know” to an evaluation question about what he needed to learn next. Similarly, subsequent to the Year Two Ensemble, I observed Matapo in his classroom and, from one perspective, his participation could
have been described as reticent. However, when he did respond it carried mana with other children. Furthermore, he spontaneously gifted a poem to me, which I thought revealed a special integrity about music involvement.

Returning to the performance, Matapo subtly but clearly valued involvement and demonstrated significant development in his keyboard and wider musical skills. His attentive eye contact with the tutor’s conducting showed concentration, interaction and a desire to participate at a meaningful level. I would sum up, by suggesting that he was secretly pleased to be there. A little later in the year, he wrote in a diary entry, “I like the music room because it is relaxing. I can just think when I need to” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

**Summary for extension and maintenance ensembles**

Individuals did not stand out as much in the larger group, while child participants in the second group showed more evidence of solo work and responded to higher levels of individual challenge. However, the fact the first group performed in a high pressure situation surely contributed to more emphasis being placed on the ensemble rather than individuals. For all that, I did not perceive any differences in the level of involvement, and the children in both ensembles demonstrated good application and alertness. Overall cohesion and accuracy seemed more consistent in the smaller group, though they also played fewer pieces. The smaller group appeared to play with a more avid sense of style. However, the larger group played in a greater diversity of styles and given the opportunity to improvise, revealed the beginning of “Wow it is my turn” attitudes. One factor differentiating the two ensembles was the tutors’ knowledge of the children. The tutor of the second ensemble had been the keyboard tutor for the majority of the child participants. It appeared this knowledge contributed to the level of confidence the tutor had in the children, for example influencing Matapo’s accompaniment role, and Anna being encouraged to opt into a solo on the day. Furthermore, it was more practicable to devote time to individuals in the second and smaller ensemble.

Finally, while their purpose was partially a compromise to maximise resource application, I found the observed and videoed performance data compelling. They highlighted important elements of technique and cohesion in the child participants’ musical growth during the ensemble activity. Similarly, the data reinforced the importance of social, extrinsic motivation and community growth as underpinning of child participants’ skill acquisition.

**Summary comparison of learning in Music Heartland year one and year two ensembles**

In a social participatory sense, the child participants in the Year Two Ensembles showed more consistent and avid levels of involvement. This included more independence in terms of when to
play and getting instruments ready. They were noticeably more responsive in terms of cohesion and ensemble, as well as to the presence of an audience. The evidence suggests that the level of interaction amongst the children, and between the tutor and children in both Year Two groups reflects the regular and longer term focus on music in their school lives brought about by Heartland involvement.

In a musical sense, overall challenge in technical terms and the complexity of pieces was significantly higher in the Year Two Ensembles. Individuals were more confident when taking on responsibility. Furthermore, while there was a difference in the level of accuracy between them, both were superior to that achieved in Year One. The children were able to self correct more quickly and showed greater technical proficiency on whatever instrument they were playing. Also, most read some of the time, albeit as a support in well rehearsed pieces. Hence, the five child participants showed clear growth of skills, social confidence, and personal motivation. As to the extent these changes are a reflection of Music Heartland, in my view the qualitative improvements in performance, musicianship and social interaction from Year One to Year Two went significantly beyond any advancement generated by maturation alone.

**Introduction to learning In Music Heartland Year One Keyboard and Theory**

Early plans for the programme intentions did not include keyboard learning as a core component of the first year. However, several factors prompted the introduction of a keyboard and theory programme in 2003. These included the previous successful initiatives the Out of School Music Classes (1986) in Invercargill and The Music Place keyboard classes (1994 to 1999) in Dunedin, as well as a chance reminder of the significance of piano as a musicianship tool when visiting the Corelli School of the Arts in Auckland in 2002. Although these programmes are widely disparate in nature, in each case an identifiable advance in ability and confidence emerged during relatively short periods of keyboard learning. The children also appeared to regard the keyboard or piano as ‘real’ instruments, with potential to generate a greater application.

Keyboard learning is also an accepted tool for establishing music literacy, which was detailed as a priority in the application to the Ministry of Education (2002). “From the second year students will share the results of the literacy and composition aspects of the programme. They will explore the nature of their own and other instruments in the programme as a basis for developing short pieces” (Heartland, 2002). In that, I anticipated keyboard skills would be a useful vehicle for learning about melodic and harmonic principles in music for later application in creative work.

---

74 The brief to the Ministry of Education included ongoing ensemble, creative work and instrumental learning. Instrumental learning was to include a range of orchestral, band and popular music instruments but not necessarily piano.
A third factor was Heartland’s emphasis on establishing practice habits within children’s daily routine. This again featured in the proposal to the Ministry of Education: “To provide opportunity for children to develop independent learning skills” (Heartland, 2002). Regardless of how the progress of the child research participants in the Year One Ensembles (2004) is interpreted, independent learning was not a strong feature. Even given the advantages of the 2004 Year One Ensembles over 2003 groups, Tulevai’s words are telling: “I didn’t find anything hard” (Yr 1 child participant, 2004). Finally, as the hire and loan of instruments was a budgeted item, this was cost effective through the then Dunedin College of Education hire pool.75

The records show that my proposal to include keyboard and theory in the Year One programme gelled with the tutors. Accordingly, while most of the teaching occurred on piano, keyboards were housed in each Heartland school with the intention that the children practised at school by arrangement with classroom teachers and school management. As to the programme, in 2003, a music text was provided for each child but in 2004 and 2005 tutors opted to compile material suited to individual children’s needs.

In recognition of different strengths amongst the tutors the teaching was open ended. It seemed desirable to have the learning based on guidelines rather than prescriptive outcomes, as had been adopted for the Year One Ensembles. Further, the learning needed to cater for both beginner and musically experienced individuals. Thus, the agreed goals, which were labelled as priorities, emphasised the application of musical knowledge to develop what I regarded as lifelong useful musicianship skills and understandings. The priorities were:

- Play keyboard in a manner conducive to lifelong keyboard interest.
- Develop knowledge of melody, in terms of contribution and diversity.
- Develop knowledge of how harmony works and contributes to the sense of music.
- Develop knowledge of rhythm and performance.
- Improvise, play by ear and from notation.
- Contextualise the development of theoretical understanding.
- Discuss models of keyboard playing. (Heartland, 2003)

During the data-gathering period, four child participants learnt Year One Keyboard. The three case studies detailed below represent a range of responses to the opportunity to learn keyboard.

Li Xiang is documented as a high achiever. Her drive was evident in a self evaluation at the end of her first year in Heartland 2004. After about twenty half-hour keyboard lessons, she noted she would be able to improve if her tutor: “Gave me more songs to play and have 4 lessons a week”

75 Many of the instruments including forty keyboards were a residue of the community music education scheme The Music Place.
The tutor participant’s report in the same month indicated that Li Xiang received the highest ranking in twenty-one of the twenty-five categories, including creative aptitude, quality of application, consistency, personal initiative and willingness to share. The report came with a recommendation that Li Xiang consider studying two instruments. It stated, “She is diligent and enthusiastic, and displays much technical skill and musical sensitivity in the pieces she has learned. She has been experimenting with transposition of her pieces, and is making excellent progress with her note reading of accidentals” (Tutor, 2004).

In 2004, I observed one of Li Xiang’s keyboard lessons and was captivated:

> Li Xiang participated with alacrity in the music lesson. She showed special ability to respond to instructions, converse regarding musical qualities, and play with great confidence. In her playing and discussion I noted enthusiasm and assertiveness. She brought a confidence, her touch was firm and her technical confidence was supported by an ability to learn quickly. She plays her pieces ‘rapidly’ which one might interpret as less than musical, but I would say it reflects her thirst to learn – get better – show command. (Moore, 2004)

The data relating to Li Xiang reveals significant growth toward the learning priorities. Coupled with her overt personal commitment, this suggests wide ranging learning was taking place. This was reinforced by the fact Li Xiang recorded the highest rating for the speed of development in playing and talking about music in the self evaluation in 2004.

Prior to becoming involved in Heartland, Jo had learned recorder for two years at Saturday Morning Music Classes. She was highly recommended by her tutor at the completion of the Year One Ensemble. She progressed to keyboard and theory on the basis of her demonstrated aural skills, enjoyment of challenge and, ability to express excellent ideas about music (Tutor, 2004). In an interview, just after the ensemble, she described herself as, “I’m good at singing, but I don’t really like singing in front of a small audience of people that I actually know” (Yr 1 child participant, 2004).

Following completion of the keyboard and theory lessons, her self evaluation noted she enjoyed everything about keyboard and theory, valued her tutor’s input and sought more lessons per week. She felt she read music well, particularly treble clef, and indicated she practised for about fifteen minutes at a time, although not on a daily basis. In a self evaluation she stated, “I do one hand at a time” (Yr 1 child participant, 2004). At the completion of her lessons in 2004, Jo evaluated herself as needing, “More work on the bass clef. More practice” (Yr 1 child participant, 2004).

---

76 See Appendix 5 for sample of Heartland’s tutor reporting format.
77 See Appendix 9 for the field work observation guide.
Jo’s tutor rated her at the highest level in all but five of the twenty-five reporting categories. The high ratings included creative aptitude and quality of application, consistency, personal initiative and willingness to share. Five categories rated as very high were for music literacy and the tutor suggested Jo was making rapid progress:

Jo has made fantastic progress on the keyboard. She has been committed to personal practice, and enthusiastic about what she is learning. Her reading fluency is coming along very well…. Jo needs to make sure her good memory does not take over her work in reading the notes off the page – careful slow practice would be good. The chance to do some singing would be great also – she has a great voice and is confident and keen. (Tutor participant, 2004).

The evidence, including a “great tutor,” from Jo’s 2004 self evaluation, suggests close parallels in the ways the child and her tutor saw the learning progress. In itself, this indicates that sustained and meaningful communication occurred between child and tutor. Furthermore, Jo’s evaluation revealed she personally enjoyed the keyboard and anticipated music she wished to play, reflecting a positive response to the opportunity. Jo’s tutor reported the development of her playing skills in both hands and, in reference to fluency, an early appreciation of style. Similarly, a willingness and success in composing tunes suggests growing confidence and the growth of wider musical understandings. In fact, Jo and Li Xiang’s creative skills became more apparent in later creative projects, along with total focus and confidence in performance situations.

Maia, the third child participant, had learned flute at Saturday Morning Music Classes for two years prior to being selected for Heartland. Her Year One Ensemble tutor (2004) noted a quiet demeanour, good aural responses, perseverance, and that, although she was is a positive model, she was a child who needed encouragement. In a similar vein, after observing Maia in a piano lesson, I recorded:

Maia was tentative throughout the session. Based on her level of playing it would seem she had managed only a little personal practice because new music was negotiated as ably as known pieces. Maia was obliging, attentive and keen to respond. The level of response was superficial in a musical sense in that practical and verbal responses were at an elementary level. Maia’s behaviours suggested her sense of self direction and personal resilience were developing more slowly than I would expect in this situation of high support. Maia was clearly enjoying the situation and the tutor worked hard to boost her confidence…. Playing and reading are both a challenge for her despite her high level of comfort in the situation. (Moore, 2004).

At the end of 2004, the tenor of Maia’s self evaluation showed confidence in technical progress, daily practice of twenty minutes and a desire for two lessons a week (Yr1 child participant, 2004). She also indicated that she enjoyed engaging with her tutor, although disliked being corrected when she made a mistake. I perceived this to be an indication of shyness or perhaps lower
personal confidence. Along with her perceptions of her overall playing skills and ability to talk about music, Maia rated her progress in the middle category.

Maia’s report ratings from her tutor ranged from low to very high. The contrasts were interesting. For example, her commitment was rated as very high, but evidence of practice was low. Her aural skills were rated very high but reading attributes were low. The tutors recommended Maia continue learning keyboard into 2005, noting steady progress, a need for regular practice and that, “She works particularly well in a group situation, and I feel that her confidence in playing alone could improve with some chances to play in front of family and friends” (Tutor, 2004).

The notes for Maia’s classroom teacher’s Independent Education Plan show a variety of improvements in her learning independence, time management, knowledge transfer and commitment. By the end of 2004, these categories joined leadership in receiving a very high rating, with comments indicating that Maia was coping with school and participating in Heartland. “Maia is a middle of the road student whose progress in all curriculum areas is even. Certainly the time at Heartland has been beneficial and has not compromised her academically” (Heartland, 2004).

In a second interview in 2005, Maia stated that she considered her piano learning to be alright and that she liked music more because, “You get out of school sometimes, it’s really boring” (Yr 2 child participant, 2005). After being prompted for a more considered response she noted that one outcome of Heartland was, “Because I get to write my own music” (Yr 2 child participant, 2005). By the end of that year, her tutor noted middle to very high ratings for twenty one of the twenty five report categories, including reading and literacy. The tutor commented, “Maia has made real progress over the last three months and should be pleased with herself. Her understanding and recognition of notation improved enormously, and her confidence has grown. I would encourage Maia to keep learning an instrument” (Tutor, 2004).

While perhaps not dramatic, it seems Maia did respond to the expectations noted in the Year One Keyboard reports, as tutor comments from 2004 and 2005 indicate improvements in reading and general confidence. Coupled with the comments in the Independent Education Plan and the growing confidence she expressed in the 2005 interview, it seems reasonable to suggest that Maia’s keyboard tuition and wider Heartland involvement provided a lift in her independence with regard to music and general classroom learning.

Summary for Year One keyboard and theory
Two of the three child participants appeared to show strong growth in technical aspects, such as working with the instrument, technical aspects of music, reading and being able to talk about
pieces. While Maia also made gains, these were not as marked. A similar pattern was evident for accuracy and challenge. Observations revealed Li Xiang was quick on the uptake, enjoyed being challenged,\(^78\) liked quicker tempi but understood the need for accuracy. Maia was tentative and was largely dependent on the obvious support offered by tutors. According to the reports, while reading was a fact of life for Li Xiang, it was something Jo needed to focus on to supplement strong memory skills. Although reading remained a challenge for Maia, it was one she was beginning to address. Similarly, with respect to cohesion, I observed Maia playing simpler pieces and with less obvious musical style than Li Xiang. The three children appear to have been equally independent. This was supported by comments made in self evaluation reports. All three sought more time with their tutor and valued most components of the one to one learning. From observing Li Xiang and Maia, it was clear they were engaged and that they happily contributed to odd moments of dialogue between me and the tutor.

As to the wider musicianship outcomes of keyboard and theory, I suggest the keyboard learning priorities were meaningfully addressed in all three cases. Li Xiang and Jo’s 2004 creative work in particular showed a significantly improved understanding of music elements, rhythmic and melodic fluidity and ability to improvise on melodic and rhythmic ideas. Outside musical goals, a keen sense of purpose was apparent in Li Xiang and Jo’s learning, and all three interacted well with their tutor. These child participants clearly took responsibility to make it to lessons in spite of barriers, such as the demands of the wider school programme or recreational activities. In return, my observations indicate that the tutors generated a good level of expectation, despite the comparatively small number of teaching hours. While Maia and Li Xiang behaved very differently in lessons, a growth in confidence along with a clear sense of involvement was evident in both cases. This perception of confidence was reinforced during a later sharing time, when Jo and Li Xiang’s keyboard skills already seemed the result of an enjoyable habit.

Finally, the musical and social outputs of the three child participants in Year One Keyboard and Theory indicate that they accommodated music learning in school and at home. While the learning seemed more intense and challenging in regard to Li Xiang and Jo, Maia became more focused in 2005. Her commentary indicates a greater willingness to try and she seemed more willing to accept personal responsibility for her progress. Clearly though, Jo and Li Xiang appeared to be more independent and to have a more defined sense of self-direction. In my view, however, all three children demonstrated advanced music skills relative to the school setting, and

---

\(^78\) This thirst for challenge included her voluntarily transposing a piece for the tutor while I was observing.
showed meta-cognitive strategies in music learning and, in which practice, musical product and positive self efficacy were effectively woven.79

Learning in the Music Heartland Instrumental Programme
In 2004 and 2005, approximately thirty Heartland children received twenty to twenty-five half hour lesson equivalents in instrumental learning during the school day over two to three school terms.80 Along with its precursor, Year One Keyboard and Theory, this became the only Heartland programme component facilitated on a week by week basis. About one third of the children were transported to different schools, either by volunteers or by taxi81 to allow same instrument groupings.

Tuition for guitar and keyboard/piano, which from 2004 involved the largest proportion of children, was provided by Heartland’s core tutors. Where feasible, Ministry of Education itinerant teachers provided tuition in other instruments and freelance community tutors were employed in a few cases. In most cases where itinerant teachers were asked to teach, financial support was provided by the pupils’ school because of the cost recovery requirement of the secondary school based scheme.

The range of instruments offered was decided by the tutors and me from the range that could be readily hired within New Zealand.82 As the application to the Ministry of Education noted, “The range of instruments offered to children will be dependent on funding available and support from supporting institutions such as The Music Place” (Heartland, 2002). Families paid thirty dollars, whatever the cost was to Heartland, on the basis of my experience that better care results from even a nominal hire charge.

It was agreed that popular music instruments would be included, though they were reserved for school Year Seven and Eight children. The rationale for this, which was distributed to families, can be summarised as follows:

79 The three child participants were involved again in 2005 by tutor recommendation. Maia’s case was discussed because of her lower progress indicators, but as noted her 2005 report shows the ongoing inclusion was taking more effect. As noted, Jo began trombone and Li Xiang continued on with piano as a second instrument to violin. Li Xiang was also chosen by the tutors to perform at the Ministry of Education hui for gifted and talented initiatives in Wellington.

80 While the budget forecast allowed for twenty-two lessons, any budget surplus was committed to extending the number of instrumental lessons. This occurred in 2004 and 2005. Variation in the number of lessons was also due to tutor and instrument availability, and a few instances of block teaching. These have not been reviewed in this study.

81 In addition to family and school, assistance from the Bendigo Trust and Otago Taxis meant the transport cost was sustainable.

82 The most available resource was for band and orchestral instruments made available through retail outlets (Auckland), high schools, Saturday Morning Music Classes (Dunedin) and the then Dunedin College of Education Hire Scheme.
Piano, guitar, orchestral and band instruments are more likely to encourage ongoing reading and literacy development, particularly if they are a child’s sole instrument.

Heartland was committed to place the project within the context of existing community performance groups.

Popular music instruments (electric and bass guitar and drum kits) were not available on hire in sufficient numbers, despite one hire source purchasing additional instruments to support the tuition.

Table 2: Table of instruments offered by Heartland and taken up by children (2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strings</th>
<th>Woodwind</th>
<th>Brass</th>
<th>Keyboard</th>
<th>Guitar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Violin (4)</td>
<td>Clarinet (4)</td>
<td>Trumpet/ (2)</td>
<td>Keyboard (7)</td>
<td>Guitar (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cornet (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cello (1)</td>
<td>Flute (3)</td>
<td>French Hn (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Electric Guitar (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oboe (3)</td>
<td>Trombone (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Percussion/Drums (0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children and families were made aware that instrumental learning was regarded as the pinnacle of the Heartland programme and offered on the evidence of rapid progress and application during the child’s first year. As communicated to families:

> The learning expectations need to be high for children in the instrumental programme. Personal practice habits will be encouraged and later be an expectation. Student progress will be reviewed after about 10 weeks of tuition. The schools are also being asked to take an interest in the learning and where appropriate make school arrangements for personal practice. We hope families also can supportive of personal practice at home (Heartland, 2004).

Families were invited to consider a range of factors in making a decision on an instrument for their child. These included the child’s abilities and physical characteristics, and possible community pathways. Families were advised that budget restrictions, the practical necessity for tutors to group like instrument learners in one school and tutor/school recommendations would also influence the final allocation of instruments by Heartland. Eligible Heartland children were brought together for a morning to hear and try the range of instruments in 2003 and 2004. In 2003, an evening information meeting was attended by more than thirty family members. Although only eight attended a similar evening in 2004, many more alternative communications occurred than in 2003.

---

83 This service was provided by Itinerant Music Teachers over and above their normal workload.
The following was communicated to the children and their families to advise them of the instrument they had been allocated:

I appreciate that (name) may learn an instrument that may not have been a first choice. A number of criteria were used other than the choices made by children. These were:

1. The project being committed to small group tuition.

2. The project needed to make best use of the teaching resource funding available to us.

3. The project is committed to being responsive to community playing opportunities as they currently exist.

4. Children who succeed in one instrument are likely to develop skills in other musical instruments or voice at a later stage. (Heartland records, 2004, 2005)

Heartland records show that most of the children who were already learning an instrument external to Heartland accepted the opportunity to learn an additional instrument. Those that did not accept gave reasons such as the child becoming over committed or that the child needed to make good use of existing learning. Of note, in one instance a community tutor directly intervened to stop their pupil’s second instrument learning after a few lessons.

Similarly, records show that a much more cautious attitude was adopted when offering second instrument learning in 2005. “To first year project children who already play an instrument, to learn an additional one is a big decision…. We think there would need to be special circumstances” (Heartland records, 2004). This policy change was in response to situations where the level of progress on the second instrument was low, or if in some way the two instruments lacked what could be termed reciprocal value. Meeting notes indicated, “Consensus that if a 2nd instrument is being picked up, that the two need to be complementary, e.g. melodic (violin) and chordal (keyboard/guitar)” (Heartland records, 2004).

All of the child research participants who were eligible opted to learn a second instrument in 2004. One withdrew from her Heartland instrument in 2005. Two children learning a second instrument were withdrawn by Heartland at the end of 2004 because of low progress. Of the five eligible Year One child participants who already learned an instrument outside Heartland in 2004, four were deemed to be learning a melodic instrument and thus accepted the offer of keyboard or guitar learning in 2005.
As regards goals for instrumental learning, marked variations in confidence and achievement were evident in the final creative sharing of 2003. Coupled with confidence in the expertise of the tutors, I felt a common set of learning goals would be inappropriate. Instead, I and the core tutors developed a reporting format (See Appendix 14) intended to establish priorities for children’s musical development, and by implication the anticipated teaching approaches. Hence, the learning was monitored and the children were given feedback about technical development on the instrument, musical style, particular instrumental skills, reading, creative activity, aural awareness, and personal application. As part of that reporting, in 2004 and 2005 one sharing time was designated for children to demonstrate progress on the instrument they were learning through Heartland.

A number of challenges arose as to the extent of the instrumental learning. These were summarised in the mid 2005 report to the Ministry of Education as follows:

we are delighted with the impact on children, particularly the 20 gifted students whose families would not have been in a position, or had not considered musical tuition for their child.

However there are issues of note.

The resource available for first year students in the programme is diminished because approximately half of the project’s staffing resource is required to support this instrumental programme.

There is significant variability of tuition standard available within the community on particular instruments:

- The students who are making the greatest progress tend to be students who are taught by tutors who are part of the core teaching of ensemble and creative work within the project.
- The impact of the Heartland project in schools has been dampened where there are few or no students learning instruments.
- Logistical organisation is difficult in the light of the range of instruments, tutors and variable support available in schools. (Heartland, 2005)

Clearly, these matters are significance to later data themes.

**Analysis of learning for child participants who began a first instrument in 2004 In Music Heartland**

At the end of 2003 and 2004, I communicated to the Heartland families:

A report on your child’s progress is included. The report makes a recommendation about your child’s involvement in 2005. I remind children and families that the goals of the
project are for high levels of achievement and these are consistent in the selection of children to continue in 2005. (Heartland, 2004)

Helen, Serena and Matapo began first instrument learning in 2004. Helen began Heartland participation in Year Six and progressed to violin in Year Seven. In both mid and end of year reports, Helen was rated as high or highest for twenty of the twenty-five report categories. However, five of the categories were not graded, including those relating to creative activity. At the end of 2004 the tutor commented, “Helen is very self-motivated and has made amazing progress this year on the violin. She is very musical and her intonation is mostly accurate. She cooperates well in lessons, comes well prepared and is a great student to teach” (Heartland, 2004).

In her self-evaluation at the end of 2004, Helen stated that she practised twice a day for fifteen minutes and that, “Practice makes perfect” (Child participant, 2004). She rated her skills as developing rapidly and, in response to what she looked forward to in 2005, commented she would stick with the violin.

In mid 2003, Serena’s tutor noted that reading was an issue. However, by the end of 2004, Serena’s summary comments state:

Serena has been a pleasure to teach. She is quiet in lessons but is willing to work hard to try something difficult and challenging. Her work has been consistent throughout the year and she continues to develop her technical skills. Serena has a very good style when playing and seems to have an aptitude for the piano. (Tutor, 2004)

From observation, I noted:

Serena seems a relaxed and gentle child. She seldom asserted herself or felt the need to within the lesson. Serena is great at following instructions but self determinant application was observed in her learning strategies. Through the lesson her playing gained confidence and discussion about the musical ideas became more in depth. I did not observe her generating playing initiative or discussion starters. Serena has been identified as musically gifted. I think what that means is that she enjoys music, is biddable and show high level of willingness to collaborate. As a distant observer, her playing needs to show more enterprise, energy perhaps command for her to fit the notion of being gifted. (Moore, 2004)

However, the records show that Serena’s progress fell away in 2005, partially due to an instrument not being available to her early in the year. At the end of the year her tutor recorded, “After a muddled start (until a keyboard was arranged) Serena had a good term 2, mastering a difficult piece. However, her commitment varied a bit, missing several, so progress hasn’t

---

84 Helen was taught violin by a tutor who was not a Heartland core tutor.
continued for the whole year” (Tutor, 2005). Because Serena did not participate in the self-evaluation, even though she was at school, it seems fair to suggest that her interest had waned.

As noted, Matapo played a chordal accompaniment for his tutor in a confident and firm style after approximately eleven hours of tuition. I considered the early skills and his attentive eye contact with the tutor indicated that he valued participation and concentration. This sense of maturation was further evidenced in Matapo’s Keyboard and Theory reports for 2003 and 2004:

Matapo is a pleasure to teach. He has periods of focused study showing amazing results, the output reflecting the time input. Matapo has great keyboard skills developing and a real feeling for music. (Tutor, 2003)

Fantastic, committed start to musical learning. Working away at own musical activities (e.g. *House of the Rising Sun, Fur Elise*) as well as pieces/exercises I have given him. Has shown perseverance and increased maturity over the term. (Tutor, 2004)

Except for reading, which was recorded as low in both reports for 2003, Matapo was given middle or high ratings for all of the twenty-five report categories. In 2004, the mid-year report showed his application was in the mid range but that reading development remained at a low level. The other twenty-two categories were noted as high or highest. In a mid-year self evaluation, while knowing he would be at high school, Matapo indicated a wish to be involved in Heartland in 2005. He recorded that, although reading music was important to him, he still played mostly by ear. As his tutor wrote mid 2004, “Preference for Polynesian sounds, although picks up classical phrases by ear and enjoys those” (Tutor, 2004). However, in the second 2004 report while Matapo’s reading fluency remained at a low rating, his ability to read had moved to the middle category:

Matapo has made an effort to improve his music reading this term which has been a great decision. This needs to be continued so that he is not limited to playing by ear only. In the same way Matapo needs to spend as much time as possible playing the piano/keyboard and developing his skills. He has a great deal of ability and is only limited by how much he practises. (Tutor, 2004)

In Mid 2004, Matapo played in a sharing time of instrumental learning activity. In a piece he was reading, a lower level of personal ensemble was evident and limited fluency. However, the level of accuracy was high and his musical style showed that his left/right hand coordination had markedly improved from earlier work.

In a wider learning frame I noted from a classroom observation:

He has a reticent approach to challenge or for that matter something which is new to him but once begun he seems to relish success. While he may not verbalise a lot, his ability to
conceptualise and apply ideas is strong. He sticks at ‘it’ with encouragement and when he mentions a piece or concept within a piece he communicates fluidly and with an excellent depth of meaning. (Music Observation, 2004)

At the end of 2004, Matapo performed as part of a cross-school group creative project. As described, he projected a strong persona, even a sense of occupying the piano when other children might have legitimately played one of the two pieces. The first piece was an improvisation on *Albatross Rock* in which he effectively anchored the chord sequence. Overall, the level of his musical style and cohesion was of a high order. This was no better demonstrated than when he briefly lost his place and the rest of the group had obvious ensemble issues until Matapo picked up his part again. The second piece was introduced by the tutor as Matapo’s song. This was a haunting melody and beautifully played by Matapo. His strength of touch and technical confidence meant the music was a step up from anything I had heard from him before. Personal involvement was obvious, with others in the ensemble taking visual and aural cues from his lead, as well as those of the tutor. In 2005, Matapo moved on to high school. He agreed to take part in holiday creative projects85 in 2005 but did not attend.

**Summary for first instrument in 2004**

Each of these child participants made measurable and, in some cases, splendid progress on a first instrument. Matapo’s example is particularly telling, as he developed meaningful skills with less apparent family support. However, the data suggests that the child participants were making choices. Serena was very positive in the 2004 interview and the reports from that year are in keeping with that. However, the rate of her progress waned, even though there was no suggestion of her not being capable. On the other hand, while Matapo and Helen’s application was not completely consistent, it was nevertheless sufficient to ensure development.

By implication, it seems appropriate to suggest the model of school based instrument learning was successful. The idea of performing in dedicated instrumental or creative sharing times, together with the reporting framework, seemed to encourage commitment and progress. Of significance, my experience suggests that, when committed, the progress of the three individuals paralleled results one might expect from private tuition, despite fewer lessons over a year. This possibly hints at the effects the wider Heartland programme, including ensemble, creative and shared components, had on these child participants.

---

85 Heartland tuition was not available in secondary schools.
**Analysis of learning of child participants who learned a second instrument in 2004 in Music Heartland**

Heartland was committed to instrumental learning as a catalyst for musical development and I believed that a second instrument would increase the potential to accelerate and diversify musical growth and direction. Child participants Michael, Heidi, Josh, and Ainsley were each offered a second instrument in their second year of Heartland in 2004, and their learning is the basis for the following case studies.

Michael made an immediate impression with me in an interview, seeming almost irrepressible in his enthusiasm for music in general, and Heartland in particular. His end of 2004 report commented:

> He has become extremely competent at reading both bass and treble clefs. Because of this, his sight-reading of both pitch and rhythm is excellent. Michael enjoys writing his own music. His interest in music appears to lie more with his guitar than the keyboard and this is reflected in his lack of commitment to keyboard practice…. Enjoys composing music to play on the keyboard. Has developed structural techniques to do this. (Tutor, 2003)

In 2003, Michael was already learning guitar. His family’s request for him to learn keyboard in 2004 was supported by his tutor and the school liaison teacher. In mid 2004, however, Michael’s ratings for twenty categories were low to middle, with the tutor comment, “Has difficulty to play in a relaxed style. Slow overall progress on piano” (Tutor, 2004). The end of year report indicated improvement to the middle rating for fluency, and as in 2003, he received a high rating for creating tunes and rhythms. The comment included, “He is a very bubbly student who talks a lot about music and seems interested generally in musical things. However, Michael never consistently applied himself to practising so struggled to achieve at a good rate” (Tutor, 2004).

Looking deeper, Michael’s 2003 self evaluation indicated a preference for guitar. I had not considered the self evaluations as indicators alongside the instrument learning reports. Had I done so, Michael’s later difficulties learning the keyboard might have been averted as he asserted a wish to learn drumming.86 “I want something more interesting to play. It is boring what we have to play, because keyboard and piano are the most boring instruments” (Child participant, 2004). So striking was his statement, two other child participants felt a need to speak up in defence of the piano.

---

86 He realised drumming was only an option for school Year Seven and Eight children.
In a subsequent interview with Michael’s mother, also a research participant, a comment was made about the choice of instrument:

Well he really wanted to further the guitar because he does guitar anyway he wanted more guitar [electric] and that was his first choice even though it was marked down as for the older children only…. He said, “Well I’m doing it, why is it only for them?” And then I foolishly put keyboard down and he told me off for the whole year…. And he wouldn’t take to it and he wouldn’t do it. Probably that was quite detrimental to him. (Parent participant, 2005)

It seems clear that continuation on piano did affect his commitment. As confirmed by his tutor, Michael had to wing it in lessons, “cause every week I didn’t practise and you get hard [music]. And I would think, ‘Oh no I have forgotten all this’” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). He was withdrawn through the reporting process at the end of 2004, but was nominated again in 2005. However, since Michael’s outward enthusiasm in interview had made a mark on me, I quizzed tutors when they did not recommend him after the re-audition. They reminded me of a lack of sustained attention and focus on tasks. Hence, he was not included in spite of the courage I felt that it would have taken to put himself forward for a second time.

The data relating to Heidi’s Heartland instrumental learning has a similar ring to Michael’s, although a more positive ending. At the end of 2003, Heidi was recommended for Heartland continuation with the comment, “Rhythm developing. Good sense of melody, starting to develop sense of harmony in composition” (Tutor, 2003). Her instrument choices included cello as a second option. I adopted this enthusiastically, as a core tutor in 2004 was a cellist and in addition I had a wider community viewpoint in mind. However, the decision was made in the knowledge that Heidi already had a substantial violin learning background, having received Saturday Morning Music Class tuition and private teaching for six years.

Within the first term of lessons, the cello had lost favour with Heidi. She described the challenges in the interview early in Term Two, “Yes in the Violin, you use different fingering, and then you have to miss out a finger on the cello” (Yr 2 child participant). Her mother further elucidated:

She was a bit disappointed with the first one, that she didn’t have the guitar. But, by lunchtime she had got quite excited about the cello. She was very excited by the time she started and it was good for the first, I don’t know three or four weeks. And then she just sort of decided that, it was I think too hard. It wasn’t anything like the violin. It played a different piece and the bow wasn’t the same. She didn’t hold the bow the same and so I think she found it was too similar but not.(Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005)
At the request of tutors, Heidi was transferred to guitar mid 2004. Heidi’s end of year report for guitar rated her progress at high or highest for all of the twenty five categories, except for a middle rating re dynamics and phrasing. The comment included:

She is developing a number of skills including strumming, picking accompaniments and picking melodies. She is able to use a variety of strumming patterns to accompany her songs and her fluency with chord changes is strong. Heidi is developing skills in reading musical notation and is musical in her approach. (Tutor, 2004)

In her 2004 self evaluation, Heidi indicated that she would like to learn more chords, that she practised twice a day and stated that she concentrated on everything she was supposed to when she practiced. She indicated there was nothing else her tutor could do to help and that she was doing fine (Yr 2 child participant).

In 2005, on the basis of the tutor’s recommendation Heidi continued learning guitar in the third year of Heartland, while in Year Seven at school. Her final report shows all ratings at highest, apart from playing with musical expression and using dynamics were rated as high. The comments in the report note growing fluidity, expression, technique and transfer of skills to electric guitar. “Heidi has continued to contribute well to ensemble and creative work especially in her efforts for the hui in Wellington. Not only was her preparation great but her performances were a credit to her” (Tutor, 2005). On this occasion, she was part of a trio that played Rush Hour by Keith Grey in which she demonstrated a fluid level of technical expertise on guitar. Although Rush Hour is a challenging, genuine trio with three distinct lines, secure accuracy and independence were evident in Heidi’s playing. She maintained eye contact with the tutor and other members of the group and varied the intensity of her playing according to mood changes. Heidi’s confidence and obvious intent aided a pleasing musical style. Throughout the rest of the larger group’s performance, her responses to the ensemble and cohesion demands of the music were excellent. While her involvement was not overt, Heidi was completely focused and sure.

With regards to the change of instrument, Heidi’s mother noted that her daughter loved learning the guitar and that instrumental learning was the aspect of Heartland she favoured most, “she likes the other parts of the programme but she, the thing she likes the most is learning to play the guitar” (Parent Yr 2 participant, 2005). Considering Heidi’s father also played guitar, there is little surprise about Heidi’s preferred instrument and it would be of interest to know if she continued with guitar and violin after 2005. Heidi demonstrated excellent progress, application and ability to meet challenges in her guitar playing. From an administrative perspective, her progress exemplified the policy of allowing flexible responses to issues about a child’s learning.
Josh was selected for Heartland by his school while in Year Seven. Like Heidi, he was already an established instrumentalist, in this case on trombone. At the end of 2003, his keyboard and theory tutor rated Josh high or highest in all categories, commenting, “Josh has continued to make great progress through keyboard and creative programmes…. He is able to create expressive ideas relating to a theme and then use his instrument to make the idea come alive” (Tutor, 2003). Josh’s self evaluation noted that his goal was to be more fluent in both hands and that he would like to compose Jazz, Rock and Classical pieces. Over the course of 2003, his stated practice times changed from thirty minutes once or twice a week, to most days for about twenty minutes.

Josh chose guitar for 2004 and began learning in Term Two. I observed his performance as part of a guitar group of school Year Four to Eight children after about eight lessons. Although the video data is not definitive, because he was the sole electric guitarist, some analysis was possible. The challenge was to pick and strum chords for melodies, such as Wimoway and Ode to Joy, mostly played in a medley form. While the tempo was slow, Josh showed medium to high command for this stage of learning. The level of accuracy was high, and technically he readily made the transfer from strumming patterns to elementary melodic picking. Josh was dependent on the lead of the tutor for ensemble and cohesion, although his personal tempo appeared consistent. In terms of involvement, Josh appeared to fit in with the others and followed well as a group member. Although his personal focus was high, there was no evidence of Josh taking a lead or a sense of particular musical style. He seemed confident and managed to sustain communication with the tutor.

Later in the year, Josh’s personal circumstances changed and, according to the tutor comments, this caused his commitment to wane for a period. Observing a guitar lesson later in 2004:

Josh showed little voluntary contribution in the music session. I note that in general he seems to have a gentle personality and weighs up carefully before he speaks. Guitar is genuinely a new instrument in 2004. His progress seemed satisfactory rather than accelerated. In most communication he was passive and this was unlike his communication when participating in 2003. He showed he could do the stuff but that the stuff was not about him right now. (Music observation, 2004)

In this observation, the mood indicators moved from mid range state of being relaxed and accepting on the seven point gradation, to being uncertain and resistant by the third ten minute observation cycle. At this point in the lesson, the technical level was challenging, including a blues scale and an expectation of elementary improvisation. Marked variation in Josh’s resilience was recorded and the tone of comment he made about being a beginner suggested he was not enjoying the degree of challenge in the lesson. In approaching a new form of finger-picking, his
personal ensemble on the instrument was halting. Gentle tutor feedback suggested a low level of home practice, which he did not counter.

By the end of 2004, however, Josh showed marked improvement. Josh’s tutor rated him as high or highest in all of the twenty-five report categories except playing with expression and dynamics. The comments reinforce Josh’s interest in composition and improvisation, and include a reference to potential musical style. “Josh’s strumming is showing some improvement and will continue to do so with more experience and freedom with feeling the rhythmic accompaniment of a song” (Tutor, 2004). Observation of the sharing time at the end of 2004 supports this feedback. His role on electric guitar, as one of a large group of intermediate aged children playing a diverse array of instruments, showed Josh to be more assertive and positive in his involvement. His technical proficiencies included more confident rhythm and complexity in the strumming patterns. Video data shows Josh was able to demonstrate higher levels of musical style and cohesion, and that he was more apparently enjoying participation. In addition, playing in a brass duo on trombone he showed positive leadership and equal commitment to the guitar. On that basis, it appears Josh had negotiated the challenge of the two instruments, with clear evidence to suggest he enjoyed both.

I regarded Ainsley as one of the most musically gifted students at the end of 2003 based on her skill in a creative project. Yet, records show that, by the end of 2005 her school and Heartland tutor had withdrawn her from Heartland activity because of an apparent lack of commitment. In response to strong tutor recommendations from 2003, Ainsley was placed in cello lessons for 2004, in the knowledge that she had begun private clarinet tuition the previous year. In the middle of 2004, her tutor rated her cello development as lowest to middle in all categories, though her willingness to share and discuss ideas were rated as high. The tutor comments include:

Ainsley has made fairly slow progress over these last two terms. I feel this has more to do with a lack of application and diligence (and interest?) towards the instrument. She has a good ear and sense of pitch, and observes relevant things within music in our discussions, but so far her technical limitations haven’t really allowed her musicality to emerge, or me to see what shape it takes. (Tutor, 2004)

In the interview, Ainsley was very confident in her dialogue and often helped Helen out as well. She was clearly enjoying being involved in Heartland, although she expressed disappointed that Heartland had gone with her third choice of instrument in assigning her to the cello.

I observed Ainsley in a cello lesson and a classroom situation later in 2004. On both occasions, Ainsley’s mood ratings were mid or high level throughout and there was evidence of in-depth
child generated communication and a high level of response to instructions. I recorded that Ainsley’s responses appeared parallel in the two observations. “She presents gives a nonchalant like persona but in cello task or in drama role commits confidently and securely. Her application in the cello lesson seemed good” (Observation, 2004). However, physiological challenges inherent in playing the cello were obvious. As part of the lesson, the tutor gently but repeatedly reinforced matters of bow control, fingering techniques, articulation (slur/separate bowing), thumb position and techniques for sustaining tone quality. I noted:

Ainsley’s basic skill level on cello still showed her ability to question, learn quickly and deal (within her physical ability) with the multiplicity of technical/co-ordination/cognitive control processes needed to play at all. Notably she openly and clearly talked about the challenges, even if it was not from the perspective of accepting responsibility for these. (Observation, 2004)

Resilience in approaching new concepts was recorded as medium to high over three observation cycles during the course of the lesson. Of importance, the observation notes indicate that Ainsley participated with a warm and personable attitude. The sense of connection she maintained with her tutor was reinforced in an interview comment about creative work. “I think it would be cool if a tutor was taking it [creative project] like our Cello person”(Yr 2 child participant). In the observed lesson, her playing consisted of simple technical challenges in tunes such as *Jingle Bells*. Ainsley worked with good humour in attempting to apply the various techniques outlined by her tutor, including much focus on intonation. Though the new material, such as *Long Long Ago*, was simple, her playing showed her to be a confident reader. However, even given that she was a beginner, Ainsley’s level of personal ensemble and cohesion skills was low. Thinking the standard reflected limited application outside the lessons, I recorded, “Skills being learned – however needs a lesson every day as minimal amount achievable on her own” (Observation, 2004).

Concerning commitment at school, Ainsley stated that she worked at things she liked. She summarised the challenge of learning cello and clarinet as, “I find it, cello, quite hard because I play the clarinet, so it’s different” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). Nonetheless, it seems Ainsley gave the cello a reasonable chance. In a supportive mood, her mother pointed out:

I think it was a week when she had a huge lot of other stuff on, she was really tired. And a couple of weeks later she said, “I’m glad you said to carry on, I will, I like it now”. So it was just that little wavering view and she just needed a little bit of help through that. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

Ainsley’s cello report at the end of 2004 rated a number of categories as high, including aural ability, willingness to talk about musical ideas and creative categories. However, twenty two headings remained ranked at middle or low, including personal practice. The report noted a
general improvement in fluency and that, while progress was slow, it was reasonably steady. Hence, for 2005 the tutor recommended, “her continuance on the instrument is possible but contingent on her own decision to commit more time and energy to practice” (Tutor, 2004). Ainsley showed her general musical confidence again in the creative sharing of 2004. However, it was notable that she had part composed a duo for clarinets rather than cello.

In 2005, Ainsley chose to stay involved in the Heartland ensemble and creative projects but not to learn the cello. However, as Heartland final activities of 2005 approached, her attendance became irregular and the subject of her lack of commitment cropped up in tutor meetings. As her classroom teacher expressed concern about Ainsley’s progress in an Independent Education Plan update, she was withdrawn on the recommendation of the creative project tutor and the school liaison teacher. In my view, Ainsley is a most interesting case. On one hand, it seemed that had Heartland chosen a more accessible instrument, she could readily have accommodated learning two instruments. However, given that she did not engage with the opportunity to be part of the creative work, something she expressed enthusiasm about in 2004, a more general decline in music interest may have been occurring. Once again, to have gained further information about her learning beyond 2005 would have been of interest.

Summary for second instrument in 2004

The case studies suggest that the children experienced mixed success in learning a second instrument. Regardless of Heartland’s intentions, family decisions, the allocation of instruments and logistics all needed to be aligned for success to be likely, regardless of the uniqueness of the opportunity and the child participant’s musical potential. Within that, string playing seemed to create special challenges, which I think is also a matter for further research.87

Within Heartland as a whole, the guitar and keyboard emerged as being a more successful choice of second instrument. Hence, it is clear that Heartland’s policy of attempting to bring a balance of instrumentation in support of wider community goals caused issues for a few of the child participants. As such difficulties were felt keenly by the Heartland staff, a more judicious offer of second instrument learning occurred for 2005. This meant some children participated only in the ensembles and creative projects. Finally, while this section has revealed a range of significant issues, the prevalent response of child participants who learned a second instrument was positive. In two cases the progress was superb, and as I had anticipated, their progress on both instruments appeared to have a positive impact on social confidence, breadth of musicianship and involvement patterns in other parts of Heartland’s programme. In my view this is indicative.

---

87 My experience as the director of the Marama Strings Academy in 2007 revealed that marked improvement required an enormous amounts of family commitment and time hungry tutoring
of the importance of musical volition and readiness for greater challenge in musically gifted children.

The impact of Music Heartland’s music reading expectations

In planning the Heartland programme, I had expected music reading skills would most likely develop through the learning in Keyboard and Theory and other instrumental components. While that was the case, music reading also became evident as a feature of some of the Extension and Maintenance Ensemble work, and individual and small group creative projects, though it was much less evident in the large group creative projects.

Music reading was noted as a learning challenge for some of the seven child participants who had not learned a musical instrument prior to Heartland. For example, “I’ve found it hard reading music now and with the guitar and I’m getting mixed up so my teacher has to write the note in so I can practice it” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). However, most child participants understood the importance of being able to read music, and recognised that the tutors were making an effort to reinforce the skill. In response to what they felt their tutor might want them to practise, one child volunteered, “I could already read the music” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). Her instincts were correct. The principles of Music Heartland did place a clear emphasis on music reading being an integral part of the musical development of musically gifted children:

The programme aims to foster excellence and achievement. The intent will be to train the abilities the children have. It is a given that the language of music is a programme requirement. However, some children may flourish in improvisation and ear playing while others through playing from notation. Ideally children will develop a mix of reading and improvisatory approaches. (Heartland records, 2003).

As noted, this was echoed in tutors’ priorities about the nature of musical giftedness.

In the case studies on instrumental learning, music reading was a particular challenge for Matapo and Maia. Their respective tutor reports note a limited ability to read and slow progress. It also appears the child participants did not feel the need to learn music reading. As one good reader of music indicated, “I can normally hear the song in the music. And that’s how I kind of react to what it is” (Child participant, 2004). Nevertheless, Matapo and Maia’s reading did show some improvement. Matapo’s report for later in 2004 notes greater willingness and, in 2005, Maia’s ratings also improved. As Maia indicates in her self-evaluation, “I learn the piano reading…so if I don’t get the right chord I just do it again” (Yr 2 child participant, 2005).

Significantly, in the repeat interview in 2005, the four child participants no longer signalled reading as a challenge. While they still made comments about learning by ear, the tone of the discussion indicated that all of them were reading and that they accepted it as a tool.
Furthermore, observation of the Extension and Maintenance Ensembles and instrumental sharing times during 2005 revealed that the use of notation had increasing markedly from 2003. Similarly, children in small group creative and ensemble projects had clearly notated their compositions in development, particularly when they presented multiple pieces.

In discussions with tutors, it appeared they regarded notation to be one of many useful tools for a modern day musician, along with the capacity to improvise and be creative. The school liaison teachers had a similar perspective, though one clearly saw notation as a rite of passage towards personal expression and creativity. When talking about the level of challenge and expectation in Heartland, he noted:

> I mean we’ve got incidences of children who are actually making perhaps too large a jump from their skill level to wanting to not learn vocational music but just go straight in composition. And they can do it, they compose things, but they’ve kind of gone past. They don’t want to actually learn all of the notation, so, we have to talk them round into actually learning the mechanics of music as well. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

All the liaison teachers agreed that reading was a challenge for some children. Moreover, they felt the children required ongoing reinforcement of the role reading plays in fostering independent musicianship and vocational activity.

**Summary for music reading**

The 2004 data suggest that a few child participants, in particular those who had had no previous playing experience, found music reading a challenge. As such, reading occasionally emerged as a question mark in the participants’, and their tutors’, perceptions of progress. This is not surprising because playing from notation was a priority in instrumental learning. Furthermore, while the tutors appeared to recognise, and adapt to the children’s potential aural strengths, their reports frequently reflected belief in reciprocity between practical progress and reading fluency. At the same time, if a child participant was making good practical progress, slow progress in music reading skills was not used as a basis for withdrawal from Heartland.

Around two years into the programme, it appears that reading became less of a challenge. Hence, it is reasonable to suggest that after this length of time, the programme, the ongoing music lessons and experiences, and expectations were beginning to blend and complement each other in a way that secured music reading skills. For example, according to her 2005 comments, the advantage of applying reading skills in independent practice was more apparent for Maia. This seems an important finding, considering that the general response of the child, tutor and liaison teacher participants was that reading is a necessary tool for musically gifted children who wish music to be their vocation.
Learning of children who were withdrawn from Music Heartland

This section explores the learning of a sample of child participants who withdrew or were withdrawn from Heartland. Progress in the Year One Ensembles or instrumental learning proved to be the basis for most of the decisions to withdraw children from Heartland. Six of the thirteen child research participants from 2004 were no longer part of the 2005 full programme. In brief, Ainsley effectively withdrew herself, Josh and Matapo moved on to high school, and Tulevai, Michael and Allen were withdrawn in consultation between tutors and me. The learning of Tulevai and Allen is explored in some detail here.

Tulevai was part of the Year 4 – 6 school research group made up of children in their first year of Heartland. He was withdrawn after partaking in a Year One Ensemble. In an interview, he seemed sure of his musical ability, although at times he was a little taken aback by the verbal confidence of other child participants. Hence, I sometimes offered prompts to encourage him to make a contribution. His comments about the Year One Ensemble indicated there was little to challenge him, though he stated that he liked music more from having been involved. He was relaxed in affirming that he had achieved better things in other music settings and was confident when talking about his home involvement and learning music from family members.

From a teaching perspective, the tutor who taught the Year One Ensemble observed of Tulevai:

> The most unfocused, I felt: needed some strict discipline sometimes, good singing voice, happy to sing solo, a bit slower on the melodic and rhythmic front – learned his parts in the end, with some memorisation but I felt was hampered by a lack of focus and distraction of others and by others. Should be encouraged to think about the discipline involved in music – it will have to be his own commitment that instigates the learning of an instrument. A choir could help! (Tutor, 2004)

These comments are difficult to reconcile, as Tulevai made it clear the work did not stimulate him while the tutor suggests he showed little focus in sessions. Similarly, Tulevai was quick to comment that he did not need to practice between sessions while the tutor perceived a lack of personal discipline. At the same time, it is possible the relationship between Tulevai and his tutor was not completely relaxed, as informally the tutor suggested a need to incorporate strict discipline when working with Tulevai.

Nevertheless, video evidence of Tulevai’s ensemble participation tends to support the view of the tutor. In my view, the ensemble played individual harmony lines and melodic work that were challenging for children at this stage. The wider group was focused and performed at a confident level, despite the brief preparation period.
Of importance, in the Individual Education Plan his school entered after he had been withdrawn from Heartland, Tulevai was accorded the highest rating for leadership. The Plan noted, “Now offers to stand up in front of the ‘whole’ school/parents etc on his own and lead the music/singing – gained confidence in his own ability to do so” (IEP, 2004). On this basis, it appears that Heartland made a difference to Tulevai’s confidence and leadership ability. Nonetheless, possibly because the ensemble was the core tutor’s first Heartland teaching role, or because the nature of the ensemble did not suit his learning style, Tulevai did not respond constructively or apply himself in the ensemble. It is also noteworthy that Tulevai’s responses did not reflect the same level of excitement others showed about the possibility of learning an instrument.

Tulevai was withdrawn on the recommendation of his tutor. He was part of the group of fifty-one children who had passed through the group audition process in 2004, but not one of the twenty-three who proceeded to Year One Keyboard and Theory. However, from an administrative perspective, his loss was felt keenly, as the number of children progressing to Keyboard and Theory from his school was small relative to most other schools.

Allen showed complete surety about his musical ability in the group interview, the observed music lesson and during classroom activity. In 2004, he was in Year Seven at school and in his second year with Heartland. Importantly, in the previous year Allen had been withdrawn at the suggestion of a tutor because he lacked concentration and seemed unwilling to cooperate in group situations. However, Allen never really left and, because of his determination to be involved, the tutor advocated for his return later in 2003. I recorded the following while observing a keyboard lesson:

Allen is an enigmatic child. In observations he appears relaxed to the point of nonchalance. The music lesson revealed little evidence of personal practice or taking responsibility for personal practice. Fingering and overall dexterity around the keyboard suggested unfamiliarity and that combined with an absence of established significant reading skills meant his ability to pick up ideas in the lesson was minimal. This has to be a surprise considering the weight Allen and family put on Allen being able to learn keyboard. During the lesson he showed little interest in applying himself or addressing challenges (either of a practical or reading nature). When short patterns were known/explained to him there was greater confidence but the fluency was not retained on a second playing. (Observation, 2004)

When I observed his classroom learning, the class was being taught by a relieving teacher. An open ended house design task was set for the class and Allen’s approach was ‘wait and see’. There appeared to be little drive to complete the task or give it meaning for himself. On the other hand, I think most children would have realised there could be no meaningful application for this work. As I noted:
In the classroom Allen enjoyed banter with his neighbours. He was aware of my observation but his way of passing on to neighbours about why I was there suggested my presence was of little concern. From that I decided his peer communication was relatively typical. In that communication, he did not sustain conversation but more ‘cut and withdrew’ in a teasing manner. More meaningful topics about the task did not seem to engage him and his work seemed at best comparable with classmates. His design [of a boarding house] reflected a child’s view. A house based around an entertainment centre with bedrooms placed anywhere in his words ‘just for fun’. (Observation, 2004)

I remain confused about Allen, as he was the only child participant who was confident about being selected and who perceived he was already good at music before his nomination. In 2004, I leaned towards thinking he was not taking the Heartland opportunity seriously. Yet he showed advanced guitar playing skills, which included glimmerings of improvisational ability. As a supervisor suggested, Heartland may have been too formal to stimulate him. However, after observing Allen as part of a Heartland creative performance during a school concert, I better understood the concerns of his tutors. Despite the rather daunting atmosphere of the Dunedin Town Hall, Allen was mostly oblivious to the significance of his role or his responsibilities to the other performers. This opportunity was a big deal. Yet, while the tutors were making best use of a short rehearsal window, Allen played constantly and appeared to be in his own head space. That is, he did not seem to be listening well, became noticeably out of time and sometimes fudged chords, even though he was very familiar with the song. Pleasingly, his persona sharpened in performance and he performed confidently, apparently taking the 2500 children in the crowd in his stride. For all that, there was still little aural sympathy for the complex changes and moods in the total piece (Journeys) and in the song, his chord changes were sometimes erratic relative to his skills. Thus, even in this high intensity application it could be said that Allen played to suit himself.

After two years in the project, Allen stated that practice made him “pretty bored sometimes”. A core tutor noted continued issues with concentration in other ensemble projects. Hence, toward the end of 2004 he was withdrawn at the request of the tutor and the school liaison teacher. Meeting notes record that this was due to low commitment and that his theoretical understanding was a long way behind other students who were creating music. Ironically the final report from his instrumental tutor states, ‘Allen has a fantastic ear for music, and prior knowledge shows that if he wished to be an entertainer he would have nothing but green lights shining his way. What Allen needs to remember however is that you need to practically put the time and effort in to get results” (2004 Heartland Report).

Allen was another sad loss for Heartland, as I felt numerous flexible options had been offered to him. He was offered a second opportunity in 2003, following a number of requests from him and because of his ability to wow on guitar. He was given his choice of instrument, the keyboard in
2004 and, in effect, a personal choice of tutor: someone who was well known to him and thought highly of him. Yet, perhaps changes were occurring. He attended a self evaluation session even after he had been withdrawn. He noted he was using personal time “more usefully”, that his learning priority (albeit on his first instrument rather than keyboard) was to “learn the chords right”. Furthermore, while his work in class had not changed, in spite of the many hours spent with Heartland, he rated his ability to keep up with his classmate as “mostly” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). This appears to closely parallel the views of his classroom teacher in the Independent Education Plan concerning the changes resulting from Allen’s involvement in Heartland. “Time management was a problem at the beginning. Independence has also improved. Very happy with his progress” (IEP, 2004). On this basis, like his instrumental tutor I believe Allen could have been a “green light performer” had the programme been less formal and more focused on what he appeared to love, playing the guitar. Certainly, a study of his teenage music making and learning, as well as his adult views about participating in Heartland, to which he brought an established skill set, would likely be a source of rich data in future research.

Summary for withdrawn children

It appears that both of the child participants withdrawn from Heartland had identified themselves as having high levels of musical ability. However, they did not, or could not respond to the manner in which Heartland sought to develop that ability. In both cases, a greater enjoyment of music emerged and their schools identified positive social changes linked to their involvement in Heartland. Nonetheless, these factors did not produce music learning behaviours that were conducive with the expectations of Heartland. On this basis, it would appear that aspects of cooperation, social application and commitment to learning were influential in the decisions Heartland tutors and I made about involvement, as we endeavoured to make best use of resources. Furthermore, while Heartland offered quite an inclusive and extended identification process, in those cases where high ability did not coalesce with commitment, attitude and speed of learning, there is clear evidence of a hard barrier being applied to individuals who did not appear to be responding well.

Personal viewpoints about practice effectiveness and application to independent music learning in Music Heartland

This section explores the emphasis placed on practice and personal commitment in decisions made about continuation or withdrawal from Heartland. The majority of child participants had no previous background in personal practice and few parent participants had experienced childhood music learning which might have influenced home practice of child participants.
As noted, child participants in their first year of Heartland discussed practice in the context of the Year One Ensembles. Apart from one child, who was already learning, they showed little conviction to work on ensemble pieces at home or school. Rather, they expressed confidence in their own abilities, stating for example, “No, I just rely on random practice but…I don’t really practice much but I’m really good at anything” (Yr 1 child participant, 2004). However, two noted engaging in specific music activity in their spare time, using skills they had established prior to their involvement in Heartland, or listening for pleasure.

The Year Two and Three Heartland child participants were forthcoming about practice when sharing strategies for learning a new piece. As described, they mostly talked of repetition until they “got it right”. However, there were no comments to suggest the children actually looked forward to, or enjoyed practicing. The mood of the comments is represented by, “go over and over and practise and practisce until you get it” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). In 2005, the group, which was made up of two children from each of Years Two and Three of Heartland, was more detailed and positive about their learning and practice strategies. Reading had become a more prevalent tool, and a greater willingness to seek help from tutors or family was now evident. The following comments are representative of attitudes among the group:

Well like it just sort of slow it down and just play it really quiet slow and then speed it up and then you can get faster and faster and faster until you have got it.

Some of the fast things I learn slow and then you can go over if you make a mistake. (Yr 2 child participants, 2005)

When questioned about improving the style or mood of their playing or practice, the child participants agreed they did this after being prompted by me. Their focus was on technical matters, such as playing the piece faster. In 2005, one child mentioned particular strategies about style, though his comments reflect his age and playing maturity, “You sort of know it’s a waltz cos it sounds like it. But then you’d sort of know how to play it since you’ve already been taught sort of how it sounds. And like you’ve been listening to it” (Yr 3 Child Participant, 2005). On this basis, it is reasonable to suggest that, in general, practice was primarily about repetition with little reference to strategies for developing metacognitive or underlying skills other than initial practice at a slow tempo.

All the participants in the 2005 group spoke of involvement in one to three hours of practice over the course of the weekend, along with other specific music recreational activities. The mood

---

88 Year Two and Three child participants were learning an instrument at the time of the interview and had learned keyboard and theory in 2003.
of their comments suggests engagement, as one of the child participants confidently explained. “In the weekends I play my violin and then I practice my piano. And then sometimes if I get some time off I get to sing to myself in front of the mirror because I don’t really like singing in front of other people” (Yr 2 child participant, 2005).

Again, the parent participants were positively aware of the importance of taking an interest in their children’s musical development, without necessarily having the will or ability to be able to help significantly. At the same time, parents empathised with the challenges the children faced in making progress:

> The other thing that’s hard too is you don’t know how well they are doing. At the start the cello doesn’t sound that nice, they don’t progress very fast. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

> ‘I don’t want to do guitar anymore I want to do ripper rugby’. And I said ‘Well you are going to go’. And this is on the way to the lesson. Then, by the time we pulled up outside, he has forgotten about ripper rugby and he is off. And he comes out and, ‘Oh we did this and that’, you know and yeah he really enjoys it. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

### Summary about practice effectiveness

Personal practice appeared to be a given, as it was the prevalent response from child participants both in self evaluations and interviews. As their skill level increased, their comments began to reflect greater application and more defined strategies for improving their ability to play pieces. From 2004 to 2005, their comments about personal practice became more assertive and suggested a general growth of confidence in independent music learning. In the 2005 interview, the most reserved child participant stated, “Yes, I have more confidence ‘cause I’m not that nervous [anymore]” (Yr 2 child participant, 2005).

At the same time, the sophistication of the practice strategies, including thinking skills or metacognitive strategies, was not high as represented by the comments of the child or parent participants. This is of interest in a project which aimed to meet the needs of musically gifted children. The children’s responses happily reflected how good, or not so good, they felt they were in relation to playing a piece or the instrument. In other words, the data suggest an apparent understanding of whether or not a piece has been mastered or is good, without particular connections being made to wider musical skills or style elements that could be applicable in future learning.

In relation to habitual practice, the comments suggest that the levels of engagement and satisfaction that were gained through personal achievement were higher in 2005 than in 2004. As noted, this appeared to be cumulative, in that, as practice brought greater skill, the children
received greater satisfaction which, in turn, generated a willingness to engage in further practice. Nonetheless, the growth of the independent volition to practise was slow, though, like reading, it was observed as a regular habit among child participants in their second or third year of tuition. In fact, the habit of practice and the need to practise were most evident in the six child participants who had learned other instruments prior to their Heartland involvement. This suggests that diversity of experience may also be a factor in establishing habitual practice. The quality of practice and the application of broader thinking strategies are certainly matters for further research.

**Learning That Occurred in Music Heartland Creative Programmes**

The expectation the children would be able to create music was included in the contract that was negotiated with the Ministry of Education in 2002:

> From the second year students will share the results of the literacy and composition aspects of the programme. They will explore the nature of their own and other instruments in the programme as a basis for developing short pieces. The development of composition skills will be supported by the Music Heartland’s Project’s reference group. Children will be asked to annotate their compositions and recordings will be made using available recording facilities at the Dunedin College of Education. The project directors will coordinate ensemble experiences along with the itinerant teachers. (Heartland records, 2002)

In fact, modules of between fifteen and thirty-five hours replaced the planned fortnightly creative lessons. In initial planning, creative work had been planned purely as an amplification of other forms of instrumental skill development. However, as will be explored in this section, a wider view, building on social and ensemble outcomes, evolved during 2003. Creative development was also encouraged within instrumental learning, and tutors were able to review the children’s progress in two of the twenty-five instrumental learning reporting categories.

Most of the creative activity became project based and was usually taught on an intensive basis. As a result, the projects were taught by Heartland’s core tutors, rather than instrumental tutors. The core tutors were already teaching the ensembles and Year One Keyboard and Theory. During 2003 the tutors’ flexibility, commitment, broad musical skills and determination to ensure the best possible provision for the children made them a cornerstone of Heartland. They were producing a dynamic social effect across the programme and I realised that they were largely responsible for the fledgling sense of community that was emerging. Furthermore, as each element of Heartland unfolded and the children began to explore new territory, I came to realise through my work in meetings, lesson observations and informal discussions about individual children just how important it would be for tutors to know the children well in support of the
serious intent to foster creativity. With this in mind, the intended individual creative activity was changed to group creative work, as a stimulus and catalyst for individual development. As a result, in developing a framework for the creative work, emphasis was placed on collaboration and sharing. Our expectations were to have the children:

- Show growing awareness of sound quality, effect and mood.
- Show increased understanding of musical elements and their interaction in music through practice and discussion.
- Show ability to compose for classroom, environmental, conventional instruments, voice.
- Compose 1 –2 pieces individually or collaboratively of up to 2 minutes duration.
- Participate in the workshopping and reflection about their own and other music (students/other stimuli). (Heartland records, 2003).

I considered the creative projects had the greatest potential to encourage and evaluate children’s wider achievement, as negotiated with the Ministry of Education. In the contract with the Ministry this is described as, “To identify ways in which intensive music learning can contribute to the children’s social, cognitive and emotional growth” (Heartland records, 2002). Accordingly, this objective was included in the common learning aims of the creative projects:

- Learning process to respond to interests and diversity of the children
- Learning process to build on commitment and self assessment
- Learning process can respond to school initiatives in other curricula
- Learning process to accelerate independent work and give opportunity for application
- Offer a clear model of action and reflection89. (Heartland records, 2003)

Because I anticipated that creative work would lead to cross curricula investigation and application, the planning and delivery of the creative modules was a likely catalyst for involving school liaison teachers and classroom teachers. Accordingly, the schools were advised:

The project’s intention has been for a cross curricula project completed with guidance from classroom teachers and tutors. Thus a mix of the following applications is possible in Term 4 with students possibly involved in different aspects and levels.

- Continued creative music making with existing larger group.
- Specially creative for the top students…perhaps cross school grouping.

89 Individual Education Plans were maintained only in those schools attended by child participants involved in this research.
• Workshop for children who are playing instruments other than keyboard…again cross school.

• Choral workshop…again cross school grouping.

• Additional tutor expertise to give input to student’s practical or creative work.

• Part payment for release of classroom teachers to assist the development and execution of the cross curricula project.

• Continued keyboard tuition. (Heartland records, 2003)

In reality, classroom or school liaison teachers became involved in Heartland through theme development, school logistical organisation and the occasional informal session support. While many projects were cross curricula in nature and some evolved on a school wide basis, my expectation that the creative work would be a catalyst for classroom teacher professional development was not realised, except from acting as an observer to the performances and teaching. While shared engagement was a key element to the success of the project in schools, I felt it would have been inappropriate to reduce teaching hours to include liaison or classroom teachers as co-facilitators. Similarly, the management group felt a change in staffing patterns would not have been in the interests of the children participating in the project. Moreover, it would have been unreasonable to request the release of further teachers given the significant resources schools were already committing.

The evolution of the creative projects was a complex process, and the work produced a diverse range of outputs. In 2005, this “wide diversity of in-depth projects ranging across music and cross curricula applications” was summarised in the report to the Ministry of Education as including the following:

• Story based.
• Technology (imovie, Sibelius, Garage Band).
• Culturally based.
• Improvisation.
• Song writing.
• Rock music projects.
• Thematically based, e.g. Antarctica.
• Composition for specific instrument(s).

As the framework for creative projects:
• Children were always aiming for a performance of their work (sharing times) and independent work was a given. This real life context had significant meaning for the children and their families.
• Children understood that the creative work was a celebration of the practical skills and musical knowledge developed in the project or through learning from other providers.

• The creative work encapsulated a wide range of musical styles and reflected potential strength and interest.

• The learning was collaborative, in most cases brought children from several schools together and sometimes spanned Yr 4 – 8 or Yr 6 – 9th class levels. (Heartland records, 2005)

Almost by accident, the sharing of the creative music projects became both the conclusion and the highlight of each year’s programme. During early planning, it became clear that significant investment would be needed to fulfil the wider project goals and the tutor’s ambitious intentions. Accordingly, the creative projects received approximately a third of the annual teaching budget, significant liaison and organisational help, instruments and equipment, and logistical support, such as the transport of children.

Importantly, attitudes relating to being included in the children’s creative projects changed between 2003 and 2004, almost in parallel with the decisions about which children would be invited to learn a second instrument. Following the first creative project sharing time in 2003, the tutors and I agreed that children who had not gained skills by going on to Keyboard and Theory found it difficult to contribute at the same level as their peers who had those experiences. Accordingly, in 2004 and 2005 only those enrolled in Keyboard and Theory or other instrumental components were involved in the creative projects. Further, reflecting the significance creative work had achieved in the first two years, in 2005 the four Extension and Maintenance Ensemble projects became partially focused on creative work, as well as planned to be stimulating for the highest achieving children. In that regard, it is apparent that the Heartland community had become more focused on high achievement with greater expectations of creative product. This intensity continued into the final sharing time of 2005. During its early planning I had been surprised how definite the liaison teachers and tutors were about having the final sharing time presented as a public showcase. To facilitate this desire to go public, some of the creative project works were shared on an in school basis, rather than at the final sharing time of Heartland.

The following table details the music learning, including creative music activity, of the child research participants as part of Heartland’s 2003-2005 programme.

---

90 Yr 6 – 9 refers to the age group typically spanning eleven to thirteen years of age.
Table 3: Music Learning of Child Participants Across the Heartland Programme 2003 to 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Creative Projects</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Number which performed</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>2003 Entry to Heartland</th>
<th>2004 Entry to Heartland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Michael</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serena</td>
<td>Marango</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td>Anna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Ainsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maia</td>
<td>Smantha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Li Xiang</td>
<td>Tulevai</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**2003**

Activity within Keyboard & Theory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

End of Year Creative Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>20-34</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**2004**

Activity within Keyboard & Theory, Instrumental Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

End of Year Creative Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>20-30</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Project developed in conjunction with Southern Symphonia for 2004 schools concerts.

|                   | 1  | 1  | 40 | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  |
|-------------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|

School Yr 9 – 10 Holiday Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>12</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**2005**

Activity within Keyboard & Theory, Instrumental Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>NA</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

End of Year Creative Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>20-30</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Extension and Maintenance Ensembles (14 to 20 hours) in three host schools. Three of three

|                   | 3  | 3  | 14 -20 | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  | ✓  |
|-------------------|----|----|--------|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
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### The following table lists the projects involving child research participants, the four case studies are identified as Selected Projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of Creative Projects</th>
<th>Number of Projects</th>
<th>Number which performed</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>2003 Entry to Heartland</th>
<th>2004 Entry to Heartland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Michael</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serena</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Marape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heidi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Josh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ainsley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Allen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Smartha</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tulevai</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Li Xiang</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>performed their music.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifted and Talented Hui, Wellington (Forty hours).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Yr 9 – 10 Holiday Projects</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
While the number of projects remained approximately the same each year, the number of schools hosting projects reduced. This reflected an imbalance in the number of children emerging across the eight schools. Creative projects were typically hosted in the school that the largest number of Heartland children attended.

- The creative projects dovetailed with elements common to all Heartland ensemble work, including performance of work being a goal. In one case in 2003, this was not realised.
- In addition to the available staffing resources, the hours allocated for particular projects reflected the number of children involved, the relative complexity of the project, and performance expectations, Involvement in the Year Nine projects was by way of invitation for the Heartland students who had moved onto high school. As noted, these students were no longer receiving tuition from Heartland tutors.

In all, twenty-two creative projects were initiated. Some of these involved multiple pieces to be performed to peers, school communities, the wider public and/or Heartland sharing times. Each of the creative projects produced a potentially rich data source for this study. The difficult task of choosing which projects to include as case studies for analysis in this report was based on:

- Inclusion of one or more child research participants;
- Inclusion of a diversity of music types and source stimulations and chronological representation;
- Inclusion of a variety of musical ideas relative to the experience of the composers;
- Confident performance by the composers relative to their experience;
- Those that could inform about reciprocity of the development of creativity and broader musicianship.

The following table lists the projects involving child research participants, the four case studies are identified as Selected Projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Selected for analysis</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Nature</th>
<th>Research Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selected Project</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>End of Year</td>
<td>Environmental theme using trash instruments. an imovie project based on <em>The Last Time</em></td>
<td>Helen, Ainsley, Heidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>End of Year</td>
<td>Lord of the Rings music</td>
<td>Josh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>End of Year</td>
<td>Song and improvisation on <em>Albatross</em> Rock</td>
<td>Matapo, Anna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Project</td>
<td>Mid 2004</td>
<td>Sinfonia Project</td>
<td>NZ story <em>Journeys</em></td>
<td>Josh, Helen, Ainsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>End of Year</td>
<td>Music story based on <em>Jack in the Bean Stalk</em></td>
<td>Heidi, Serena,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>End of Year</td>
<td>Music story based on <em>The Sneetch Who Stole Christmas</em></td>
<td>Maia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>End of Year</td>
<td>Individual improvisation pieces</td>
<td>Josh, Helen, Ainsley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing Time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mid 2005</td>
<td>Extension and</td>
<td>Guitar piece and an ensemble created by the players for two violins, flute and keyboard.</td>
<td>Anna, Heidi, Li Xiang</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintenance Ensemble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected Project</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Ministry of Education Hui</td>
<td>Song and improvisation on <em>Where we belong.</em></td>
<td>Heidi, Li Xiang, Anna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>End of Year</td>
<td>Music story based on <em>Three Little Pigs</em></td>
<td>Jo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>End of Year</td>
<td>Pasifika story of <em>Tuhuvi</em></td>
<td>Maia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of the four case studies utilises elements of musical achievement already applied to the analysis of the child participant’s practical learning (See Appendix 11). I was audience to all of the performances, but the analysis was completed with the aid of recordings. Furthermore, while the contribution of individual child research participants is considered, because the case studies are all group projects the analysis also reflects the musical learning and creative application exemplified from all Heartland children, whether or not they were participants in the research.

**Creative projects example one: Analysis of learning in Trash Band**

This piece was created in 2003 around the theme of using trash, in the form of recyclable materials, as a source of instruments. The main stimulation for the piece was the British enviro-percussion band Stomp, along with a technology investigation of waste. The project involved thirteen children between school Years Four to Six, and from two Heartland schools.

The piece begins with a single rhythm played on recycling bins and then builds in intensity through the layering of several polyrhythms played on other sound sources, such as large coke bottles. The musical characteristics of the piece can be summarised as follows:
• It contains a wide diversity of base rhythms, some of which are intricate and feature triples across duple time.
• The established base rhythms become more complex.
• A sense of ownership in the rhythms created and played by each participant.
• Numerous scoring devices, including long periods of rest for the rhythmic motifs, changing combinations of motifs and dynamic variation for instruments as well as the ensemble.
• Inventiveness in how the instruments are used giving variation of texture and mood intensity.
• The use of layering and unbundling of rhythms and hocketing to give diverse textures and subtle tone colour shifts.
• Using a form which reflects application of knowledge about overarching balance and mood shifts.

Within the performance, the children provide much of the leadership. They respond sensitively to small variations, including tempo changes, and they demonstrate an excellent sense of ensemble and sub-groups’ responsibility for sustaining rhythmic consistency. The involvement of the child research participants is clearly evident. They are alert in providing leadership within their components of the music. They show a high level of accuracy and sensitivity to the possibilities of the enviro-instruments. In terms of challenge and technical skill, the hocket rhythm motives are complex and some require a high level of dexterity, particularly in the case of Ainsley and Helen.

Based on the characteristics listed above, I consider the cohesion of musical ideas to be superior throughout the piece, particularly given the Year Four to Six age level. There was excellent balance of parts throughout and regular variation of texture. While there is some direction of the performance, the child research participants are clearly alert to approaching changes and responded confidently to those. Reading is not evident in the performance, as the children had memorised the elements and structure of the four and a half minute piece. Independence is evident in the range of rhythms and instrument variation, as the music reflects extensive exploration but also commitment to ensemble consolidation. In my view, originality is demonstrated in relation to the use of tone colour, some of the polyrhythms, the rhythmic complexity and texture of the piece, and its synergy with the environmental theme. In support of the estimation of this music’s integrity, following the presentation of a recording at the Gifted and Talented Hui (2004) in Wellington, comments from the audience left me in no doubt that it was considered a ‘wow’ example of children’s work.

Creative projects example two: Analysis of learning in Journeys
This piece was created specifically for the Southern Sinfonia’s 2004 school’s concert programme. Heartland records show the preparation and the rehearsal periods were extensive (36 hours),
partly due to a later than planned performance date and the complexity of the final piece. Furthermore, the performance goal was intense as *Journeys* was to be shared at two concerts, each attended by approximately 2500 children. Hence, it was essential that the child composers were confident performers.

The music represents a potted history of Aotearoa New Zealand, including traditional tikanga, music of the new settlers, the integration of settlers, and ends with a song in a popular style about living in New Zealand. New cultures are shown to arrive and integrate into New Zealand society using snippets of music traceable to the country of origin. The music also includes historical features, with early sections being atmospheric and chant-like, while later sections are more familiar to the ear. The following music features are evident over the eight minute duration:

- Music is utilised to support story threads and images typically associated with that story. There are numerous short fragments suggesting activity and/or culture and the music reflects assimilation and application of diverse ideas as part of the creative process.

- Drone and pedal points are used as sustaining and linking devices typically on the fifth of the repetative diatonic or pentatonic scale. Approximately two thirds through the piece, the pedal becomes the drone of the familiar bagpipes as a harmony for a reel.

- The range of instruments includes three electronic keyboards, bass and alto xylophones, flute, a variety of non tuned percussion, electric guitar and voice. A conch trumpet provides a call early in the piece and a later hornpipe section rhythm is played from backstage by the orchestral drummer. Most of the composition was carried out by the use of electronic keyboards and percussion that remain an important tone colour in the finished product. The research participants, Josh, Ainsley and Helen, played instruments other than their main instrument in the composition.

- The total composition of some twelve sections reflects careful consideration of instrumentation. All but guitar are used for melodic figures and all but voice are called on in an accompaniment role. There are unusual pairings of tone colours, for example, albeit short question and answer figures between clave and electronic keyboard.

- For the most part, sections dovetail through a rhythm being carried over, restatement of rhythmic or melodic material, or sometimes a sustained drone. However, some transitions seem more awkward with moments of insecurity about where next, though I consider this was perhaps more of a performance matter. For all that, thematic ideas within each section feel congruent even though ideas of multiple composers have been threaded together.

- As to musical content, the sections frequently use music idea intended to evoke image, time or place. Typically, there is opportunity for longer sections to have evolved from these components. However, the composition moves on purposefully and this sometimes leaves an unresolved feeling, perhaps deliberately. Some sections feature an individual’s work (for example, the opening melody played by Josh). Other sections reflect creative work and arrangement across a range of combinations from short duos to well developed whole group pieces. The combination of *Shortnin’ Bread* and *In Excelsis Deo* is a good example of arrangement capability.

- Harmony devices include already noted elements such as counterpoint between *Shortnin’ Bread* and *In Excelsis Deo* as well as the use of drones throughout the piece. In addition, there are several chored melodies, the most distinctive being the hornpipe and the final
song. In this, the Bb minor and F major alternating chords provide the basis for a straightforward but effective resolution for the composition. Near the beginning of the composition, several short melodic sections are characterised with more dissonant if passing harmonies. The contrapuntal pentatonic section seems a clear representation of new Asian settlers.

Technically, the range of devices used across all music elements shows an ability to manipulate sound effectively and awareness of the effects of differing melodic structures, intervallic construction, simple harmonic devices, motion and diverse textural effects. Melody is the key composition driver for this piece. While not demanding in a strict technical sense, the individual melodies vary in mood, are often not predictable, are fresh in character and utilise a variety of structures. Most are harmonised by two or three chords or a drone, and there is effective use of dissonance in keyboard and tuned percussion parts, particularly in the more atmospheric sections. In consideration of accuracy, while sections work well as units bridging passages would have benefited from more decisiveness and perhaps the use of devices such as pause, precursors of new material or tags using previous material. Many portions of the music had been recorded in conventional notation but not as a whole. Clearly, memory and direction from fellow performers or the tutor are aids in the performances.

The level of involvement of the child research participants varies markedly. Allen plays guitar in the concluding section but does not contribute noticeably until that point. Ainsley and Helen contribute on keyboard, vocal lines, as well as keyboard accompaniment in the flute hornpipe. They show sensitivity to each other in performance suggesting positive collaboration in earlier creative processes. Josh also provides accompaniment figures and melodies, notably the atmospheric melody at the beginning of the piece. While Allen’s contribution seems to focus on the concluding song, the other three child participants had each created at least one significant section of the piece. These three also showed maturity and engagement within the performance and while small ensemble glitches are evident, the musical journey is defined and evocative in both performances. As noted, the extent of challenge varies across the individual sections of the total piece. Yes, the music reflects the modest instrumental capability of the research participants. However, in relation to tone colour, balance of voices, mood and texture contrasts, and song character, a surprisingly high level of musical innovation and sophistication are evident.

With respect to cohesion, it is evident that much consideration had been given to the emotional dimension of the music from its atmospheric beginnings to the work song at the conclusion. The diversity of blends, contrasts, use of restatement and consistency shows the research participants successfully applying advanced knowledge of music elements in this creative context. Despite some sections appearing to be better rehearsed than others, the overall flow of the music and the
convincing nature of the total structure show superior understanding of workable cohesive devices relative to the children’s age and experience. The level of independence evident in the piece is more difficult to define. No doubt, guidance and direct facilitation was critical to the music’s final structure and in that, decisions about those components that would undergo greater or lesser development. However, in observing the performances one is aware of the variation of character that research participants contribute to thematic sections, and for the most part their engagement is obvious when presenting personal components or supporting others.

The above is strong evidence for regarding Journeys as a testament of quality in the children’s response to the demands of composition, in that they explored, reworked, shared, reflected and consolidate initial thematic ideas. Sometimes derivative music icons are utilised and there are structural issues. Nonetheless, in my view the music reveals significant originality as well as conviction about the worth of personal creative product.

**Creative projects example three: Analysis of learning in Where We Belong**

In 2005, Music Heartland received funding to send a group of children to the Ministry of Education hui for Gifted and Talented Education (Wellington, 2005). The group, including child research participants Anna, Li Xiang and Heidi, presented approximately thirty minutes of music, including arrangements, performance on instruments they had learned in Heartland and an original song, Where We Belong. Again, because of the prominence of the occasion, Heartland records show that the tutors took much care in selecting which children would perform in Wellington. Four of the eight schools were represented, with preparation based on half or full days of teaching spread over a term.

The following music features are evident in Where We Belong:

- It offers distinct and memorable melodic ideas that give genuine variation between verse and chorus. The verse is wide ranging and creates a poignant mood through use of a major sixth, uses an effective mix of stepped and wider intervals and repetition to create overall listener engagement. The flowing rhythms are appropriate to the lyrics. In the chorus, the melody becomes the top line of a stepped and repeated descending harmonic sequence. The single lyric of the chorus punctuates the theme Where We Belong, leaving the listener free to enjoy the harmony and progression. As a soft rock ballad, while one might have expected a wider contour in the chorus, nevertheless it fulfils the role of giving emotional contrast and more intensity than the melody of the verse.
Table 5: Structure, voicing and chord progression of *Where We Belong* (Duration: Five minutes)

| Structure, voicing and chord progression of *Where We Belong* (Duration: Five minutes) |
|---------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Introduction | Verse | Verse | Chorus | Improvisation |
| Picked guitar which introduces the chord progression for the verse. | G  G/F#  Em  G/D  C  D7 | Verse | solo singer over established chord progression | Solo singer takes top line as described with other voices harmonising on colouring notes of repeated chord progression. | Verse | A middle eight like section in which there is improvisation on piano, guitar and conga drums. These are developed around the chord progression established to the verse. | Chorus | Verse | Verse | Chorus | Verse | Verse | Chorus |

- Because of the balance of verse and chorus and the use of standard four bar phrases, the structure works effectively as a popular song. The transitions between verse and chorus emphasise the major minor chord shifts.

- Instrumentation consists of two keyboards, three guitars, conga drums, flute, and solo and harmony voice parts. This is a difficult combination to balance, even with a sound system and the commitment of the performers is well demonstrated through their responsiveness to changing dynamic requirements where sections feature stronger or weaker solo instruments.

- The melodic and improvisational material is memorable. In my view, little concession needs to be given for the youth of the creators and performers. As noted, the verse melody is shaped in a balanced and appealing manner and as the chorus begins, there is more urgency in the accompaniment as the vocal harmony descends with the chord sequence. Each improvisation appears confidently as players assume the mantle of soloist. The melodic improvisations do not stray far from the chordal notes but they appear free and pleasingly shaped. When the congas intensify the mood, the rest of the band lifts in intensity in response to the challenge.

Technically, all of the performers, including the child research participants, contributed to the development of the song utilising an instrument learned in Heartland. The application of the chordal structure within improvisatory sections, the integrity of melodic sections in shape and completeness, all reflect the confidence of these performers to think creatively and express ideas using their instrumental skills (12 – 30 hours of tuition). With regards to accuracy and musical style the performers show confidence about the song and its improvisational structure and reflect an appreciation of the contrast between the melody and the chorus. The song applies successful strategies to vary the mood and instrumentation. These characteristics of accuracy are no better demonstrated than in the picked guitar opening which sets a contemplative mood prior to the
more compelling rhythms introduced as the verse kicks in. At the end of the song, the use of an Em chord as the final harmony serves as a poignant musical question mark.

With respect to the challenge and cohesion of performance, the standard is high throughout the band and the improvisations reflect appropriate instrumental technique and ensemble awareness. Dynamic sensitivity is good, except in one section where the guitar improvisation dominates. In my view, the ability to blend skills and apply oneself to creative processes blossoms in this music, and a high level of individual creativity and inventiveness was evident among the research participants. Heidi and Anna feature in the opening of the song, with Heidi also playing an improvised section. While not displaying technical acrobatics, her touch, sense of phrase and harmonic security are all strong features. Anna, also playing guitar, is less evident as a performer in the piece. However, her attention to detail and keen support of the other performers around her are noticeable. Li Xiang sings and plays keyboard. Her vocal harmonisation through the chorus is a feature of its success, and her chordal accompaniment throughout the song shows real confidence, both reflecting a willingness to lead and support within the ensemble.

Reading was evident in the work of several performers. The flute improvisation is notated, and Li Xiang is playing from music, though she seldom glances at it. Independence is well evidenced in the song. For example, the performers reveal interpersonal and individual strengths in their playing along with subtle variations as different roles are called upon. In my view, these reflect hard work, children who are thinking musically and a confidence to enjoy their creative instincts. Involvement was exemplified in Where We Belong as possibly the most mature composition of the four pieces presented in these findings. Throughout the performance, the group’s senses of collaboration and community appear at a high level indeed.

When I observed a rehearsal of the material approximately a month before the hui performance, a freedom and quality amongst the child research participants was very evident in their discussions. Li Xiang, the youngest of the group, was clear and firm in what she had to say while Anna practised quietly and acted as a minder for others apparently less focused at that moment. Heidi independently worked through the chord sequence and snippets of her improvisation in a typically committed manner. Hence, it is fair to say that the tightly collaborative responses in performance derived from the qualities of the creative process that lead to the song.

Significantly, the tutors and I were fully aware that the performers were selected from a group who had excelled in ongoing selection and review processes for up to three years. However, in the frame of gifted and talented provision, the credibility of what they achieved during the performance meant the investment felt justified. That sense was heightened by the response to
these eleven children from diverse personal backgrounds, as the audience’s expression changed from conference mode to smiling eyes and nodding approval and then acclamation following the last murmurs of Where We Belong.

**Creative projects example four: Analysis of learning in Three Little Pigs**

*Three Little Pigs* is included as an example of an integrated literature based creative project and, as the last to be developed in Heartland, completes this chronological overview. At least one literature based project featured in each year of the creative music sharing, including *Where the Wild Things Are*, *The Sneetch that Stole Christmas* and *Jack in the Beanstalk*. The piece was created by school age Year Four to Six children in their first or second year of Heartland.

*Three Little Pigs* is a humorous adaptation of the traditional story told through the voice of Mr Wolf. Presentation elements are integral with the music as the three narrators, the flutist and electronic keyboard players become singers, and the tuned and untuned percussion players double on electronic keyboard and sing choruses. The piece is made up of four music sections that alternate in response to the storyline. They link through musical bridges based on an harmonic or rhythmic sequence. The final product resembles an oratorio as performers come forward to speak and take on different roles within the ten minute musical journey.

**Table 6: Description of the four musical components in Three Little Pigs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of the four musical components in <em>Three Little Pigs</em></th>
<th>Non tuned percussion effects</th>
<th>Song on a blues sequence</th>
<th>Tuned percussion accompaniment sequence</th>
<th>Drama chord sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cymbals, woodblocks, claves are used both to support melodic work (independent rhythms, sound effects) and to punctuate signposts in the narration. A number of the interjections are musically startling in their effect while some are more predictable sound effects. A diversity of effects are heard throughout the piece.</td>
<td>A song is created in a blues style, though with a twist in the typical twelve bar chord sequence (In bars: C chord x 4, F chord x 2, G chord x 1, F chord x 1, C chord x 2). The C tonality and three chord harmonic basis is heard with variations across the whole story. The clearly shaped melody consists of six bars of a rising repeated sequence with a four bar tail that resolves. The key is C major with the flattened seventh and minor third used consistently within the melody over the chord sequence. Each statement of the song is followed by a flute improvisation. It is freer.</td>
<td>An accompanying blues sequence is played on xylophone while the narration continues. It is partially a linking device but like unturned percussion emphasises textual signposts. The pattern is consistently played on three alto xylophones. The sequence of root position chords often with the third omitted is: C chord x 2, F chord x 2, C chord x 2, G chord x 2, F chord x 2, C chord x 2.</td>
<td>A C minor chord emphasises the infamous huff and puff drama points of the story. The three vocalists (different than for the blues style song) have developed a repeated ascending phrase sequence using dotted rhythms. The final phrase descends in minimis to round and close.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Description of the four musical components in *Three Little Pigs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non tuned percussion effects</th>
<th>Song on a blues sequence</th>
<th>Tuned percussion accompaniment sequence</th>
<th>Drama chord sequence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>than the song melody and more fluidly incorporates blues chromatic alteration on the 7th and 3rd of the scale. The initial statement is a descending natural blues C scale but the subsequent phrases are melodically more independent. There is a change in the chord sequence in the improvisation (In bars: C chord x 4, F chord x 4, G chord x 4, C chord x 1, F chord x 1, C chord).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Three Little Pigs* shows a clear appreciation of musical style as the four musical components unfold. Although the structure of each component is brief, melodic and improvisatory their content reflects early understanding of blues scales and chromatic alteration. Furthermore, keyboard and percussion work shows confident dexterity. While technique reflects the children’s early learning maturity, their understanding of balance, use of repetition, consistency of melodic and rhythmic patterns and the overall inventiveness is high. In terms of cohesion, a genuine rapport is achieved amongst the performers in spite of the length of the piece and children needing to meet the tutor’s expectation of applying early instrumental skills. This is particularly successful in the case of the flute improvisation.

The musical structure is well defined which shows the influence of the tutor. However, the audience respond to the manner in which the children met the challenge of how to convey humour in music. Similarly, sinister moods are successfully characterised by use of a minor triad coupled with a rather emphatic melody. While in general the melodies of the piece can be described as derivative, they are clearly innovative relative to the experience of the children and show useful application of understandings about melodic structure, climax and denouement. A number of the individual components in the music had been notated and notation is sometimes utilised within the performance.

The general confidence of the performers and ease with which they changed roles reflected early independence. In this, a high level of involvement is evidenced by children’s energy and the obvious ownership and enjoyment of the music theatre they are presenting. Jo, the single
research child participant, contributes through singing and narration and undertakes leadership responsibility. Finally, much collaborative child exploration and development is apparent. For example, variations across the three melodic components constructed on similar harmonic ideas show the effect of different composers working to guidelines then merging material toward a larger group product.

**Summary from analysis of four creative projects in Music Heartland**

From analysis of the four pieces, the following summarises the findings about learning in Heartland’s creative projects:

- Relative to the age and experience of the child participants, the music of each project reviewed shows originality in children’s approaches to sound for all music elements apart from harmony. The compositions reflect uniqueness in the application of musical devices and ways to achieve compositional coherence.

- At an aesthetic level, the results are musically satisfying, show diverse moods, touches of brilliance and evocative meaning and the music appear to create lasting impressions for peer, parent and teacher research participants.

- The evaluation criteria reveal an overall ability to meet challenge, to be inventive, appreciate structural devices and demonstrate high levels of independence in creative activity.

- The group creative processes emerged as a workable and successful strategy, which also appear to have heightened the sense of community amongst children in Heartland. Coupled with the performance expectation, the projects emerge as a tool for encouraging and securing development of wider musical understandings, theory application, confidence to create and an acceptance of a creative aptitude among the child participants;

- Performance goals for creative work can be seen to encourage growth in ensemble playing skills and give additional relevance to personal instrumental skills. The data suggest cumulative learning results from instrumental, ensemble and creative components, particularly in the case of Year Two and Three Heartland children.

- For each of the case studies, I observed the specialist teachers as having a dramatic effect in encouraging breadth and quality in composition, as well as on the children’s confidence to create.

**Significance of programme components in Music Heartland for participants**

This section discusses perceptions of the learning effectiveness and the social ramifications of the Heartland programme. Interview commentary from the four categories of participant (parents, children, tutors and liaison teachers) is used to inform Heartland records of child participant progress, self evaluations and observations. With respect to differences in the views of the different categories of participant, it must be noted that their viewpoints were often from a second or third hand perspective. For example, as lessons were held during the school day, parents rarely observed the teaching sessions. Yet, they appeared comfortable offering viewpoints about their child’s learning or his/her enjoyment of programme components.
Perceptions about the general effectiveness and balance of Music Heartland’s programme components

Heartland’s records show broad approval of the nature and breadth of the programme components. For example, my suggestion to curtail instrumental teaching to simplify the programme and to improve administration was rejected by both the school liaison teachers and the tutors. “Support for all components of the programme was unanimous, in spite of logistical challenges for schools and project” (Heartland, 2004).

While child participants had individual suggestions about programme components, an emphatic tone of approval is reflected in comments such as, “I like all of it” (Yr 2 child participants, 2004). The following comment by a parent appears to sum up participants’ views about the multi-stranded programme:

Not having experienced anything like it before, I think to my mind it seemed quite a good balance of what could be possible. Especially when they are only children and you don’t want to freak them out with giving them too much, too quickly. What was offered was good. It was a good balance. (Parent Yr 3 child participant, 2005)

Furthermore, the value of simply being involved was noted by one parent, “she loves the fact that she’s learning” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

Comments from tutors and liaison teachers similarly reflect wide ranging support as well as valuing each component of the programme. For example:

I think that’s a really broad approach…that’s good. (Tutor, 2004)

I think they’re all very important, I think it’s really important that kids get a taste of all of those. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

The latter comment is significant in light of the amount of time the children were involved and the complexity of timetabling the work in each school. For example, a second year child might have been involved in an intensive for a Maintenance and Extension Ensemble (four to six weeks) at the same time as having a thirty minute instrumental lesson each week.

However, there were unresolved issues particularly among tutors about the modular nature of the programme:

For example [after] the creative or ensemble activity earlier in the year, some students didn’t do much for another term. You work with a group of students and you get them motivated and then they don’t get the continuity through the whole year or sometimes not even through terms. It’s a bit stopping and starting for some students. And we’ve tried to do so much stuff, like ensemble, creative and instrumental identification and everything in blocks. (Tutor, 2004)
This issue was heightened by several factors, including the tutors’ part time employment, inconsistent weekly schedules, Heartland’s budget constraints that meant spreading the programme thinly, and the necessity to respond to school timetables. Tutors noted they found the whole programme very intense and that they sometimes coped by delaying administrative duties like form filling (Tutor, 2004). However, in talking about how they coped they gave no impression of demeaning what Heartland was trying to achieve. As one tutor commented, “I think sometimes it’s been incredibly full-on with the amount of resource, you know, time and money. And it’s never an ideal world. But it’s just, I don’t know, we’re always sort of, yeah, we’re not really a step ahead of ourselves” (Tutor, 2004).

**Perceptions about the effects of ensembles and modules in Music Heartland**

Perceptions of the group work were readily available from the comments the child participants made about what they would have liked in Heartland’s programme. For example:

I think there should be more in groups cause its fun… I want more.

The lessons are fun, but it was really fun being in groups the last year” (Yr 2 child participants, 2004).

Similarly, commenting about the components Heartland offered one parent participant commented, “He was the opposite from Heidi, he particularly enjoyed the creative and ensemble” (Parent Yr2 child participant). Liaison teachers reinforced the significance of ensemble and creative group work by highlighting children’s personal confidence and motivation as outcomes:

I’d agree that the pieces that strike me, even though our children are a bit younger, are the creative bits definitely. But the other piece is the ensemble pieces. And that’s exactly the point that you’re making Jane. It’s when they play together they suddenly feel it’s magical because were all doing something together, ‘I’m part of something bigger’. They can perform for others as a grouping and people go ‘ooh’ and ‘aah’ and they don’t feel the intense stress on themselves. They feel very much part of that setting. And I think when I look at music at our school the ensembles have been a key drive. It really gets kids excited and enthusiastic about it, performing music. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

They also emphasised an emerging appreciation for ensemble work and performance of the children’s products in their schools. Their comments recognised musical growth, improved application and child ownership of learning. For example:

I think the ensemble was a bit of an eye opener for our students who weren’t in Heartland and our teachers. When they had a sharing day and they all got up there, even children though people were slightly doubtful, you know, for maybe behavioural things that happened in class, or,…somebody that basically had difficulty focusing for more than two or three minutes on any task, was able to be one hundred percent for like thirty
five minutes. Absolutely focused on what he was doing. But not only focused on what he was doing he was actually listening to what everyone else was doing and altering what he was doing. He was watching. I think it was Sue that was conducting and his eyes were just pinned on her the whole time. And people that afterwards were coming up and saying you know they were absolutely astounded that he could be so focused! (Liaison teacher, 2004)

The tutors all agreed the ensembles were a positive feature in music learning for the Heartland children:

I think it’s been really, really good, thinking of the leeway it’s given us in the ensemble programme. Like, there’s a range of resources, we can put in different skills in rhythm and singing within, because its two hours generally…there’s a real range that we can tailor to the children which is really useful. (Tutor, 2004).

Their comments indicated that ensembles generated their own curriculum with important social aspects and that motivational gains emerged as an additional outcome:

The group work, ensemble work’s got a whole momentum of its own, the working together and the team thing, watching someone who’s conducting, following the music and all that. I saw it as a fun element for them as well. Lots of skills in it, but it’s quite fun because it’s the whole group together. It’s got quite a lot of momentum. (Tutor, 2004)

The move to have ensembles as a mainstream learning component was effectively an evolutionary process, rather than a planned development. For example, in regard to ensembles and creative work, the initial proposal to the Ministry of Education states:

The project would involve children in instrumental lessons on a weekly basis. Composition experiences would be extended fortnightly sessions and ensemble work at least once per term to begin, and increasing in the second year to up to five times per term. Both of these activities have been shown to require high levels of metacognition for success to be achieved. (Heartland, 2002)

In hindsight, I can but smile at the optimism of this intention. Heartland’s capacity to sustain concurrent weekly and fortnightly programme components was challenged from the very first organisation of the 2003 Year One Ensembles. While the children had similar provision in terms of time when calculated over the year, the following pedagogical and logistical points were influential in the decision to change the delivery pattern to block formats (modules) in an ensemble setting.

• A concentrated timeframe for ensembles appeared to improve the impetus for learning and brought a clear contribution from the school community.91 While individuals and independent work were a key focus, records and commentary show that all groups of

---

91 The children worked two to three hours a day, six to eight times over a two to three week period.
research participants considered children working collaboratively to be a desirable outcome.

• The modular and project focus allowed Heartland to be more responsive to the identified strengths and needs of individual children. Ensembles also appeared to achieve a greater flexibility in response to school or tutor initiatives for schools or groups of children.

• The performance of child participants in ensembles showed the work was a positive stimulus for personal instrument learning. The ongoing cyclic nature of lessons and ensemble participation appeared as influential in establishing and maintaining habitual instrumental activity.

• All ensembles had the expectation of sharing work via school assemblies, Heartland sharing times or in more public arenas. In most cases, this seemed to assist motivation and the music focus of child participant’s work. I noted a performance incentive helped frame the ensemble modules for tutors who began to initiated performance opportunities if one was not available through Heartland at an appropriate time in the ensemble’s learning.

• Records show that modules conducted over a two or three week period caused the least disruption to school programmes. Even so, particularly at the school Year Seven and Eight level, child participant Individual Education Plans occasionally expressed concern over the number of interruptions to class time once children had progressed to keyboard or other instrument learning.

• Because Heartland tutors’ terms of contract were part-time, blocks of teaching made it more feasible for them to coordinate their Heartland roles, other work and personal commitments.

• Organising the movement of children between schools and the supply of equipment was more manageable on a modular basis.

Perceptions about the effect of instrumental learning in Music Heartland

Heartland’s instrumental learning consisted of Year One Keyboard and Theory and Year Two and Three Instrumental Learning, which may have again been keyboard. This teaching was ongoing rather than modular, with child participants receiving between twenty and twenty-five half hour lessons (mostly individual) over two to three school terms.

Data emerged from the child participants’ responses to interview questions about what they enjoyed, the level of challenge they experienced and their views about music participation in general. The prevalent response was that instrument learning was seen as the core of their liking for the total programme. All Year One child participants who had only experienced the Year One Ensemble at the time of interview, expressed enthusiasm about the possibility of learning an instrument.

Similar data emerged in the comments from Year Two and Three child participants. Enjoying learning an instrument was a prevalent thread and their comments suggested they thought about the wider outcomes of that learning:

Since I got on the guitar I liked it heaps. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).
Just the experience…. How I can play the piano better and how I can read my lines, so I’m really pleased that I am part of that. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

Instrumental playing also emerged as an important factor when the child participants were interviewed again in 2005. “I feel good on piano and I think I am doing a really good job…. I feel confident about it. I’m already always ready to play” (Yr 3 child participant, 2005). They also appeared to accept that it was a long haul gaining instrumental confidence and that it takes time to meet challenges. For example, “I’m not good changing the chords. I have got so small fingers that I can’t reach each string. She made a CD for me but the CD goes really fast. And we are like still trying to learn that thing” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

Asked about what they found challenging within Heartland in 2005, some child participants noted they saw instrumental mastery as representative of wider musical confidence. For example “I would just say oh I’m really good at Music. I’m good at two instruments” (Yr 3 child participants, 2005).

The prevalent responses about family interest were also connected with the development of instrumental skills. For example, “Nana, she really happy about me playing because her daughters, she got them playing but they didn’t like it. And, she was really happy that she has got a person in the family playing piano” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

Prevelant parent participant responses also highlighted the significance of instrumental learning. Two parents commented:

She likes that fact that she’s learning the music, learning an instrument. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

Heidi has really enjoyed it. Especially…the things I think she has enjoyed the most is learning how to play the guitar and more so than the making music and things like that. (Parent Yr 3 child participant, 2005)

The instrument(s) their child was learning appeared to dominate discussion at home. For example, “I’ve noticed that she talks more about the guitar than the violin. The Heartland one [guitar] is definitely the big interest and she will always be out here and say, ‘Hey look listen to this’ and show us what she has mastered” (Parent Yr 3 child participant, 2005).

While liaison teachers focused on ensemble components in their evaluation of the programme components, there was agreement that the availability of instrumental learning was significant in motivating children seeking progression through the Heartland stages.

and it was just that enthusiasm that the ensemble thing generated in those children. A whole lot at the end of the first year were saying, “Oh well recorders that’s ok but now I
want one of those shiny things”. And, they all went for different bits, and this year, we’re seeing with Heartland, a bigger range of instruments again, a tutor coming to school and opportunities to just play a whole different set of instruments again. (Liaison teacher, 2005)

The tutor participants confirmed the importance of instrumental development for Heartland children, seeing it as a matter of course in a blend of practical and creative aptitude. As one tutor described, “I agree with the holistic approach, and what you’re saying about creativity, but also your sense that the creativity must be there and balanced by other key musical skills” (Tutor, 2004).

**Perceptions about the effect of creative work in Music Heartland**

Extended and specific creative music making, led by specialist tutors with specific performance (sharing) goals was almost certainly new to the child participants. Nonetheless, a very positive response to creative work is apparent in the records and interview data from the end of 2003. As one child participant (Year Seven) described *Journeys*:

> I liked that project this year when we found out about making all the music, like, getting the chance to make your own music…. If you get the chance to make your own music, you realise how much you like it…and how fun it is. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

In 2005, all child participant responses brought the importance of creative activity into sharper profile:

> I get to write my own music. (Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

> it was really good because you know I got to sort of write music and stuff and get some improvising in there. (Yr 3 child participant, 2005)

> I think it was cool because everybody got to get together and share their ideas. (Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

Furthermore, they appeared to understand that innovation was an important benchmark for a music project. When asked what they would show a visitor to Heartland, the Year Seven and Eight child participants agreed they would share, “something creative…because you’ve got to show your skills to the important people” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

While parent participants did really distinguish between ensemble playing and the group creative projects, the latter appears to have triggered an awareness that the children’s creative work was something out of the norm. For example:

> And someone [a tutor] is sort of inviting them to actually have a go at trying to come up with a tune themselves which might not otherwise have even occurred to them that they
might be able to do…. Because they don’t get that in paid music classes. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

When referring to *Journeys*, parents noted surprise at the quality, application and growth of confidence that had emerged from creative learning and performance. As one stated:

I saw that performance and I was amazed, it was really, really good. But I don’t think that they had a sense of how good it was, until they actually performed it. And that was the hard thing, just keeping going, keeping going, I think that’s perhaps a little bit…but then once they’d done it, they had realised it was really impressive. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

Parent participants also perceived advantages in the group approach to creativity. As one observed:

they get a chance to, confidence wise, to play in a group and the difference with private lessons is that they don’t play with anybody else unless they are in an orchestra or something so they have got a chance to do all those things to share what they know and playing with other kids their age and that so I think there is a good mix really. (Parent Yr child participant, 2004)

A similar degree of surprise about the uniqueness of creative learning was evident amongst school liaison teachers. As one commented:

I know the buzz that our kids have got out of it. What they’ve come back to me saying wow wow wow [about] does tend to be the creative stuff. Just because, that’s probably where in their own musical history and learning that’s probably where they’ve haven’t had so much input. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

The Liaison teachers also discussed creative learning in relation to other music providers:

because of the way they’ve learnt, you know, go along to the piano teacher and ‘you play I play’. Whereas, the being able to get together with a group of other like minded kids…gifted kids bouncing ideas off each other, bouncing creative ideas off each other…and they just they’re buzzing. You can see it. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

Furthermore, and of theoretical significance, the liaison teachers suggested that the creative learning set Heartland apart in meeting the needs of gifted and talented children:

the creative end and the application end rather that more of the same, which, I think is the danger with some of the things people call gifted and talented programmes. They’re just more of the same, bigger numbers and that’s not really what this is about. This isn’t blowing harder on the trumpet, this is actually totally different. This is going into heavily creative stuff. And I think that’s the parallels I’d see with other gifted and talented programmes would be about application of skills within a creative context. (Liaison teacher, 2004)
The liaison teachers were also open about comparing the product of Heartland’s creative work with what their schools could realistically provide for children. As one commented:

what we’ve noticed that is very different, and the bit that has given our kids the buzz is the creative side…. Everything else I think we’ve probably in the past dabbled into, found ways I think to provide those things. (Liaison teacher, 2004).

The tutor participant had mixed views about the creative projects, describing the creative expectations of Heartland as demanding and intensive. However, as to the significance of the work, all agreed it was important to encourage creative abilities in musically gifted children and felt it could begin during the identification processes. As one stated:

I think that’s really important in music-making now, especially when you can develop into careers that are quite creative in a music context, without actually being a technically skilled instrumentalist…. And I think that’s the way things are going. And so being a creative musician the success rate and attainment level in the future is promising…. I also think that the creativity thing is perhaps being a little bit underrated in overall musical development, traditionally. (Tutor, 2004)

Furthermore, the tutors agreed the creative projects revealed most about children’s commitment and independence:

Whereas in an ensemble group, there’s always varying things that you can fit into a wee bit and still get that group satisfaction and things. But with the creative thing, if someone’s way off doing this amazing stuff and you can’t sort of match it, and the commitment’s not there, I think it shows up a wee bit…. I think we’ve found it requires the most commitment from the students and that sometimes what shows them apart is that commitment at the creative level. (Tutor, 2004)

They also agreed that creativity was not dependent on instrumental excellence, no matter what value you put on playing. As one commented, “when you do the creative ensemble work you know if a person is passionate about learning music” (Tutor, 2004).

Unprompted, the tutors recognised that Heartland’s philosophy had brought a shift in their approaches to tutoring in other situations:

I think I’m trying to get them to do more creative work in their individual lessons now, just so that they’re thinking that way. It’s not just reading music, or copying, it’s making something up….not spending a lot of time, but saying “What have you written this week?” and “Do you want to write this down in your book and keep a tab on what you’re doing”?…. They realise that’s a natural part of music, that you’re creating at the same time. But probably, it wasn’t my learning experience, so it’s taking me a while to get to that kind of way of teaching I guess. (Tutor, 2004)
Summary of the analysis of perceptions about Heartland’s programme components

There appeared to be broad approval for the range of programme components and recognition of the contribution each could make to a child’s musical development. Child participants and parents were most aware of the effects of learning to play an instrument or instruments, possibly due to the regular pattern of lessons and home activity. The liaison teachers and tutors were most aware of the children’s enjoyment of the creative and ensemble projects. For the tutors, learning an instrument was an assumed element of musical development and an integral part of being musical. Their comments suggest that the results of the ensembles and creative projects featured most in the minds of other teachers in the schools involved in Heartland.

While the participants had little or nothing to compare Heartland’s programme to, they concurred that it included some unique elements. All participants were clear about the rather special learning and social outcomes of the creative and ensemble projects. These were identified as providing authentic extension for musically gifted children. In particular, all categories of participants noted the positive momentum generated from children’s involvement in creative developments. The child participants valued the sharing of ideas, the fun, and that creative outputs would be impressive to outsiders. Parents and liaison teachers noted the children’s application to creative work and were surprised about the quality of their children’s pieces after seeing performances. The tutors mentioned creative activity as where musical talent, deeper commitment and independent strategies flourished and noted that their teaching outside of Heartland was now more likely to include creative activity. The creative projects and their performance as ensembles were seen to have a genuinely motivational effect and to have played a pivotal role in determining children’s involvement in subsequent musical activities.

The tutors’ comments identified a variety of matters that had a possible negative influence on music learning on occasions within the duration of the Heartland programme. These included:

- The large size of some groups/ensembles;
- the high number of students involved in Heartland at any one time;
- the range of abilities children presented;
- the time allocated for children to fulfil the expectations of a particular project;
- the sometimes interrupted nature of a child’s learning;
- the intensity and organisational complexity of the total programme which tutors had to contend with on a daily basis.

At the same time, the tutors’ comments downplayed the significance of the above concerns relative to the greater benefits perceived as emerging from the diversity of experiences Heartland
offered to children. Furthermore, while their concerns were completely valid, they did not appear to impact on the views of child, parent or liaison teacher participants about programme quality. This would indicate high regard indeed for the skills of the tutors. To close, the adult participants who naturally brought a greater range of experiences to their perceptions were clear about motivational effect from children learning about creativity and developing diverse ensemble skills in which instrumental skills were integral. This position was reinforced numerous times as being an appropriate expectation of a programme aimed at fostering children identified as musically gifted.

Part 3: The integrity of child participant involvement and the effectiveness of Music Heartland as a community of learning

The growing sense of community during Music Heartland reflected the commitment of the children, schools and families. However, the momentum took me by surprise. Because many of Heartland’s activities were cross-school and involved vertical groupings, the children frequently worked in schools other than their own and with children they did not know well. In addition, the children attended concerts, sometimes performed in the community and at other schools, and were participants in the Heartland sharing times. Whatever the benefits to the individuals, Heartland was a significant disruption to school routines. This included repeated withdrawals from class programmes, being transported to and from school, missing out on activities with friends and, in some cases, missing out on other special school activities. Nevertheless, records show that in most cases the children were well supported by families and schools, and that lesser support became evident early in the programme. Accordingly, this final part of the findings explores the relationships with school and community that framed the children’s learning.

Heartland’s influence on musical independence and self efficacy

The children’s independence and self determination has thus far been approached through data about home practice, recreational activity and the factors that influenced engagement, such as peer responses and music reading expectations. The focus now shifts to the individual child participants’ perceptions of their ability to learn music and their sense of ownership concerning their musical activity. As mentioned earlier, even though the child participants were slow to develop practice habits, most of them accepted the need for personal practice. Similarly, practice appeared to enhance their personal focus and the precision of practice strategies employed. Furthermore, a sense of accomplishment, particularly amongst those with two or three years experience in Heartland, appeared to have a positive influence on the personal satisfaction they gained from learning and playing music. Even in their first year of Heartland the children enjoyed applying keyboard skills, and engaging in creative activity. For example:
When I finish my practicing I just do like to make up little songs on my keyboard.

At the start, until mum notices that I’m not playing what I am supposed to. (Yr 2 child participants, 2004)

Ongoing experience appeared to enhance the child participants’ sense of being personally responsible for improving their skills, albeit to please another person. For example:

Learn something…on the keyboard. (Yr 1 child participants, 2004)

When she comes back…I’ll show her how good I’ve practiced. (Yr 2 child participants, 2004)

We’ll try and make up a song so that we’ll play it for her when she gets back. (Yr 2 child participants, 2004)

In 2005, the children were unanimous in responding “No” to my jest that they would muck around if their tutors were away. With respect to independence, they appeared to be more definitive about their time commitment, practice strategies, and preference for creative outlet. For example:

I practice on the stuff I’m really having trouble with. (Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

I’d practice all my songs. And then I’ll make up a song so I can show her what I’ve done. (Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

An increased air of self determination was also evident in the more experienced child participants. For example:

I’ve got quite a lot of stuff on, I’ve have like other orchestras and stuff, so I know that I don’t really have much choice but to practice…. And I’ve got a team music group thing that I sort of have to practice for if I don’t want to embarrass myself. So, like I enjoy it. I try and get things right, and just playing in our group socially. And I suppose we just sort of just muck around on the guitar a bit as well. (Yr 3 child participant, 2005)

The substance of this intention to pursue music independently became evident in comments about participating in future Heartland, and wider music projects. All the child participants unreservedly agreed that they would like to continue learning in Heartland, as one said, “All of us will still be here…. ‘Cause it’s really fun” (Yr 2 child participants, 2004). Similarly, while nothing was indicated to them about ongoing involvement, the prevalent mood was one of anticipation. For example, “if we went to intermediate, will we still carry on?” (Yr 2 child participants, 2004).

In all, the children indicated a sense of well being about being involved in music. This was supported by a low level of self-withdrawal from the wider cohort. Just one or two children per year. Furthermore, fully aware that Heartland would not continue into 2006, the child
participants became more purposive and self-determined in describing learning intentions, including improvisation, writing music more effectively, finishing their tutor books, and technical goals, such as learning harder chords. As one said, “To be able to play really hard songs that are even harder than the level that I’m on. Like adult songs! So that I’ll be able to impress my friends” (Yr 2 child participant, 2005).

Though several years away, music was already part of the child participants’ plans for adulthood, either recreationally or vocationally. While a few were confident Heartland was the beginning of a music related career, the prevalent responses reflected intention for a mix of recreational and professional engagements with music. For example:

When I grow up I want to be an interior designer but I would probably do music as well. (Yr 2 child participants, 2004)

I might play in a few orchestras or something like that, or jazz bands…sort of part time. But I actually can’t really see it as sort of like a complete sort of living. Do you know what I mean? (Yr 3 child participant, 2005)

In both 2004 and 2005, there was a clear self-determination to pursue music learning, as it was considered a learning priority by the majority of child participants. There were a few more ambivalent views, such as, “It’s not that important, it’s like, there’s some things that you are good at, and some things you’re not so good at” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). However, the prevalent expressions of high enjoyment in the child participants’ self-evaluations suggests that most gave priority to adult involvement, as the following comments indicate:

I’ve always thought that music was a top priority. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

I just think it’s quite important because I enjoy it and if it’s something you enjoy then you should keep doing it. (Yr 3 child participant, 2005)

Finally, although not explicitly asserted, when asked if they thought they learned more quickly than other children, most child participants felt their ability to learn music gave them a comparative advantage. “In music we probably get better ‘cause we have actually all learnt more” (Yr 2 child participants, 2004). Of interest, however, in 2004 and 2005 interviews the child participants did not feel this advantage transferred to other parts of the curriculum.

**Summary of musical independence and self efficacy**

Based on comments and the children’s prevailing mood during the interviews it would appear that involvement in Heartland had a positive influence on the child participants’ confidence and personal direction, the significance they attributed to music learning and their attitudes towards ongoing music learning and activity. The contributing factors to this positive influence include:
• The children’s self-determination relating to involvement and practice was influenced by the length and by implication the success of their involvement in Heartland.

• Their comments suggest they could acknowledge a relative ease of learning music without discomfort, though this was not seen to be transferable to other curricula.

• The level of musical self-determination was modest in 2004 and seemingly connected to pleasing others. However, the 2005 data suggest higher levels of personal direction in music learning amongst the children, and this more assertive sense of self-efficacy can possibly be traced to musical involvement.

• From 2004 to 2005, the child participants gained greater clarity regarding the likelihood of their adult involvement in music. In spite of their youth, the child participants’ comfortably anticipated partaking in music either recreationally or professionally.

• Frequent comments about creative activity suggest it was a barometer for personal progress, in that the child participants intuitively linked creative volition with ownership of musical ability and self-determination.

**The effect of peer and family responses on child participant attitudes to learning and practice**

Thus far, musical learning has largely been considered outside of the child participants’ social contexts. This section explores how the responses of the child participants’ family and peers affected their learning and their involvement in Heartland. The child participants’ comments suggest they were ambivalent about the influence of peers on musical progress. While some comments note that friends were disappointed about not being included or being withdrawn from Heartland, there is little evidence peers had any negative implications for child participants. One quoted typical comments he received from his peers, “How do you get out of work? Do you have fun? [They] complain that I’m away” (Yr 2 child participants, 2004). Consistent with earlier comments about peers who were not selected, the prevalent mood amongst the children suggested they accepted ongoing involvement. For example:

My friends they just reckon it is boring. And then they come and listen to me play and then they are like, “Keep playing”. So I don’t care what they think. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

Ohh music just looks boring”. So then you get into it by saying that, “It’s really really fun. So if you try it you would know what it was like.” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

At the same time, the child participants were sensitive to the needs of other children and acknowledged that being part of Heartland was a little special. For example, “They could be jealous…. I reckon…I don’t really feel comfortable…that I can do better things” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). They also talked about changes to socialisation patterns, such as missing out on lunchtime games or after school activities with friends. However, the mood of each of the child participant groupings was accommodating. As one child participant put it, “There has been, but I’m happy to go out and play with them, and do music as well” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). As to learning support from peers, only a few spoke of specific areas where progress had been
aided, for example, “My friends have actually taught me how to play the keyboard” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

The child participants appear to have tacitly acknowledged that a certain degree of difference from what their peers were doing was acceptable, and this was something they were mostly comfortable with. Regardless of their level of giftedness and the intensity of the music learning they were experiencing, the child participants recognised themselves as following their own pathway and deemed that to be alright. The following comments indicate the prevalent attitude towards receiving help from peers in both 2004 and 2005:

Why would my friends be able to help me, I am the one getting music?

I didn’t really need any help because I’m really the only one who really knows how to do music in my class. (Yr 2 child participants, 2004)

The influence of the overall approval of parents and family has already been explored. It was found to be have mostly had an effect in connection with instrumental learning. However, probing further into the relationship between the child participants and their family produced a range of seemingly contrary responses. For example:

We’ll like normally I will play my Mum a song…but then she will just carry on work like talking and then…she wouldn’t really care. But she would get me into all these music stuff, and then she doesn’t even care” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

However, the child participant’s mother took a different line:

Every now and then she’ll sit me down, and I’ve got to sit there and listen to all the new chords that she’s learnt…. I don’t mind. I don’t mind…I sort of boost her up a wee bit more. Just to let her know that I think she’s doing really well. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

In another case, differing perceptions were expressed about getting practice done. “I don’t really get to practice at home because my mum always saying to me, ‘Oh don’t play that’. Some parents don’t actually like want you doing it” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). However, although nearly a year later, the parent stated:

He has got his own room but he doesn’t like missing out. “You’re not missing out on what everyone else is doing. It’s actually quite healthy and good for you to do that.” And, he actually has learnt that and discovered that over the last year. I’ve especially noticed with his homework this year, it’s the first time ever I haven’t had to hassle him every day to do homework. So he is definitely maturing. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

I think these are fascinating examples and worthy of more investigation. Nevertheless, the data suggests that the prevalent comments about home support focused on the ways parents tried to
help, rather than impede their child’s practice. A few parents were able to give specific help, as represented by comments such as, “My mum always says, ‘That’s out of tune or something…you’re in the wrong key’” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). Overall, however, the prevalent tone was one of general social and emotional support. For example:

Mum listens to my playing lots.

When I’m playing up in my room they like, “That sounds so nice Ainsley” and stuff. That’s cool! (Yr 2 child participants, 2004)

Some comments mention involving wider family members. For example:

if you are on the tape, like we had to sit. I didn’t really want to show them the tape but they all made, I had to show them the tape that we did last year. And I showed them like, “Oh look at you, you’re so good at that” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

In close alignment with the child responses, most of the parent participants’ comments focused on giving general support and acknowledged if they were unable to offer specific music tuition. For example:

I haven’t had to give any because I don’t play the guitar but Garry’s probably given the lead there….. She didn’t seem to need much help but trying to keep her happy while she shows us a whole new thing that she could do. (Parent Yr 3 child participant, 2005)

I guess we encourage her to practice. She likes us to listen so we go to another room. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

One particular matter of interest was that the mood of the parents did not suggest they required their child to practice. That is, their comments did not mention accelerating or intensifying their child’s progress through practice. However, as I communicated to all parents in regard to ongoing involvement, clear progress was an expectation in instrumental learning:

A child will be showing commitment and good progress to continue in the project in 2005. The extent of teaching and range of experiences has been pretty special so it is reasonable to expect high levels of work and progress. (Heartland, 2004)

With or without musical expertise, parents considered their general support for their child’s development was more important than fostering specific routines and committed work at home. In essence, it appears they perceived that most of the responsibility lay with the child: For example:

She’s not exactly the flashiest practicer in the whole world, but she’s always keen to do it. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004)
It's more of a time thing. It’s not that she doesn’t want to, she probably just doesn’t get around to it. (Parent Yr3 child participant, 2005)

While the mood of the interviews showed parents clearly recognised the importance of practice, it was possibly easier to be clear about this in an independent interview than in communication with their child. For example, “Michael takes things for granted. I was aware that it was a very special opportunity and wish he had realised. I don’t think he really quite honestly realised” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

At the same time, the child participants tended not to expect parent or wider family involvement at home in developing musical skill. In fact, only one comment carried threads of social, emotional and musical support:

Four people in my family play instruments…like my mum plays the piano my dad plays the guitar and my sister plays the violin…we usually practice together…cause mum listens to it and then Dad sometimes listens to it and then he says what it should be cause mum doesn’t know much about that and then Josie she plays with me so then she can say if it is right or not. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

Summary of peer and family effect on child participants

While comments suggest peer attitudes and behaviours were important, overall they had a neutral effect on the child participants’ feelings about involvement, practice and musical progress. Few comments indicated peers having any real influence on a child participant’s progress and, perhaps more importantly, there was no expectation that this would have been the case. Rather, the child participants acknowledged they were on a pathway different from their peers and both parties were essentially comfortable with that.

In terms of family support for personal practice and development, some comments revealed participants from the same family had mixed perceptions. However, in only one case did the variation in perceptions appear deep seated and of possible significance to the child’s learning. Overall, the child participants had quite high expectations of support or of what they perceived as appropriate encouragement. By the same token, although the parents suggested they knew that support was important, without the advantage of musical knowledge they felt that being positive about the opportunity was the best way to assist:

I think Heidi and I were both on the same track with the programme. I think I was happy that she was in it and she was happy to be in. And I was pleased that she was getting a chance to learn another instrument and playing in a group. I think she appreciated that as well. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

It appears there was clear family support of the children’s practice habits, though with wide variations as to what constituted support. In a few cases, support consisted of shared music
involvement, but for the most part it was expressed through appreciation and encouragement (mostly through the wall). Earlier data about individual child participant’s learning during 2004 and 2005 indicates that practice levels increased over 2004 and 2005. A likely factor in that increase was the interest and encouragement of parents and family. However, as I interpret the data, the expectations at home did not match the quality or quantity of practice Heartland expected. Rather, practice can be said to have been allowed and encouraged, and children’s progress was acknowledged in mostly positive ways. This leaves a question mark about reciprocity of the expectations of project and home given Heartland’s wish to maximise the rate of instrumental development, particularly in respect of the proportionately large resource investment required.

The effectiveness of professional relationships within Music Heartland.

This section explores data concerning perceptions relating to the effectiveness of the child participants’ relationships within the school, i.e. with their Heartland tutors and classroom teachers. Beginning with child participants, the prevalent view of their classroom teachers’ responses to Heartland was one of support for the child’s participation. For example:

Well my teacher likes that I like music, like the fact that I am doing extra-curricula. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

She’s really like happy that lots of us learn it, 'cause we are sort of like the music people in the whole school. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

A few child participants noted conflicting factors, such as teacher irritability if the child was out of class for long periods. These comments are informed by IEP information from classroom teachers, which indicated respective child participants were not coping with the amount of time spent away from class.

In terms of their teachers helping, or taking an interest, the prevalent response of child participants was neutral. For example, “They just call our names to go to Music Heartland and then they just carry on” (Yr 1 child participant, 2004). While a few children expressed appreciation for the help given by classroom teachers, others indicated disappointment with ironic comments such as, “All my teacher helped me with is putting it [instrument] up in the cupboard” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).
Liaison teachers were positive about the support of colleagues, particularly those who had Heartland children in their class:92

Ours is really positive. I think any teacher who’s got kids going along to it was hugely supportive of it. And, they can sort of see the benefit of things…like that I mean whether its music or other things. Anyway I don’t think we really have a problem with anything. But there’s obviously a direct benefit to individual children within, and especially things they wouldn’t normally…probably have the opportunity to do. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

They were equally clear that practical follow up of Heartland children’s music activity was unlikely. As one put it, “because teachers are just flat out treading water all the time, and this child goes off that’s great. But, they don’t have the energy to go pursue that, and inquire about it” (Liaison teacher, 2004).

In regard to the children’s relationships with their tutors, while a few noted a preference for one tutor, all were positive in a general sense. For example, “I like Mrs Jenkins and Miss Aldridge…because they’re really nice and when we say little funny things, they like laugh with us, not just take it seriously” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). When probed about what their tutors communicated in lessons, a few child participants had no response. The prevalent range of comments recalled practical music aspects, such as keeping the rhythm or tempo and similar comments were made in 2004 and 2005. For example, “My tutor says I’ve got to really slow down, because I’m just eager to play really fast songs. And, I play slow songs fast ‘cause, I don’t really like slow songs” (Yr 2 child participant, 2005). The prevalent response regarding the makeup of lessons was the repetition of pieces, and based on the mood of the comments the child participants felt this was appropriate:

I play the song and after she just tells me keep on repeating that line until you have got it right. Then you do the next one until you do it right. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

if I get something wrong she just goes ‘oh practice that all week. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

As to effectiveness of the tutor/child relationships, there was one child in each participant group (2004) who stated they did not take the lessons seriously. However, the prevalent response acknowledged a clear focus within lessons, which in fact appeared to be their expectation. As one stated, “You concentrate…otherwise, you wouldn’t know what you were doing” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). Comments in 2005 suggested the children perceived more intensity in the lessons as well as all appearing more self-directed in their approach:

I’m quite serious, because I really want to learn more things.

92 The liaison teachers gave a great deal of expertise and out of school time in the support of Heartland operations within their school.
More than last year…last year I was probably a little bit nervous. (Yr 2 child participants, 2005).

The child participants were clearly comfortable and affirming when talking about their tutors and acknowledged the interest their tutors took in them. For example:

We’ll normally, she always saying what you put into the work during the week. And then she knows that we play netball, and she will ask who won, and how did it go. And then she’ll go onto the music. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

Older child participants noted more in depth conversations with their tutor with comments like, “It’s not just learning music, it’s like a history lesson all in one” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

The tutors highlighted a willingness to work with individual Heartland children in a manner sensitive to their diverse musical, cultural and social differences. For example, “Some flourish in the creative more, and others love the one-to-one, like it’s reassuring, they like to get to know you” (Tutor, 2004).

All of the liaison teachers were generous in their approval of Heartland’s tutors, in particular the core tutors. As one stated, “I think they have done a fantastic job, fantastically skilled tutors for working with these groups of kids” (Liaison teacher, 2004). As practising classroom teachers and leaders, I interpreted the degree of their approval as an acknowledgement of the communication and relationship quality the tutors had fostered with the children.

Aside from their wish for more active support from children’s classroom teachers, it was apparent the tutors’ felt valued and included professionally. For example, “I find overall that I think generally the schools respect us as being specialists” (Tutor, 2004). However, they sought to test out the effects of more consistent communication about specific children’s learning, as they described in relation to a number of chance occurrences. For example:

I was just commenting about the student’s success in the early ensemble work and hearing that they were quite underachieving in certain subjects in school. And coming from a general classroom teacher I would never have identified that with the confidence and the ability, and not just playing by ear, but the musical intelligence, like the reading and everything. There was no doubt of ability so that was really refreshing. (Tutor, 2004)

It was one of the teachers, ‘She doesn’t do well at other things’. I thought that she [child] would be generally capable, especially in written language and oral language, but her achievement was quite low. So there was that sort of element of surprise – and it was not agreement or disagreement particularly, but it was just sort of, and again that’s a nice thing. (Tutor, 2004)

Observing the child participants’ music lessons, I noted a high level of focus and expectation of children, as well as encouragement, particularly from the core tutors. While, in a few instances, I
noticed lower levels of application from child participants, this did not appear to detract from the open nature of communication during the lesson. The tutor participants communicated in engaging ways during lessons, ensemble teaching, playing and sharing situations and creative projects. In each case, there was a sense of genuine expectation coupled with warm support of the children’s contributions and performance. As the liaison teachers suggested, the children relished being around, and working with these musical mentors.

**Summary concerning professional relationships**

The child participants appeared comfortable talking about relationships with their tutors and classroom teachers. The prevalent view was that they considered the classroom teachers to be supportive in a similar manner to their families. The child participants felt this support was natural and built on goodwill, rather than a specific strategy within the classroom. At the same time, the liaison teacher participants saw their colleagues as openly supportive of the children involved in Heartland. The tutors clearly valued the child participants as individuals and, in most cases, the children were open and positive about their enjoyment of their Heartland tutors.

The liaison teachers appeared to hold the tutors in high regard and the tutors acknowledged this as being valued in the schools. However, the effectiveness of communications about children was an issue for tutors, in that they felt more consistent support and planned dialogue would have enhanced their ability to cater for and challenge particular children. However, the liaison teachers were clear that the classroom teacher’s already expansive classroom responsibilities meant they had little opportunity to offer specific encouragement. Clearly, this is a topic for further investigation. At this juncture, the weight of data suggests that the overall pattern of professional communication and the relationships amongst children, tutors and schools was very positive and, at the least, intended to be mutually supportive. As one tutor stated, “I think the Heartland is quite a busy thing within schools, it’s quite a high profile. And, I think the schools feel like they’re getting quite a lot” (Tutor participant, 2004).

**Tutor expertise within the Music Heartland community**

From the beginning of Heartland, I identified that it would be critical to locate high quality tutors for the project to have any real chance of success. This section focuses on the attributes of the core tutors who completed most of the teaching requirements of Music Heartland.93 As described, successive administrative decisions led to the instrumental programme being narrowed

---

93 The three tutor research participants were the core tutors of Heartland. As clarification, non-core tutors fulfilled teaching roles for approximately thirty percent of the instrumental components and, on occasions, worked alongside core tutors in ensemble and/or creative projects.
and most children were learning guitar or keyboard by 2005. These instruments were taught by
the core tutors, along with the ensembles and creative work.

Importantly, a number of factors led to a decision to minimise the teaching done by non-core
tutors during 2004. These included the challenge of encouraging groups of children to develop
an interest in an instrument, the transport costs of moving the groups between schools,
instrument maintenance issues, school and tutor communication issues and Heartland and tutor
communication issues. Furthermore, the momentum of learning on instruments other than guitar
and piano was less predictable. For example, children playing other instruments were less evident
at Heartland sharing times, they stopped learning without apparent reason more frequently and,
even given the challenge in playing an instrument like the cello, appeared to be making less
progress through the year. Regrettably, I was unable to provide appropriate support for the non-
core tutors, some of whom were teaching for just an hour a week. Similarly, from an
administrative perspective, Heartland could not afford to offer the non-core tutors the benefits
provided to the core tutors, such as professional development opportunities and partial
reimbursement for meetings. On reflection, the data surrounding Heartland’s decision to limit the
range of instruments, and by implication the number of tutors, raises many questions pertaining
to part-time teaching in schools. Some of these issues are addressed in Karen Carter’s (2003)
thesis concerning the effectiveness of itinerant music teaching. It is a complex matter, as in a few
cases, the children who prospered with a non-core tutor on instruments, (other than guitar and
keyboard) continue to learn from the same tutor some five years later.

Returning to the role and qualities of the core tutors, they were chosen in accord with
Heartland’s principles as specialists with diverse and complementary musical strengths and, in
most cases, were teacher trained. The core tutors were involved and influential in the planning
and development of each year’s programme. I had regular formal and informal communications
with them, which was a real advantage in times of challenge and uncertainty. Furthermore, they
readily adopted the breadth of the philosophy espoused in Heartland’s principles, such as their
positive adoption of creative elements in instrumental teaching.

The liaison teachers’ comments specifically describe the attributes of Heartlands core tutors. For
example:

I think the quality of the Heartland programme runs from the fact that it’s well resourced,
comparatively, and has committed tutors with skills with a clear philosophical
underpinning, and that really makes the thing fly to me. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

Moreover, a liaison teacher encapsulated the professional qualities Heartland had access to in its
core tutors as, “having someone who really knows music and is creative and can link to children”
(Liaison teacher, 2004). Similarly, credit was given for the selection of tutors, as one liaison teacher noted, “A lot of that also comes down I think, to [Heartland’s] choice of the tutors” (Liaison teacher, 2004).

**Summary concerning tutor expertise**

The findings suggest the importance of communication and regular professional development for people working in relative isolation, such as tutors. As described, Heartland records show that each core tutor participant brought a musical background, including varied performance experience, the confidence to facilitate skill learning and composition, and a range of teaching experience. In my view they were committed to fostering broad and challenging musical development opportunities for children within a strong community framework. In 2003, this was reported to the Ministry of Education as follows:

A key element in the success of the programme to date is the diversity of staff in the programme. Three of the four current part time staff are trained teachers, and, all sustain a variety of specialist music roles in schools and community. The diversity of their backgrounds adds enormously to the richness of discussion in staff development and organisational meetings (13 hours to date). (Ministry of Education Milestone, 2003).

By my analysis, any markers of success attributable to the Heartland programme over and above the products and development of the children stemmed from the qualities of the core tutors. Within a challenging framework of part-time and inconsistent hours, they were able to demonstrate:

- An ability to involve and inspire through engaging teaching strategies and meaningful communication with children.
- Respect and empathy for challenges occurring in children’s lives, along with ability to foster acceptance of diverse abilities and social concern amongst musically gifted individuals.
- A diverse sense of musical integrity founded on personal musical involvement and training.
- The capacity to be models and advocates for a broad range of musical genres and cultural expressions.
- A willingness to reflect on what makes for rich musical development for a diversity of musically gifted children.
- An ability to engage with schools and classroom teachers through positive, confident and flexible communication strategies.
- Sufficient surety to write and talk about musical development pathways for all children, alongside a willingness to engage in, cater for, and reflect on the complexity of a multi-stranded music teaching programme appropriate for musically gifted children which is grounded in *The New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007).
The Music Heartland project as an administrative and learning community

As an administrative entity, Heartland collaborated and sustained communication with eight schools, up to sixteen tutors, and between fifty and eighty children and the children’s families. Records indicate several hundred letters, emails and other communications, as well as nearly 150 formal and informal meetings were generated over the three years. These communications related to selection, programme organisation, programming, special events, specific module organisation, equipment, personnel, budgeting, salary payments, strategic planning and Ministry of Education reporting. Overall, despite the fact that the allowable funding for the administrative, direction, and liaison roles was relatively small, and nominal in the case of Queens High School staff, I believe a substantive communication network was sustained throughout the duration of the Heartland project, and particularly from the second year. As one school recorded, “The project has been a mammoth logistical operation and in spite of that, has run very smoothly” (Heartland, 2005). Furthermore, all of the schools indicated they would want to be part of an expanded Heartland programme were it to receive further funding past 2005.

As to the robustness of the community, the comments of most research participants suggested high levels of child participant involvement. Furthermore, child participants appeared confident about the benefits of Heartland learning, highlighting lessons and group work as musical activities they valued. For example:

This is like a lifetime experience and most kids aren’t lucky enough to get into this. You need to work hard for it otherwise you might drop out and then that leaves an experience that another kid won’t get. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

Another measure of the sense of community came from observing the child participants as performers and audience. As they gained experience, the cohort became less reserved in appreciating the work, creative ideas, and results of each other’s activity. Even in 2003, when children seemed unsure of how enthusiastic they were supposed to be about each other’s work, a milestone report recorded that, “eighty children were an attentive audience for more than two and a half hours” (Heartland, 2003). During performances in 2004 and 2005, a heightened sense of anticipation was evident whenever child participants came together. I observed children exhibiting overt expressions of support for their peer’s performances, as well as sensitivity and enthusiasm in their responses to the widen diversity of music the cohort was now producing. Now more spontaneous, the child participants were relaxed about being involved and appeared to share a sense of community ownership. As one child put it, “I think I like it more because I get to learn new things and you get to know more people” (Yr 2 child participant, 2005).
From seeing the outputs, the parent participants gave clear support for the kinds of group involvement Heartland offered:

I was so impressed with the variety and the different things the children came up with in those groups. It was really cool and it was so nice being able to share. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

It’s just really nice that it doesn’t have to be some concert from overseas that you get to go and listen to these really cool musicians. That there is these local ones, who aren’t necessarily even adults, and getting to share and listen to what they can do. It was awesome! (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

I also observed the schools became more responsive to meeting schedules and, on occasions, released liaison teachers from teaching duties to enable them to take part in meetings and sharing times. In fact, after the creative sharing time at the end of 2003, I found the liaison teachers to be more enthusiastic about their children’s involvement and more likely to attend performances themselves. As one school liaison teacher described the children’s motivation:

When these children [Years Four to Six in school] actually work with a tutor it makes the whole thing feel pretty important and it makes them important. They get in on Thursday morning, and at ten past nine the taxis arriving to take them to something, and they’ve got everything ready, and they’ve got to be ready. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

The tutor participants projected a broad enthusiasm for the community, talking of children staying in touch with the project even if they had been withdrawn and that Heartland involvement was perhaps a bright spot for some children’s well being. Similarly, the tutor participants consistently talked about future strategies for the Heartland Project and, like the school liaison teachers, they looked to find more avenues of inclusion for children. In this case, they were mindful but not deterred by tall poppy connotations:

I was thinking about the tall poppy thing. There’s always a sort of an awareness of not wanting to create an ‘us-and-them’ situation, but I think it’s always been there to a certain extent. It’s partly our attitude of encouraging a good attitude amongst the kids we’re dealing with. Not an attitude of arrogance or specialness in a divisive way, but how they’re going to use it…. I still think about picking up the kids that have been in the ensemble…. I wonder if there’s a way forward of picking them up as well. (Tutor, 2004)

As a learning community, the tutors and liaison teachers had similar perspectives about Heartland’s expectations of the children. The liaison teachers were happy with the tutors’ decisions about children and considered school and tutor expectations to be mutually supportive:

I think we’ve got pretty high expectations. And I think the tutors have as well. And any time that it has been an issue, it’s been a very, very rarely…it’s been good because I’ve just been able to stop them and say, “Could you…follow that up”. So you always know how people are going. You know if there’s any situation you need to know about, the people that we work [with], are pretty good at letting us know straight away…. But I
think expectations are high from the kids too. They’re getting higher as they sort of acquire a few more skills. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

They all agreed that expectation was both appropriate and important for children involved in Heartland:

There is nothing wrong with expectations. I think it’s fundamental of every thing we do so it’s fantastic and the fact the children have independence and make decisions. It’s great! (Liaison teacher, 2004)

Similarly, a common feeling was that individual children needed to take more personal responsibility within the community and they affirmed the need for the child participants to be expected to be flexible. For example:

I think our expectation is very high…. And because of the nature of the programme, they can’t have a teacher to hold their hand. And I think that, you know, these children have, with very few exceptions risen to the challenge. And, I think that it’s very important that they do that. I think if they want make a life long choice to be a career musician, then they better start getting themselves committed to it now. I think it’s great, if we’re truly looking for gifted and talented children, then that commitment has got to be part of it. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

The tutors, on the other hand, saw the progress of children within the community as being intrinsically linked to the kinds of support coming from the schools:

I think that it becomes more demanding when the teachers in the school get on board and they say, ‘This is when you need to practice every day’. Like ideally you want them to sort of help that child develop that habit and so there’s that expectation in there. It starts being self-fulfilling because they’re achieving higher and teacher’s pleased. (Tutor, 2004)

The tutors also saw real benefits in the classroom teachers contributing to the music learning. For example, “you want the school to come and say, you know, ‘We want you present at an assembly in a fortnight.’ It has to be sort of the triangle [child/tutor/teacher], doesn’t it?” (Tutor, 2004).

The liaison teachers also indicated a need to develop interaction and collaboration between the classroom and Heartland programmes. However, they focused on the wider use of tutor expertise in the school, rather than the tutor’s wish to introduce collaborative learning approaches with the children. As one liaison teacher noted, “I don’t know for sure but I think it’s probably not utilised well enough… I think we could do a lot better at using those skills” (Liaison teacher, 2004).

The tutors identified classroom teacher interest as an important indicator of professional credibility, especially when tutors were working across multiple schools:

that its importance in the school is really critical. Like if the teachers say, How’s Heartland going?” or “Do you want to play me a piece”, that’s really important. Otherwise we’re just a random person that comes in and does something odd once a week. (Tutor, 2004)
However, the tutors were emphatic about the need for a shared model to allow them to function as more than a visiting music teacher. One described the actual engagement as, “trying to bridge between the Heartland Project that’s been a role model for teaching music in schools” and, “up-skilling teachers in schools to be able to support it [quality of music learning]” (Tutors, 2004).

**Summary of administrative effectiveness**

The Heartland community required a very large administrative resource to function. All the research participants supported the growth and nature of the Heartland community, despite the level of disruption for children, families and schools. The gathering of children together for sharing times was recognised as playing an important role in fostering a sense of community and belonging amongst the children.

As a learning community, there were mutual expectations of high quality learning within Heartland, and between the project and schools involved. While the liaison teachers felt more could be done, they considered the framework was essentially responsive and positive. The tutors suggested support was inconsistent across the schools and that all of the schools could have been more involved in supporting the high level music learning goals. All participants suggested that the overall success of Heartland made it a useful model for the development of musically gifted children. The adult participants identified a variety of musical and social enhancements for children. They also emphasised the need to foster attributes of music ownership and responsibility amongst the children. The liaison teachers, tutors and parents alike wished to be able to offer a greater proportion of children a comparable opportunity.

**Relationship of music learning in Heartland to music learning with other providers**

Six of the thirteen child participants attended regular lessons on an instrument with another provider. In each case, the instrument was different to the one they were assigned in Heartland. In a few cases, the participants had already been given an opportunity to play their first instrument in community ensembles, such as Out of School Music Classes groups. As noted, the prevalent outcome was child participants successfully adapting to the demands of learning two instruments. As to playing over and above their Heartland participation, most of the six talked of other involvement as commonplace, simply something one did if learning an instrument. There was no suggestion that Heartland participation added or detracted from personal motivation to be involved in a wider community sense:

I go busking…just outside Countdown. (Yr 1 child participant, 2004)

I actually go to Saturday Morning Music Classes and do orchestra. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)
Of interest, none of the child participants learning a first instrument through Heartland spoke of interacting with outside music providers, and they seemed unaware of organisations such as Saturday Morning Music Classes. Their other music experience appeared to involve family, listening to music and personal practice.

The three parent participants whose children learned a second instrument in Heartland concurred that the second instrument broadened their child’s musical growth. For example, “It’s just a really good opportunity for them to learn more music, and do it with other kids. It’s just fantastic… She wouldn’t have been doing such a range of instruments at all” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005). The parents identified group and creative opportunity as a real difference to what their children received from other providers. In reference to the wider community, parents were alert to other forms of ensemble being available once their child moved onto high school. They seemed to see this as a natural progression, for example, “So I’m very happy for her to stay in it. Probably through to High School I think. Once they go to High School then they have got orchestras and bands and things haven’t they?” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005).

As noted, the findings suggested that the children’s instrumental progress in Heartland to be comparable with private tuition, particularly bearing in mind the lower frequency of lessons. As to how participants saw this, the data predictably came from participants learning simultaneously in Heartland and the community. The six child participants made no comparison about instrumental learning expectations, though one older child participant commented about the project in general, “I was already up to the stage where I just picked it up straight away. Because it was quite a low level like compared to what I was already doing” (Yr 3 child participant, 2005). Parents appeared supportive of children’s decisions to learn from another provider and there was no evidence they had higher expectations of Heartland or that the children were pressured to continue one instrument or the other. As one commented about choices, “The (deleted by author), I’ve given the opportunity to give it up, or sell it. And no she still likes it ” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

School liaison teachers were clearly aware of private music teachers, other community providers and ongoing opportunities within the mainstream school system. The liaison teachers’ comments show they valued the long standing Saturday Morning Music Classes. However, they all seemed to agree that an in-school approach to instrumental learning was worthy of deeper exploration. For example:

That’s something relatively new in primary schools is the idea of employing tutors to come and teach instruments in schools. And it’s something that’s happened in secondary schools in the past and Saturday Morning Music Classes have been doing it differently.
And its interesting because having had a long association with Saturday Morning Music Classes, and now seeing it work this way, I can really see that there’s huge benefits in tutors coming into primary schools. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

At the same time, extending school provision to instrumental teaching was recognised as expensive and a potential burden to schools, because it would heighten parents’ expectations of schools. As one put it:

When you start providing tutors on site then it becomes very easy just to say, ‘Well that’s fine you can do it at school’, which at one level is great but at another you’re saying, ‘There’s another thing we’ll do for you’. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

**Summary of learning in relationship to other providers**

Instrumental learning within Heartland was seen as complementary to other music learning and there were no instances of child participants having stopped learning privately after becoming involved in Heartland. Neither did any parent or child mention any particular positive or negative effects of learning a second instrument with an outside provider. Even where a child showed a preference for the instrument learned in Heartland, their comments suggested ongoing accommodation of both. The expectation of progress appeared to be comparable between Heartland and private providers. Predictably, however, very experienced child participants were not particularly challenged by the initial Heartland group work.

Parents of participants learning wind and string instruments privately, in particular supported their children’s involvement in community activities, such as busking or involvement in an orchestra. Parent and liaison teacher participants valued the aspects of Heartland that were different from what a child might experience in a community setting, even if their child was playing in an orchestra, for example. Heartland group work was identified as motivating personal instrument skill development and enhancing confidence for other forms of involvement. Lastly, while school liaison teachers appear to have been alerted to the benefits of in-school instrumental teaching, they shared reservations about increasing the expectation on schools to provide it.

**Perceptions about the relative capability of Music Heartland and school music programmes**

As no data was gathered about classroom music programmes in the Heartland schools, findings here are based exclusively on the interpretation of interview data.

After participating in Heartland, the prevalent commentary of child participants indicated that Heartland gave them greater confidence in classroom music programmes, they learned music more quickly than other children and felt comfortable bringing externally acquired skills into play. For example:
I like doing music more than the other kids like doing it. (Yr 1 child participant, 2004)

It’s better when you do. Everyone else is just going a bit strange, and then you’re keeping the beat. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

A few child participants recalled a classroom teacher’s commitment to music and appeared to be alert to how music was regarded in a wider school frame. For example, “My old school didn’t really do much music. Like my old school [deleted by author], it was really boring. Practically the only thing you do is make mischief” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). While comparisons were broad, their views mainly focused on the advantages of Heartland in relation to school programmes. As one described, “Just the experience [of Heartland], cause I never quite had the experience at this school” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

Although the parent participants talked little about their child’s school music programme, they gave the impression of having little expectation of schools. One parent was forthright about the need for schools to place more emphasis on music. “Well that’s really important, I think it’s really important that they really look seriously at introducing music into the curriculum for all children” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005). They also noted that music’s low profile at school was a factor in why they had not identified their child as having a high level of musical ability. As one stated, “because they wouldn’t have it otherwise. It identifies kids who don’t identify themselves. And as parents you don’t identify them. So you’ve got to have that outside thing, looking for kids who would benefit from it” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

Like the child participants, parents were quick to recognise that a confident music teacher was important for a successful school music programme. For example:

[In] Year 4 he was lucky to have [deleted by author] who was a very musical teacher. She was great for Michael because he had never had a teacher quite so into music as that before. That was a good building block for being part of what he then experienced in the Heartland Project. She introduced a lot of music more than other teachers necessarily do into her programmes. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

Furthermore, parent participants applauded the introduction of more music learning initiatives in schools. In this case, the parent thinks this may have been influenced by Heartland:

I’m quite impressed to see that this year they are actually bringing that [deleted by author] in. Now, that’s new as far as I know, and I was so rapt when I saw that. I just think that is marvellous. And I wondered whether that was an influence from the project occurring, or, if it just happens? (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

The parents recognised that the inclusion of specialist music teaching was a matter of school choice. As one put it, “That’s school to school isn’t it? Different schools think different things
are priority” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005). They recognised that specialist programmes, such as a continuation of Heartland, would be a financial challenge. As one stated, “Oh, I do think it’s a great idea, but it all costs money doesn’t it. To fund these things, to get teachers and instruments” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005). Concerning the equipment Heartland had introduced, it was apparent parents recognised it as an important factor in their child’s progress. For example, “I didn’t even know the value of it, but just to see the variety that they could have. And you know, obviously, the more variety, the more interesting things they were able to come up with using those tools” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005).

The school liaison teachers agreed the quality of the tutor and child relationships they perceived to evolve out of Heartland’s small group sizes was an important factor differentiating it from classroom music. As one described:

Well that’s the quality of the interactions, because you know the tutoring for example. The classroom teacher might have whole class, with some small group recorder work going, or some xylophones, or glockenspiels, or something. But, I think that end of quality, where you can work with one with two, just makes all the difference. It’s phenomenally powerful, compared to what a classroom teacher can realistically do with thirty two children in the class, who go from, ‘I don’t know which end of the recorder to hold’, to, ‘I’ve been doing recorder, but I can now play the flute and have for four years. And, you want me to play this thing again, and I’m playing doh ray me…B A G’. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

The liaison teachers expressed a degree of frustration about the challenge catering for a range of interests within a school class situation:

I think in a classroom context you’re covering a very wide range of ability, interest, talent whatever. I think with Heartland, the big difference is we know that they’ve got talent. And you’ve got that one on to one interaction, or one to two or three at the most you know…I mean, there’s no way that we can cater in any detail for a large group of children, particularly when it’s a really diverse group of interest (Liaison teacher, 2004).

They also noted that children with high musical ability are less likely to attract the teacher’s focus in a classroom programme. As one somewhat ruefully commented, “And even if you can group those children, you know that gifted group, the ones you don’t spend any time with, because they are already, well you know confident” (Liaison teacher, 2004). On that basis, they agreed that in a classroom context musical children were mostly likely to be extended through being encouraged to support each others independent work. For example, “Could you six go down to the library, ‘Let’s practice this piece’” (Liaison teacher, 2004). Interestingly, the children appeared to accept the leadership role. As a child participant put it, “You can sort of like get it fast and then teach all the others” (Yr 3 child participant, 2005). The liaison teachers also felt that the nature of a withdrawal programme, such as Heartland, aided a child’s motivation to learn. For example, “I
think the motivational factors are quite important too, with the comparison of working with a group or a class” (Liaison teacher, 2004).

The liaison teachers recognised the limitations of many generalist teachers, no matter how considerable their professional resources may be:

Good class room teachers know how to stretch at one end, and, also support at the other, because they have the basic skills behind them to do that. But with music, you’ve either got those specialist skills, you’ve either got a background in music, or you haven’t learnt an instrument. You know a little bit about musical theory, and so, while we can do classroom singing, and, do a little bit of percussion and beat and rhythm, we can’t necessarily take it that step forward. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

They were clear about the challenges teachers faced in trying to extend children’s musical growth due to the priorities imposed by the national curriculum. As one explained, “Schools with the best will in the world have to focus on basics. And, you know, we all teach music, but probably not managing to stretch these kids as far we probably do with their maths, and their language” (Liaison teacher, 2004). Similarly, the liaison teachers felt the lack of emphasis schools placed on music was a factor in children’s musical achievement. They sensed music was the last cab on the rank of curricula. As one put it, “[Music’s] probably the last area that we’ve tackled because we’ve been focusing on reading and writing and getting all those things back up to more respectable levels” (Liaison teacher, 2004).

The liaison teachers indicated that equipment was another issue affecting schools’ capacity to deliver effective music programmes. Like the parent participants, they were clear about the value of the resources Heartland was able to access. For example, “our kids got the opportunity to play with instruments, and sound systems, and things that had been completely out of their experience before. And that was a real buzz for all concerned” (Liaison teacher, 2004). The fact children were able to take instruments home to practice was clearly significant. As one put it, “… our kids taking their guitars home, and having keyboards at home to play with. I mean, that’s just a huge thing for our kids, to be able to have those resources available to them” (Liaison teacher, 2004).

Again, the quality of Heartland’s core tutors was a recurring theme for the liaison teacher participants. They were seen to have specific skills for encouraging musical achievement. As one put it:

it is a very special set of skills that get those things out of children. And I think if you don’t have the right people then things just don’t sort the same. You can make games, but they’re not the same sort of games. This is very specialist stuff. (Liaison teacher, 2004)
Unprompted, they suggested part of the difference between specialist tutors and generalist teachers lay with the emphasis placed on music in training, and questioned the typical assumptions about the musical capabilities of generalist teachers. For example:

[The generalist teachers] have skills and abilities of their own in writing reading and mathematics cause they were all successful at that to get into a professional course and to make a career out of teaching. So that’s a natural for them largely. Whereas music is something that you think everybody has, but they don’t. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

They suggested there was a decline in the percentage of teachers who can fulfil aspects of music teaching in schools, as one indicated about music skills:

How many teachers can play keyboards now? Not many. A generation ago every second you know junior school teacher would probably bang out on the piano but…even basic musical notation stretches a lot of people now. (Liaison teacher, 2004).

On the other hand, the tutor participants asserted that it was unreasonable to compare Heartland with classroom programmes. For one, this incommensurability was expressed in children’s initial conceptions of music tutors encountered in their professional lives. “oh, you’re going to sing on the piano’ or, like they don’t know, they don’t visualise music. So I think it isn’t comparable. It’s just completely different” (Tutor, 2004). In regard to school programmes, they all commented that, from their experience, singing was the main element in music programmes and that this offered limited potential for musical development. As one explained, “I think a lot of classes, most classes would probably have singing with other classes, maybe CDs. And I have hardly ever seen any instrumental work in classes” (Tutor, 2004). In short, “On the whole, most classroom environments, or school environments, wouldn’t provide a grounding of musical things, let alone extension.” (Tutor, 2004) However, the tutors were also quick to recognise the real constraints classroom teachers faced. For example, “I think the size, for me, teaching music as a general teacher and in the Heartland. The size difference is huge in the group, for the skill [work], and development of the creative” (Tutor, 2004).

As did parents and liaison teachers, the tutors identified that school choices plays a significant in what is offered. This was considered to be most evident in programmes for older children, for example, “Although, choirs and kapahaka and orchestral things particularly at intermediate… there’s opportunity for part singing and that kind of thing at intermediate level, which is of a reasonably high standard at certain schools” (Tutor, 2004). The tutors perceived this variation in the music teaching of Heartland’s schools, with some being seen to foster high musical achievement. For example, “it’s highly valued, and everyone’s respected at achieving highly. It’s not seen as abnormal, you know? It’s just a nice balance…. That it’s kind of a normality to be a high achiever” (Tutor, 2004).
When asked how they would address the challenge of a limited budget for a specialist school music programme, the tutors suggested ensemble playing as a core activity, though individual tuition would not be an option. One tutor responded:

You’d probably be able to gather the kids together in an ensemble, and then like what you did with your group, where they did some improvisation. You could identify individuals to do harder parts, within that context, and try and do it that way. (Tutor, 2004)

Furthermore, having seen the value of creative work within the Heartland programme, the tutors agreed that special strategies to foster creativity would be needed in a school situation:

creative work, within that you need other space, because of the sound and the management issues. It’s very difficult in one room, to have thirty kids doing creative activity. But it’s interesting at the intermediates, like they have half-classes where they go to art, or like half a class go to art and the other half stay with the teacher. And there’s systems in place for art subjects like that, and that’s ideal for music. (Tutor, 2004)

The tutors were also confident of the children’s potential to contribute to classroom music programmes and noted potential links to other curricula. One suggested having the Heartland children serve as mentors for classroom teachers who felt a lack of confidence:

A lot of classroom teachers are lacking confidence to initiate music, so they would buddy up with Heartland kids and they’d be set…. Otherwise it just doesn’t probably happen, and instead of the Heartland kids sitting in the classroom, not experiencing music with the [other] kids, then getting it from somewhere else. Why not get it happening? I mean they’re confident to be able to help out. (Tutor, 2004)

At the same time, the tutors agreed that integrating the skills of musically gifted children into the classroom setting would require a planned structure. If the children were to play a role in the classroom they would need to have confidence and a sense of integrity about what they were doing. As one tutor put it:

If kids were going to a unit on the sea or something in Term Four, you could set the Heartland kids up to maybe just play the chords for Yellow Submarine so they could, you know. Have the resources to actually do something. Because guaranteed if they’re not doing music, the teacher won’t know how to do it. They won’t know how to link the learning and the kids might say, ‘Well I don’t know how to do that’. You don’t want them just to be the person that goes and finds a CD to put on. It would be nice, like, Anna can play the guitar, so maybe there’s a way you can use those, the growing skills in a practical sense. (Tutor, 2004)

Finally, like the liaison teachers, the tutors believed musically gifted children could fulfil positive leadership roles with other children:
There'll always be other kids in the class that are musically inclined that aren’t in the Heartland project. So it’s more good partnering kids with maybe three kids in the class, you could then increase, double the size of their group, and have six kids going working with the [Heartland kids] being mentors kind of. And then you could follow on by having dance groups and things. (Tutor, 2004)

**Summary of music learning relative to school programmes**

The participants’ comments suggest there is little basis for comparing Heartland with classroom music programmes. Nonetheless, the data did clarify a number of factors that are likely to influence the quality of specialist music programmes:

- For all categories of participants, the availability of specialist knowledge was a significant factor in determining the effectiveness of classroom and extension based music programmes. The liaison teachers suggested the quality of the core tutors was integral to the high standard of musical skills expected of the Heartland children.

- Liaison teachers and tutors identified group learning as having significant advantages over classroom teaching, in terms of relationships, ability to foster individuals and creative music elements. They also favoured group work as it was seen to broaden the children’s horizon of what is possible.

- Parents and school liaison teachers considered the availability of equipment to be closely linked to the quality of musical outputs. Participants saw Heartland as offering superior teaching and physical resources compared to those commonly available in schools.

Participants from all categories thought that most generalist teachers did not have the attributes to provide for musically gifted children in their classroom. In the view of the tutor participants, most classrooms did not provide an appropriate musical groundwork for children in general. Furthermore, the liaison teachers agreed with one participant’s suggestion that generalist teacher qualifications standards are not well reflected in the musical confidence of an increasing number of recent teaching graduates. Moreover, personal practical music skills were seen to be becoming less typical amongst graduates, and the assumption that generalists could teach music effectively was no longer considered appropriate. Given this situation, it is not surprising that the parent participants commented that initiatives to introduce specialist music teachers into schools are desirable.

All participant groups recognised that schools have to make decisions about curriculum priorities. The child and parent participants believed these decisions typically disadvantaged musical provision within schools and I sensed they had a desire to have a say in such matters. The tutors and liaison teachers were clear that curriculum priorities now focused on mathematics and English. They felt that, while generalist teachers could cover the national standards requirements, they were unlikely to be able to meet children’s needs in areas such as music. Parents also felt that general classroom programmes were such that even if their child had a high musical ability, it was unlikely to be identified.
The tutors and liaison teachers concurred that musically gifted children could make a genuine contribution to the classroom music programme and modelling within the school. Given the appropriate planning, the Heartland children were identified as being able to offer leadership skills, the ability to work with other children, provide accompaniment skills and even bolster the musical knowledge of the generalist teacher.

**Links to wider curriculum achievement and social effects for child participants**

The child research participants were typically involved in Heartland learning activities for an hour per week, and substantially more for brief periods. For example, when a sharing time was imminent or a project such as *Journeys* was in preparation, a child could be involved for the equivalent of two days of the week. Transport took time, and there were other interruptions, such as performances in other schools, Heartland’s self evaluations, and data gathering for this research. In addition, there was the expectation of personal rehearsal, which most schools provided for within the school environs and, in a few cases, encouraged Heartland children to do in school time.

As described, the Individual Education Plans (see Appendix 3) for Heartland children were developed and undertaken with the teacher in charge of gifted education at Heartland’s administrative base, Queens High School. The Plans asked classroom teachers to record information about children’s classroom achievement under the following categories: learning independence, time management, leadership, knowledge transfer and classroom commitment. Individual Education Plans were recorded for eleven of the total of thirteen child participants. The prevalent rating for their achievement was above average, with a few listed as high achievers. Most were considered to be at Level Three or Four for mathematics and English. The following is a summary of the prevalent social and attitudinal ratings:

- Noticeably improved learning independence levels.
- Noticeably improved time management skills, with considerable improvement for a few.
- Noticeably improved leadership skills, with considerable improvement for a few.
- Noticeably improved knowledge transfer.
- Noticeably improved commitment, with considerable improvement for a few,
- One child was rated as having no improvement across all categories with the comment that the child was already achieving well prior to attending Heartland.

In regard to wider achievement, however, the comments mostly suggest no evidence of Heartland making either a positive or a negative difference. As described, in the case of Ainsley, who self withdrew from Heartland during 2005, the extent of disruption was noted as creating
difficulty in coping with classroom work. The teachers of some child participants were effusive about the positive social effects of Heartland. However, they were unsure if these gains were directly attributable to Heartland involvement. For example:

Organisationally, Allen has made gains and improvement in classroom behaviour is noted. His concentration levels have improved and these issues might have been a result of his involvement in Heartland. I hope it continues. (Heartland records, 2004)

Hard to ascertain, but for me and the children the programme has been brilliant. (Heartland records, 2004)

After the results of the first year became evident, the school liaison teachers noted their colleagues’ greater appreciation of what children might be gaining from Heartland. Initially, the liaison teachers noted that the classroom teachers simply coped with the disruption of children regularly leaving class. However, from 2004 the teachers recognised the quality of the work demonstrated in the school and wider community performances. Following this, the liaison teachers noted growing levels of support from the classroom teachers, particularly when they had a Heartland child in their class. The teachers were reported as seeing the benefits as socially oriented rather than terms of wider curriculum achievement. As a liaison teacher commented:

“Ours is really positive. I think any teacher who’s got kids going along to it was hugely supportive of it. And, they can sort of see the benefit of things, I mean whether its music or other things anyway” (Liaison teacher, 2004). In addition, there was a clear belief that Heartland contributed to a child’s ability to function independently. As one liaison teacher stated, “Expectations, nothing wrong with expectations! I think it’s fundamental of everything we do. So it’s fantastic and the fact the children have independence and make decisions…its great!” (Liaison teacher, 2004)

The child participants were asked about the effects of Heartland on their other school work and their feelings about Heartland being in school time. In their self–evaluations, the prevalent response was that they did not apply themselves more in class because of their involvement in Heartland, although there was a small positive shift in how they felt they used their personal time. Of interest, all the self-evaluations recorded that Heartland had no effect on their progress in other subjects, such as mathematics and English.

The child participants’ comments about application differed depending on their year of schooling. School Year Seven and Eight child participants recognised that while their classroom learning had returned to normal, they recognised detrimental effects caused by more extensive Heartland projects such as Journeys. As one said, ―I like it, but sometimes we miss out on an activity. And I don’t usually know what it is, and I end up getting rubbishy work‖ (Yr 2 child
participant, 2004). This may have been due to the fact the interviews took place only a few weeks prior to *Journeys* being performed at the town hall. Both groups of Year Four to Six child participants focused on the social ramifications of being out of class and appeared unconcerned about any effects on their learning. For example, “Sometimes I missed out on some puppets but I got to do that in some free time. And I got to take my puppet home to do” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

The prevalent response from the child participants in relation to learning focus was that they concentrated more in music lessons than in the classroom. Even Ainsley, who was not a fan of her instrument, commented, “I always concentrate on cello, because I like it. It’s easy to concentrate on something that you like eh. But I don’t concentrate in maths because I don’t like it” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

With respect to Heartland’s effect on other school subjects, the older participant group shared concerns about missed work and, when prompted, they realised they would have to catch up. The Year Four to Six child participants agreed there was no change either way to their class work. For example, “Music doesn’t really disturb my kind of…you know subjects in school” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004). The 2005 interview group involving those in their second and third year of Heartland spanning school Years Four to Eight, all agreed they were coping with the disruptive effects of being involved in Heartland. As one commented, “It hasn’t really affected like as in maybe work or anything like that ‘cause I’ve been missing time off school. I think I’m doing quite well” (Yr 2 & 3 child participants, 2005).

All the parent participants, whose children were in their second or third year of Heartland at time of interview, thought their child enjoyed school regardless of being in Heartland, and thought of it as adding extra value. For example:

> it was a nice little added bit and she has always had music at home. So she certainly enjoyed it and I think it helped. (Parent Yr 3 child participant, 2005)

> If you hadn’t had this, then I wouldn’t even have known about Anna’s ability. And, then there’s things that wouldn’t have been opened to her, and just stuff like that. (Parent participant, 2004)

Consistent with the Individual Education Plans, all parent participants were confident that their child was achieving appropriately in the classroom. For example:

> She knows that she can sort of, she can put her maths aside, you see. She knows that she’ll just be able to pick it up later on. She just finds maths so easy and stuff like that so if she wants to learn it she’ll just go ahead and play around with her guitar. (Parent, Yr 2 child participant, 2004)
She’s good at English anyway. Although she doesn’t have much confidence in her Maths she is in extension Maths class. (Parent, Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

Despite the disruptive effects of Heartland, the prevailing mood of the parents’ comments suggested they were relaxed about their child’s learning and that they had confidence in the child’s self-motivation to catch up. As one said:

Ainsley said she misses out on a couple of things…that she’d like to do. Every now and then something’s happening and she said, “Oh, I couldn’t do that because I was at music”. So I guess, that’s always a trait at school. I don’t know where else she’d fit it in if it wasn’t at school. And she can catch up if it’s work she’s missing. (Parent, Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

The parent participants offered no specific learning effects when asked about any learning differences they had noticed because of Heartland involvement. As with the Individual Education Plans, improvements in motivation were not necessarily attributed to Heartland. As one parent commented:

I’m not sure really, because I suppose at the same time, they are getting older aren’t they. So they change as well. So I don’t know, I know she certainly enjoyed it, and, it was good especially in the last year, because that last year in Primary can be quite, can drag along. (Parent, Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

However, in terms of broader social development, the parents referred to their children’s cognitive growth and increased confidence outside of specific curriculum learning, which they attributed to Heartland participation:

I think it definitely expands their mind. So I think it’s got to be beneficial. We had no signs of any negativity from him being away from certain classes, missing out on anything academic. (Parent, Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

It’s hard to pinpoint things, but I think it does affect their whole, the way they learn other things because their confidence increases. They think they’re special, they know they’ve got an ability – but it’s hard to sort of say, “Well yes, that’s improved or this”. But just, it does affect them, influences them. (Parent, Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

Finally, all of the parent participants expressed a little pride in the achievement demonstrated by the growth of their child’s musical capability:

Heidi got the cultural award at the end of the year…. She did it is all framed at the top of the piano, yeah so they only handed out one and she got it so and look she was just over the moon with that award that was like she really was thrilled it’s a framed certificate and she had tears in her eyes she was so thrilled…I’m sure it was the music side of things. (Parent, Yr 3 child participant, 2005)
Although the tutors did not directly discuss wider achievement, as noted, they attached significance to instances when a more detailed picture of a child’s learning was in conversation with a classroom teacher. The tutors felt more deliberate communication could influence how children achieved in the classroom. As one indicated:

I wondered if it could work both ways. These kids come to be kind of out of context. I see them in a musical setting, see how they go, but I’m also interested in the ones that are disruptive here. What are they like in the classroom? And the teachers too are interested, because they see these kids in this context, and they want to know what’s changing, what’s different, what’s developing, and how do we find them? (Tutor, 2004)

In line with this, the tutors highlighted the children’s creative attributes as a possible area of interest for classroom teachers. For example:

It wasn’t until the end of the year when they had an overall reflective time looking back, and seeing what kids have achieved. Then, they got the actual capabilities of children and what they can [do]…. They [classroom teachers] can see, that a child might be creative in their thought processes, and things where they might be able to identify it. (Tutor, 2004)

We’re doing speech making at the moment and they [children] have chosen the Heartland tutors as their topics to write about they’ve written some really lots and lots of superlatives about the programme and the people that are who they are working with. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

**Summary of wider achievement implications**

The Individual Education Plans showed at least noticeable improvement in the categories of learning independence, time management, leadership, knowledge transfer. However, these gains were not necessarily attributed to the programme, rather to a blend of school and maturation. Parent views were similar, although they identified Heartland as helping to broaden their children’s cognitive perspectives and personal confidence in a more pronounced way than natural maturation.

The Individual Education Plans and commentary from all research participants suggested that Heartland did not improve or detract from most children’s wider curricular achievement. This seems an important finding in consideration of the level of commitment required of children by Heartland. Furthermore, the tutors in particular believed the stimulation of children’s creative aptitude was something classroom teachers valued.

While a few of the child participants’ Individual Education Plans noted concern about classroom learning, no research participants revealed misgivings about a child’s achievement. This, coupled with the frequent comments about the social and personal benefits, as well as significant musical growth and confidence resulting from Heartland suggests, that most of the child participants
gained significantly from this in school provision, while continuing to achieve at appropriate levels in other curriculum areas.

**Participant perceptions about the implications of Music Heartland for school programmes**

This section reports on commentary about music as a catalyst for gifted and talented provision, the appropriateness of Heartland’s withdrawal procedures, and the model’s applicability to other curricula.

Parent participants offered a range of perceptions about music as a vehicle for gifted programmes. One parent noted that another subject was her child’s strength and another maintained that it was important for children to be able to make a choice. “I think I’d leave it a little bit up to the child, what they wanted, what they enjoyed doing. If they really enjoyed maths I’d go with maths. If they enjoyed music, if they have an ability in it, fine” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004). At the same time, they also considered music to have a lower profile than other areas of the curriculum. One commented:

I think because it’s something that wasn’t offered already, I would always go with music personally. There are other things offered, like we have got Science fairs for the Science, that brings out extra things for the Science. There is Maths exams nationwide, worldwide, that the children are invited. There isn’t anything extra to Music. It’s not brought into school. The school teachers say, ‘Oh these children are really good at Maths, we will put them into the Australian Maths competition, and these ones are really good with Science, there is a Science thing going’. But there isn’t a Music thing that they say, ‘Oh!’ until the project came along. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005)

In response to the question, “Should [Minister of Education] Mr Mallard continue to pay for the programme?” all the child participants were in agreement that this should be the case, some to the point of outright enthusiasm:

We could have a career in music…and you might as well get started. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

I think it should keep on going, cause its very good for us kids here, getting the technology in our brains. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

Some children won’t actually really like it, but probably 90% of children would like it. (Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

And perhaps the most compelling of all, one child observed, “If the whole world were playing, they would know what it would be like” (Yr 2 child participant, 2004).

All the participants were optimistic about a possible future for the kind of programme Heartland offered, with the typical response being, “Hopefully the schools can pick it up” (Parent Yr 2 child
participant, 2004). In the interviews, the liaison teacher and tutors’ comments consistently focused on possible future strategies for musically gifted children. This appeared to stem from the perceptions of overall success, the quality of learning, and the growing support amongst school staff. The liaison teachers expressed a clear and strategic desire for continuation, for example:

I’ve had a really positive experience of having a Heartland project at school. One would hope that this school would make staffing decisions that which would continue to you know run something for those kids…that’s where I’d be coming from. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

We’ll carry on cause we’re investing about ten [thousand] a year in our ensemble sort of school music programme anyway. But one of our issues…tutor options, that is an issue for us. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

Along with the recurring theme of the need for music teaching expertise, there was general agreement among the participants that any future programme would require investment in the appropriate equipment. For example:

I can see that changing as we probably next year spend more money on actually getting a lot more of our own resources actually into classrooms. Not talking about CD’s and things I mean actual musical instruments…. Cause we have shortages of some things, and too many of other things. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

The parent participants concurred that their children were fortunate to be learning in a school involved in Heartland. Their mood indicated gratitude, as they identified Heartland as one of only a few national initiatives for gifted and talented children:

I’ve worked with people who pretty much all come from other parts of town. They had never heard of anything like Heartland Project and I, you know, I thought we were really lucky that we are in the area that. (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2004)

Again, the parents supported the continuation and expansion of a programme modelled on Heartland. While recognising the financial barriers for schools, one commented in relation to the importance of the school years for musical development, that “something like this should be able to spread, and be available to all the schools’ programme for gifted and talented children” (Parent Yr 2 child participant, 2005).

Heartland was one of the few contestable projects funded by the Ministry of Education during 2003 and 2005 that was almost exclusively taught by specialists and conducted on a withdrawal basis. At an administrative level, there were no adverse participant comments about extra workloads in schools, or the total teaching resource being committed to utilising external tutors. From a learning perspective, running the programme within a withdrawal framework meant that the most appropriate available tutors could work with children, that children worked with other
children of likeminded interest from the same or other school(s), and that equipment and teaching resources were used effectively.

There was recurring recognition that the children’s musical achievement, together with Heartland’s overt profile, awoke the interest of other children. As one liaison teacher commented, “But this project’s been really good for our school in that, it’s given opportunities first of all, in the first year, for other kids to actually see what music was about” (Liaison teacher, 2004). However, the liaison teachers were clearly aware of research pointing to possible negative issues relating to withdrawal based programmes. As one commented, “It’s interesting. Because a lot of the research says, ‘Don’t have too many pull out programmes’. It does say, ‘Differentiate them if you can’” (Liaison teacher, 2004). Nevertheless, in the progression of the interview I sensed perceptions about the effectiveness and attributes of Heartland shifted normal support for differentiation gently but firmly to the side. First, about music:

But music seems…if you’re going to get to the really high end of music, this [Heartland] seems the classic. You can’t just have a good hearted teacher working a little harder for these children. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

Second, as one liaison teacher reflected, the focus on Heartland’s potential moved to opportunities for the wider curriculum:

It makes you wonder actually whether a lot of these ideas can be stretched, not just from gifted and talented children but from struggle in the classroom for any number of reasons; give them these sort of opportunities. I mean you could, there’s a lot of you could go a long way with this, couldn’t you? (Liaison teacher, 2004)

Third, the interview appeared to prompt deeper thinking about the nature of giftedness, as one asked:

I think the having clear criteria for selection for children, that in itself, that sort of little process, needs thinking about well. What does gifted and talented mean in music? Well what does it really mean in English in Writing and Mathematics. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

Significantly, I felt the goals that the teachers iterated for other curricula now reflected their schools’ Heartland involvement. In that regard, a fourth theme in my perception of a shift in support towards withdrawal based programmes was increased significance being attached to gifted children producing in a genuinely creative manner. As one teacher commented in relation to identification and teaching processes:

I think you’d have a totally different approach…but the emphasis I guess on the creative end. I think is really powerful. And that would link into Mathematics you know. How can you be Mathematically creative? (Liaison teacher, 2004)
[teachers] go for harder work, but it’s the same work. And you don’t really go into creative mathematics or design or problem solving in a big way…. And sometimes it’s cause well again I guess that the expertise has to be there…if not knowledge and background. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

Finally, the interview appeared to generate a buzz of excitement as the liaison teachers spoke of the effects of applying a specialist withdrawal approach to other curricula in their schools. For example:

when you actually see a mathematical person working with a child you suddenly realize, ‘No! You’ve got no skills at all in maths’…. We had a child who’s particularly gifted, particularly competent in mathematics. And for a year (deleted by author) was coming out to work with him, one to one. It was just courtesy of the college or somebody. It was amazing, it was fantastic, what this little boy could do. And it made me realize that even my doing third and fourth form task activities algebra and things with him, the creativity that Andrew could bring to problem solving, or just a variety of different things he would do.

And I’d go that’s very creative, that’s very deep, and that really has strong parallels with music. That it’s the competence of the tutors who make the difference there. And I suspect it’d be that competence and creativity of the mathematical tutor that would make the difference. And the danger is, that we might think that because its maths, we could more effectively do that ourselves, if only we had some more teaching hours or something. Whereas, it’s quite possible, actually, no! That actually, that’s another set of very specialist skills where you need highly competent people, with very high level of understandings of mathematics, to really make that fly. (Liaison teacher, 2004)

**Summary of school implications**

All participants saw advantages in continuing Music Heartland, along with a wish that more children could share the benefits of such a programme. In this, there was genuine excitement in the responses of all participants. Even so, the tutors strongly emphasised the importance of identifying high musical potential for any other programme to match the musical achievement of the Heartland children. In addition, many of the adult participants recognised that music was in a more vulnerable position than most other curricula in regards to the integrity of extension programmes.

The possibility of applying the Heartland model to other situations was widely viewed as dependent on the availability of specialist tutors and the particular virtues of a withdrawal based programme. The findings relating to school capability and comments from the adult participants clearly suggest that programmes based on classroom differentiation would not be able to produce the same quality of results or have a similar impact on school communities. Finally, the weight of the data indicates the participants considered the children’s musical experience during their involvement in Heartland to be unique and of relevance to other gifted initiatives, particularly in terms of creativity, shared musical learning and individual skill development. Hence, while there
was a clear perception that without the rationale and resources of Heartland the kind of results would be unlikely to recur, at least in their entirety, the challenge of replication does not detract from the notion that Heartland was an inspirational model of provision, with application to other curricula.

Much of Heartland’s success was dependent on the flexibility of tutors and schools in particular. These two factors allowed children to be immersed in best pedagogical practice and quality learning relationships, as well as excitement and commitment to high end musical and some cross curricular achievement. Therefore, the confidence I have encountered in informal communication with child participants like Anna up to 2011 comes as no surprise based on the assessment of her tutor at the end of 2005:

Anna has become an established guitarist and is continuing to show great ability in her all-round playing skills…. Creating her own songs and music is also important for her musical development. Even a bit of singing (Tutor, 2005).

Since I believe this data has lifelong implications for Anna, to investigate the pathways of her and fellow child participants beyond 2005 is certainly a priority for further research.
Chapter 5: Discussion, Conclusions and Epilogue

Introduction

In this chapter, I explore the most cogent threads of the findings; child participant ensemble and creative product. This introduction reviews the choice of these, leading to two interdependent discussions and theoretical consideration. The chapter ends with the study’s conclusions, preceded by explanation of my approach to these in the frame of the research questions and anticipated implications, as detailed in the study’s ethics proposal.

It is appropriate to restate my lens as a researcher; one of focus on parameters and outcomes that could be achievable in mainstream New Zealand schools for a sizeable group of children, identifiable as musically gifted. Many of the children and adults that I have had the privilege of working with have developed musically as a result of mainstream education in New Zealand; a system which I think can proudly take much responsibility for the diversity of musicianship that emerges from it. In regard to applicability, Jorgensen (2007) calls for a redefining of musical equity in Western communities. She suggests five steps for action, one of which relates to research and the study of school music programmes. She notes that “too many research studies in music education are vacuous, trivial, or are remote from the practitioners that most need them” (p. 192). She calls for studies that directly explore realities of classroom teaching and learning in music with a view to critiquing the concepts that evolve from data for the applicability to teachers and policy makers.

Similarly, throughout my career I have witnessed overwhelmingly positive effects of intervention, of planning specific opportunity, of working to build the effectiveness of a focused musical community. In regard to interventional approaches, John Feldhusen (2005) writes persuasively about the integration and enhancement of giftedness, talent, expertise, and creative achievement, as well as the role of educators within that. He describes a positive blend of events for a child, given the benefit of innate potential, en route to diverse degrees of prominence, be it in international or community situations. In the context of this study, importantly I think, he identifies that deliberate innovation is important:

The nurturance of gifts and talents also calls for opportunities at all grade levels to be engaged in higher-order thinking activities: planning, monitoring, evaluating, and problem solving. It is also essential for talented youth to be able to develop a large base of declarative and procedural knowledge.  (p. 75)

Hence, while a wide range of data generated themes were compiled and developed in the findings, it was the applicability of the research questions themselves which influenced the selection of two product forms (ensemble and creative) as the basis of deeper discussion.
Throughout the study, I felt no justification for revisiting the research questions as they had sat comfortably with me in the journey of preparing, gathering, and analysing data, and drawing theoretical implications. They remained as:

- What are discernible effects of the programme on gifted children’s achievement and self-efficacy?
- How is enriched music learning viewed by child, parent, teacher and community?
- On what basis can communities, schools and other providers legitimately define and take ownership of approaches to musically gifted children? What are useful processes for scrutinising process effectiveness and child efficacy identifiable as the result of any unique approach?

In regard to discernible effects of the programme and how the learning was viewed, from both musical and theoretical perspectives, I was frankly surprised by the diversity and quality of ensemble and creative outputs, and the possibility of reciprocal influence between these and developing instrumental skills. Hence, consideration of theoretical implications around the third research question which focuses on ownership, effective process, and evaluation was able to be grounded in the analysis of these pieces and the rich participant commentary pertaining to the ensemble and creative work. Even with the support of my supervisors, however, the choice of ensemble and creative outputs as the most fertile ground for discussion and theoretical consideration remained problematic. I was well aware that deeper discussion was warranted in regard to the qualities of tutors; the relationship between tutors (Heartland) and classroom teachers; child participants’ well-being and relationship with peers; the extent of wider or cross-curricular achievement; resource implications; and perhaps most significant, Heartland’s identification practices. In response to these potential gaps, albeit not as discrete entities, I endeavoured to include meaningful aspects as contributing influences within the respective ensemble and creative activity discussions. I carried this strategy over to the study’s final conclusions, meaning that their credibility and applicability is also underpinned by the noted contributing themes. In the interests of transparency, in drawing conclusions from the theory and implications considered in the discussion, I sided with Maykut and Morehouse’s (1994) suggestion that “some of your propositions are likely to be more important than others in contributing to an understanding of your focus of inquiry” (p. 413).

The conclusions (Part 3) are introduced in their own right. I think it suffices to say here that the two gathering points, school-wide and music conclusions reflect all three of the research questions, although, the latter two carry more weight because of their inherent link to implications and applicability (Silverman, 2005).
Part 1: The effects and effectiveness of advanced performance ensemble work in the Music Heartland Project

The purposes of ensembles from second year onwards were to offer focused application of instrumental work, a reinforcement of general musicianship, and to be a vehicle for diverse performance across the community of schools that Heartland served. The findings suggested surprising growth in individual musicianship, ability to learn diverse and complex music more quickly, confidence evidenced by solo work, elements of improvisation ability, and fundamental music skills which appeared to be transferable to other instrument playing. Further, the work of ensembles from 2004 and 2005 revealed substantial overt child involvement and ownership of process, musical independence, and cohesion in child participant’s performance compared to the 2003 product. Because most child participants were not experiencing other ensembles in their school or community, it would seem the enhanced levels of sophistication in playing and ensemble performance could be attributed to their Heartland experiences.

The findings serve to highlight what I perceive as a dichotomy in the approach of literature to the value of ensemble participation. Classically oriented ensemble training is valued for sophisticated musicianship, and is credited with long lasting outcomes for rhythmic organisation and listening (Roulston, 2006). Less formal ensembles, for example school percussion groups, have received little attention in the literature and are attributed with producing more vibrant but fleeting outcomes. For example, Silence (2009) suggests informal percussion bands are robust and allow creative exploration of sound, noise and teamwork. However, based on Heartland findings I question the legitimacy of differentiating what might be termed low-brow school percussion ensembles. Child participants involved in both formal and informal situations gained musicianship and musical understandings from both. In support, Van de Geer’s (2008) investigation of Marimba Bands, albeit with a more consistent instrumental makeup but similar to Heartland ensembles in their formal and informal approaches, cites Barrett (2005) and Wenger (1998) in describing overarching outcomes as “an affirming community of musical practice through which they gained musical insight and affirmation associated with ‘being’ a performer” (Van de Geer, p. 8).

In Heartland advanced ensembles, specific music gains included sensitivity to structural matters, rhythm, tonality and harmony, along with ready ability to memorise, which according to Winner and Martino (2000) are indicators of musical giftedness. In addition, advanced ensemble rehearsal and performance processes appear to have enhanced speed of learning and tenacity (Subnotik & Jarvin, 2005), particularly once tutors and children better appreciated what individuals and groups might possibly achieve. Hence, being mindful of the diversity of ensemble types and more
intense timetabling during 2005 in particular, it might be said that the performance of the child participants began to reflect what Davidson and Scripp (1992) describe as a reliance on integrated cognitive skills and holistic application of music elements. Further, that integrated cognitive strategies were observable in the child participants’ ability to recall pieces with minimal rehearsal, cope with a range of repertoire, and demonstrate musical depth and skill transfer from one ensemble situation to another.

The 2004 and 2005 emphasis on bringing the most gifted children together, giving them substantial experience, and choosing ensemble sizes of eight to twelve children appeared to be influential factors in promoting desirably advanced outcomes. The logistics for the group that performed at the Wellington Gifted and Talented Hui\(^{94}\) (2005) is an obvious example, because of its targeted selection and half-day sessions spread over a school term. The three child participants’ musicianship grew significantly during the life of the ensemble, and most notably Youyhun’s sensitivity to structure i.e. improvisation and transposition (Winner & Martino, 2000). Like Haroutounian (2000), I think the findings show the importance of distinguishing between sensitivity and technique in the evaluation of children’s responses. As in many school situations, Heartland’s ensembles were percussion oriented, modular, and frequently children were playing instruments that they had been learning for about a year. Hence, rather than a raw brilliance or technical mastery being a somewhat facile benchmark, growth signals tended to be subtle including evolving structural sensivities (Winner & Martino, 2000), musical nuance, and growth of self-efficacy within the ensemble situation. Hence, as Davidson and Scripp (1992) record about musical giftedness, in a group situation it may still be movement toward cognitive integration of music elements, their production, perception and reflection which favourably sway the observer about an individual, rather than a singular focus on accuracy.

In that vein, the social collaborative effects of the advanced ensembles warrant discussion. For example, individuals were less tentative when performing in these ensembles, and in responding to others, acclaim for groups surpassed that accorded to individuals. Similarly, tutors would typically reserve the most comprehensive ensemble piece(s) as the climactic end to a group’s performance. Further, while there was comparison and competitiveness amongst children from different ensembles, it was light-hearted and appeared to act as a productive social force. As children and adults came to apparently understand more about the journey to a good level of performance, all ensembles received increasingly enthusiastic support.

---

94 In Te Reo Māori Hui refers to a meeting or conference.
VanTassel-Baska (2005) asserts the importance of collaborative group work in gifted programmes. This is because of the potential in this work to adequately challenge the most musically able individuals, while creating a rich musical environment for the child making less rapid progress. Similarly, Stollery and McPhee’s (2002) research identifies the will to participate with others as the one common element across models of gifted music provision identified in schools. They also detail several potentially paralyzing factors including variable access to provision, and significantly in this context, high expectations of individual performance and associated feelings of embarrassment about perceived poor performance (Stollery & McPhee, 2002).

Stollery and McPhee (2002) call for reduced emphasis on giftedness or intelligence in schools’ efforts to fulfil all children’s musical potential. However looking more closely, their description of an effective curriculum highlights diversity of performance, which in my view implies ensemble elements, and therefore selection. Similarly, they call for quality of learning, which has implications for time and resources about which schools make choices. Furthermore, they cite Spychiger (1988, as cited in Stollery and McPhee, 2002) as they emphasise the importance of teacher pedagogy in the quality of children’s outputs. As I interpret these three parameters, they appear to be reinforcing unique approaches to individuals and groups, as undertaken in Heartland, rather than a school’s approach to the whole school population.

Of significance, in my view, the child participants’ involvement levels seemed indicative of community, i.e. growth in cohesiveness and shared pride from on-going work and performance. Looking at key performances such as the end of year sharing times, the mood was clearly more than relief about successful playing. Enhanced self-efficacy, as well as a sense of authority in children’s musicianship was evident in these performances, along with spontaneous music making, and informal conversation anticipating future ensemble activity amongst the child participants. These were no better demonstrated than in the spontaneous part singing and conversation on the return flight from Wellington by the group of children who performed at the MoE Hui in Wellington.

In contrast, Walberg and Paik’s (2005) research amongst young gifted artists and scientists reveals that while they express similar preferences, the latter are likely to find books more interesting than people, whereas artists have a more social outlook and preference for emotional closeness. Moltzen (2004a) cites Winner’s (1996) description of gifted children’s tendency to be precocious, and approach learning independently in unique and novel ways. The instrumental product evident in Heartland’s advanced ensembles offers substantial evidence of that. However, it came in a social frame, and in that regard Taylor (2004) cites Porter (1999), in reinforcing the need for
gifted children to have similarly able peers as friends and workmates. There are wider social effects too, as Taylor cites Gross (1999) in exploring a possible dilemma for gifted children; whether or not to lower personal expectations to achieve social acceptance.

In the case of Heartland’s more advanced ensembles, positive commentary about involvement suggests that they provided adequate stimulus for child participants to move past social inhibitions, or will to distance themselves. As observable both in participant commentary and in practice, the learning amongst groups of children of similar ilk and interest contributed to a sense of community, as well as empowered individual child participants. The attitudes of child participants in rehearsals and performance appear to reflect Walberg and Paik’s (2005) finding that artists sustain a focus out of aesthetic satisfaction, and in Heartland’s case, a collaborative one at that. Hence, with findings indicating authentic performance opportunity, and a high expectation of quality, Van de Geer’s (2008) conclusion about group enculturation in the development of musical understandings appears relevant:

It enhances and affirms their musical understanding and enculturation which provides a foundation within a significant and meaningful musical context. Within this context students are able to engage in music making through which they develop deeper musical understandings, and make meaning of musical terms such as beat, rhythm, dynamics, timbre, texture, structure and form etc (Van de Geer, 2008, p. 9).

An interesting parallel with findings concerning advanced ensembles is elements of reciprocity with concurrent instrumental learning. To summarise, where children played the instrument they were learning through Heartland, they were more successful and confident in larger mixed ensembles than as part of duos or trios on the same instrument type. Furthermore, findings based on reporting and performances indicate there were advantages where a child and tutor shared longer periods of involvement, as well as more than one type of learning, e.g. ensemble and instrumental learning. Hence, it appears that while particular instrumental expertise is obviously critical for teaching an instrument, the substance of a tutor’s interaction with children influences the quality of ensemble work and challenge that individual children are offered.

Exploring the reasons why child participant instrumental learning was enhanced by ensemble participation, I tentatively propose that it reflected on-going crystallising effects (Freeman, 2004; Stollery and McPhee, 2002). As evidence, child participants were positive about outcomes of

---

95 The intent of Heartland, and the flexible approach of the tutors meant, that no matter which instrument a child was learning in Heartland, ensembles became integral in the purpose for learning. Hence, be it their first or second instrument, the child participants mostly played it in the advanced ensembles, sometimes after as few as twenty half hour lessons.

96 As indicated, to achieve this kind of synergy between child participants and tutors was a key factor in the truncation of the range of instruments available for Year Two Heartland children to learn in 2005. In 2005, most of the children played guitar or keyboard as their main instrument.
their instrumental learning, but more effusive about the motivational effect of ensembles. Further, they cited ensembles rather than individual performance as the preferred option for showing off their music learning. The findings also suggest that parents realised children working together in ensembles motivated their child, an outcome that they did not see as typical from private music learning situations. Similarly, throughout my performance life I have observed a strengthening of individual potential out of focused team work in ensemble rehearsal and performance. While typically unspoken, individual playing strengths and needs are clarified, group expectations of achievement appear to motivate individuals beyond personal expectations, and horizons of individuals seem to expand about their instrument’s expressive and technical qualities.

The wish to provide authentic purpose for instrumental learning seemed to encourage a diversity of ensembles and applications in Heartland. For example, ensembles featured the first improvisations of a few older child participants, keyboard based ensembles meant even initial learning could be celebrated, culturally themed ensembles combined dance, voice and movement, and second instrument learning meant children could feature on different instruments in a sharing time after a few months of tuition. These appeared to encourage positive responses to diverse roles and expectations amongst child participants, as well as to enhance their ensemble skills and awareness. It was in larger ensembles, rather than individual or small group performances, that most child participants showed the greatest panache on their instrument, and progressed toward what Csikszentmihalyi (1996) describes as flow: automatic, effortless production representative of highly focused consciousness.

Stollery and McPhee’s (2002) research into giftedness provision asserts the importance of sheer technical facility, drive and sustained effort in the quest for musical excellence. Similarly, Subnotik and Jarvin (2005) list gains in technical proficiency as second only to speed of learning within contributing factors to early musical competency. However, in the case of Heartland, an interesting phenomenon occurred. The ensemble experiences appeared to make up for what I think most musicians would agree was a skeletal instrumental learning programme97, even though the latter was the part of Heartland’s programme from which I initially predicted instrumental technique would evolve. In effect, the evidence seems to show crystallising effects, speed of learning, and interweaving of production and reflection processes emerged in advanced ensemble learning and performances, in spite of sometimes quite limited technical instrumental progress. Further, Heartland’s advanced ensembles emerged as the most effective learning environment for encouraging those matters, which Ziegler (2005) identifies as central to excellence: explicit

97 From keyboard and theory, and other instrumental learning child participants received fifteen to twenty four thirty minute lessons per year.
positive feedback on what is done well, opportunity to apply inert knowledge and apply variation of learned strategies, child anticipation of new learning needs, and engagement through feed-forward and feedback loops. Stollery and McPhee’s (2002) claim that a requirement of a quality music curriculum is, that “[Children] should be involved in activities that allow them to respond to a greater extent at their own level of ability.” (p. 99)

Certainly, I believe that the expectations of Renzulli and Reis’s (1985) Type II Enrichment, including higher level thinking and feeling, and connection to higher level studies were pronounced in the advanced ensembles. Critical to this, I think, were factors of stability and co-adaptation, which Ziegler (2005) notes as necessary for educators to construct in a modern day giftedness conception. It seems to me that the consistency and sustained focus of Heartland tutors, as well as flexibility in the nature and development of ensembles meant that the nature and extent of reciprocity between ensemble and instrumental learning was significantly heightened.

Drawing implications for possible application in other situations, such outcomes appear likely where the teachers leading ensembles are attuned to and encouraging of diversity in individual musicianship, in parallel with growth in proficiency and achievement of meaningful goals for the ensemble. Further, the Heartland results suggest that the ensembles offer authentic opportunities for children to contextualise instrumental learning, give incentive for personal application, and encourage exploration and refinement of specific skills, as they strive to meet the demands of particular pieces and their roles within these. Lastly, based on child participants’ performance in a diversity of genre, Heartland ensembles appeared to give opportunity for gifted children to demonstrate powers of musical insight, which as I interpret it, aligns with Stollery and McPhee’s (2002) suggestions for encouraging musical intelligence and gifts.

Finally, what can be said about the qualities of musicianship that the ensembles represented? According to Swanwick (1999), it is performance on which we reflect most keenly, and from an aesthetic perspective he suggests that performance qualities are indicators of ability to respond to conventions as well as deviation from musical norms. At the same time, he questions the legitimacy of much classroom music making because of its remoteness from real world contexts. It is true that many of Heartland’s ensembles could be considered odd in that their instrumentation interwove musical styles and genres. However, as children progressed to second and third year Heartland participation, there was increasing evidence of two way transfer between their personal skills and genre and cultural styles. Similarly, the children showed more confidence about contributing for the sake of the group. These gains led to other valuable outcomes, such as Matapo’s early commitment and resolve setting him up to accompany his tutor, most child
participants showing greater surety in solo opportunities, and the performance confidence of smaller groups increasing. In my mind, these are indicative of qualities of ownership, cohesion and personal determination, and comparable with the responses of lead individuals that I observe in community ensembles. In line with Swanwick’s (1999) assertion about performance, child participant’s reflections suggest that ensembles were significant and influential in creating a sense of musical satisfaction and mastery, regardless of their diverse makeup and style.

Kwami (2001) writes of the challenges of pluralist education in reference to cultural authenticity. Another challenge for schools is sustaining the interest of older children. Most commonly this is managed through introduction of popular music ensembles, perceived to be a more inclusive and motivating frame for music making. Like Buckton (2003), I attach much importance to teachers endeavouring to bring music education closer to children’s experiences. However, the responses of child participants across the diversity of ensembles from rock to chamber music leads me to question the use of popular music as the predominant way to appeal to children and foster involvement and motivation. Yes, the musicianship varied across Heartland ensemble types, but the complementary nature of child participant skill-sets, along with similarity of perceptions about self-efficacy, indicated comparable enjoyment of each style and ensemble type. By implication, it would seem that the level of challenge and the integrity of learning does influence older children’s commitment and participation.

As to the integrity of learning, Kwami (2001) highlights the importance of timbre to unique forms of music98, and that some music requires a holistic aesthetic99 appreciation. However, he also acknowledges the importance of informed flexibility in how an original cultural expression might grow, or become enriched as a new form of product (Kwami, 2001). On that basis, it seems to me that qualities apparent in the array of Heartland’s advanced ensembles, including informed tutor knowledge, intensity of rehearsal, and evidence of critique, re-interpreting and re-creating (Kwami, 2001) validates them as authentic examples of expression in the school setting. That is, while the music is typically derivative and simplified, given the planned application and synthesis evident in the learning processes as they occurred in Heartland, growth of meaningful and authentic musicianship appear as likely outcomes. This could be an antidote to the feelings that Csikszentmihaly (2002) notes:

Our culture seems to have been placing a decreasing emphasis on exposing young children to musical skills…. Deprived of serious exposure to music, children grown into teenagers who make up for their early deprivation by investing inordinate amounts of psychic energy

98 For example, a school drum is unlikely to capture the intensity of the djembe.

99 For example, the individual skill set for gamelan playing pales in significance to development of whole group aesthetic sensitivity in the Indonesian Orchestra.
into their own music. They form rock groups, buy tapes and records, and generally become captives of a subculture that does not offer many opportunities for making consciousness more complex. (p. 112)

Further, as part of Jill Bevan-Brown’s (2004) recommendations for Māori children, she encourages the growth of special abilities within the child’s Māoritanga. As she highlights, heightened self-esteem and confidence developed in the cultural setting initially are likely to result in a child fulfilling his/her potential. In one sense I concur, particularly about the path to early identification. However I am mindful that children grow amongst a multiplicity of cultural references (Mansfield, 2003) and, as Swanwick (1999) suggests, it is best to feel at home amongst many. Hence, I suggest that Heartland’s advanced ensembles had legitimacy because the elements of Māori and Pasifika Tikanga were clear but that they were also synchronous with the concept that all music shares the same evolutionary roots (Lerdahl, 2003). Adult performers and creators work within multiple cultural frames, and according to Hargreaves (1999), the need is to be innovative rather than display close adherence to one political or cultural construction of music and/or musical expression.

I close this section by noting that Stollery and McPhee (2002) and Murphy (1999) call for an inclusive curriculum which endeavours to put the existence or nature of musical giftedness to one side for the benefit of all learners. While as a music educator I support the intent on an ethical basis, like VanTassel-Baska (2005) I identify a rubber band effect which is traceable to innate differences. Educators may push for growth in every child, but there is good reason to understand that there are differences in the amount of stretch available amongst individuals. As I see it, the variation of responses amongst the child participants as part of advanced ensembles supports VanTassel-Baska’s (2005) view:

The role of education is to provide the experiences that may stretch an individual’s potential in his or her areas of greatest flexibility for learning. This recognition of pre-existing individual differences should help educators realise the folly of trying to find a ‘one size fits all’ programme of study or curriculum. (p. 365)

On the basis of Heartland experiences, it would seem that school ensembles are likely to produce educational and community returns to the extent and integrity of leadership and resources (time and equipment) are made available. It is possible to enhance individuals’ determination to respond innovatively and fulfil challenging performance expectations. It may also heighten personal reciprocity with instrumental learning, thereby the instrument gaining greater relevance for a child alongside more authentic application of transferrable skills. Considering how ensembles assist music learning, as VanTassel-Baska (2005) suggests about the classroom, while ensembles do not substitute for individual skill growth, “individual differences coupled with the
subtle dynamics of group classroom [ensemble] interactions determine the nature and extent of understanding at any given moment” (p. 369).

Indeed, from more than two years of data gathering, it has become clear to me that musical sensitivity rather than technique may be a more reliable and prudent indicator of musical growth and giftedness, particularly in school situations. As identified from the performance of the Heartland advanced ensembles, groups can evoke the most sophisticated and overt demonstration of what child participants can produce, perceive and reflect musically (Davidson & Scripp, 1992). This is regardless of the cultural, thematic or stylistic origins of the repertoire.

However, I think it is important to stress that the qualities of acceptance in a school community about musical legitimacy and authenticity of ensemble music underpin the momentum and credibility of the work, in the minds of children. In Heartland’s case, I suggest, such acceptance was not only about more obvious playing skills and contribution to community. It also reflected recognition of advanced ensembles as a catalyst for genuine music learning and source of musical satisfaction because of their diversity of approaches to musical literacy, including arranging, improvisation and deeper ensemble skills. Subnotik and Jarvin (2005) describe professional artistry as built on the interaction of genetic and environmental components, founded on intrinsic motivation, charisma and musicality. I perceived that clear indicators (albeit early ones) of all three components were evident in the performances of the advanced ensembles, and in particular musicality and effective communication through music as a medium.

While Swanwick (2002) was talking about secondary schools, I think one of his three learning guidelines encapsulates the nature of quality engagement. As he puts it:

by all means push but also pull. Students can be drawn into what they feel is worthwhile. How well do we and other people play for and with the student? Is music an invitation? Students need to feel what they do contributes to sustaining human minds; we all do. (Swanwick, 2002, p. 208)

Yes, there was an instance of a child who opted not to participate in Heartland because of a community tutor’s concerns about the adequacy of challenges on offer, or that participation would slow progress on a first instrument. However, I think that the findings verify that for most child participants, authentic musical communication and aesthetic well-being apparently acted as a motivation for engagement in new learning (Eisner, 2002). Further, particularly in 2005, I judge that higher levels of Heartland community expectation and anticipation of skill advancement in the advanced ensembles served to cultivate the glow of achievement evident amongst most of the child participants who contributed to this research.
However, the particular advantages of Heartland need to be factored into feasibility assessment of ensemble outcomes for wider contexts. Hence, commitment to specialist tutors who have an excellent knowledge of the children, vertical age groupings (Taylor, 2004), and I think, a rationale that encourages consistent use of cross-school groupings would appear to be advantageous parameters in provision. Furthermore, authentic performance goals appear to be critical for stimulating learners to work and produce rapidly, and at a level commensurate with aptitude. Similarly, the collaborative focus, which the data indicates blossomed in Heartland’s advanced ensembles, offers a partial response to Taylor’s (2004) challenge concerning the social and emotional needs of gifted children: “An acceptance of individual differences at more than just a token level in New Zealand society would mean that gifted children’s needs could be met without them being perceived as problems” (p. 460). Hence, I believe, open recognition of the social and collaborative learning gains need to be integral in a school’s decisions about ensemble provision.

The Heartland advanced ensemble experience contrasts with what I observe in many school ensemble situations. The provision for extension tends to be short term, is constructed to support special school functions rather than the musical needs of the children, and usually includes few deeply investigative or skill based qualities. In my view, these situations lower expectations and motivation for what is possible in the minds of musically gifted children (Riley, 2004b). Bluntly put, without appropriate levels of expectation surrounding ensemble processes and products, the musically gifted child may suffer the ignominy of having to mark time, and possibly experience boredom, social disconnection and frustration. In my view, this is a situation the gifted young athlete would be unlikely to experience, since community expectations for these children seldom deviate from encouragement and support to be the fastest, or jump the highest.

**Part 2: The effects and effectiveness of creative development and creative ensembles in the Music Heartland project**

I have often wondered if strategies that I advocate to colleagues and students as appropriate for teaching creative music have encouraged predominantly hapless bashing, blowing and scraping. Influenced for example by the evocative models and scenarios of Paynter and Aston (1970), or Francis and Trussel-Cullen’s (1989) advocacy of diverse sound sources, while perhaps musical in intent conceivably even when squeezed into thirty minute creative sessions, the results are at best unpredictable. Essentially, they can amount to sound effects and thematic window dressing, and, I think, can be rather short on creative integrity.

In contrast, the music produced from the first of Heartland’s creative projects was a revelation for me, and apparently also for liaison teacher participants and Ministry of Education staff. Further, the evidence suggests that to those predominantly looking in (parents and liaison teacher
participants), the creative ensembles emerged as the wow part of Heartland. Hence, the discussion will focus not only on the implications for music learning of sustained creative opportunity, but also the concept of integrity in relation to childrens’ creative products.

According to the findings, the pieces created by child participants were representative of learning and teaching processes endorsed in New Zealand Curriculum (2000, 2007) documents, and Piirto’s (1999) and Parkyn’s (1984) writings: wait time, goal driven work, integrity of challenge, sustained independent and collaborative development of ideas, patience and sensitive domain assessment, empowerment of child participant’s creative ideas, and sustained action/reflection. Further, the data shows that some of the children’s product generated meaningful links with a diversity of other curricula, as well as heightening the quality of application of technical instrumental expertise being learned in or outside of Heartland.

In regard to music field knowledge and practices, analysis showed the work could not be claimed as original. However, through a lens of what can be judged creative relative to child participant knowledge and experience or as Renzulli (2005b) puts it, relative to declarative knowledge, some special products emerged. Equally important, the findings suggest that a love of creative musical processes and commitment to developing music of substance emerged, which was a motivation in itself according to child participant comments. Feldhusen (2005) describes what I recognise as a rite of passage, one that is little different from that of adult creators. Starting from the first raw efforts of child participants, the approval of tutors, teachers and audiences assisted the child participants’ well-being and spurred them to further explore and manipulate sound creatively, thereby gaining in independent strategies. The evidence suggests that the music that children created demonstrated diversity of style, quality application of melodic understandings, and innovative use of tone colour. To a lesser degree, but still with depth, there was active appreciation of simple harmonic effects, and application of devices that provided cohesive structure and strategies for development of bigger pieces.

Socially, as was the case in the advanced performance ensembles, a genuine binding and involvement was apparent in most cases amongst children from multiple schools and vertical school levels. From observation and video data, it appears that the sustained development of material featured individuals’ contribution but also the merging of several children’s ideas. Further, gaining from the benefit of prior experience for children and tutors, 2004 and 2005 pieces became more diverse in form and reflective of individual children’s creative kernels, albeit developed collaboratively. Similarly, findings suggest that most child participants relished creative sessions in which numerous sub groups would be simultaneously working at themes and exploring instrumentation possibilities. It was only after long periods of focus and stick-to-it-
iveness (Feldhusen, 2005), that children and tutor(s) would explore ways of bringing components together. Distinct from the nature of involvement in advanced performance ensembles, the evidence was more compelling of child participants showing independent volition, particularly Li Xiang, Josh and Matapo.

This seems to align with comments by Freeman (2004), who cites Gardner’s (1986) claim that self-teaching can be crystallising. In my view, Heartlands sustained creative activity refined independent strategies and enhanced child participants’ confidence. Rather than possibly ineffectual dabbling in the guise of creative exploration music noted earlier, I believe that even in the early composition experiences flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 2002) was observable in the learning and interactions. Csikszentmihalyi (2002) lists four rules for developing the autotelic self, one of which is immersion, described as becoming deeply involved with whatever one is doing. For instance, the child participants involved in Journeys noted feelings of pressure about quality, remembering the piece and the scale of the coming performance. Parent participants noted that children needed support to keep them going. However, at the end point (public performance) analysis showed that most child participants appeared engrossed. In my view this reflects the manner in which child participants dealt effectively with the unknown and fear of failure, and moved to a point of success. As Csikszentmihalyi (2002) describes, the flux of domain control is much more complex than gratification:

what people enjoy is not the sense of being in control, but the sense of exercising control in difficult situations…. Only when a doubtful outcome is at stake, and one is able to influence that outcome, can a person really know whether she is in control. (p. 61, original emphasis)

Probing further, Matapo was of particular interest in that his collaborative skills appeared different in creative contexts from those I observed him exhibiting in his classroom. In the classroom, he was often nonchalant and at times challenging. He was selective about when and how he would participate, and both then and in interview he was reserved and willing to show disdain about contrary viewpoints, more so than other child participants. At the same time, he showed confidence and control in leadership situations, in spite of greater responsibility. This also had a creative impact, for example, a group song from 2004 was primarily Matapo’s work, and by my observation, his accompaniment was an important factor in the song’s quality and appeal. As noted by his tutor, he was capable of long periods of study in piano lessons, and engaged particularly in chord learning and creative components. In group settings, he showed collaborative skills and wry humour, even when he made an error. Zimmerman’s (2004) call for more empirical data about what works for students is relevant in this regard, as it highlights the
need to know what kind of activities could stimulate a child’s emotional and social involvement, and apparent learning flow.

Similarly, and again of significance for Matapo, Taylor (2004) cites VanTassel-Baska (1998) in suggesting that counselling needs to be matched with social and emotional intervention strategies. “For example, to address the need to understand and develop social skills that allow them to cope within relationships, strategies suggested are teaching creative problem solving in small groups” (vanTassel-Baska, cited in Taylor, 2004, p. 458). Fraser (2004) cites VanTassel-Baska in asserting that gifted children’s creativity can suffer when they do not have opportunity to work alongside peers of similar ability. However, this is necessarily a tentative position, as not all child participants responded equally to the group creative opportunity.

Turning to learning implications of the children’s work and processes, the framework in which creativity is to be fostered is an appropriate first area of focus. Bearing in mind the place of thinking within the Key Competencies (Ministry of Education, 2007), I observe that opportunity for learners to explore innovative and creative solutions appears to have become a pressing requirement in school programmes. In Dunedin, many classroom walls display the six brightly coloured hats of Eduard de Bono (1992), and similar thinking and integrated constructs are available in gifted and talented resources, for example from Cathcart (2005) and Lazear (2005). However, my professional observation suggests that strategies appear to focus on mainstream curricula and social issues, and therefore skirt other curricula as a creative catalyst or means of expressing creatively. Riley (2004a) comments that initial integrated approaches for gifted children in the United States was based on professional development and research, particularly for language arts and sciences. She cites Van Tassel Baska (2001) in suggesting that to achieve quality through curricular integration may be easier said than done. In my observation, particularly concerning creative music applications, music is more likely to be drawn on as a vehicle for other learning without reassurance of integrity, development of understandings, or skill enhancement in musical terms. As Feldhusen (2005) writes about precocious youth, “Programs for gifted and/or talented youth often consist of bland, superficial enrichment activities involving projects and thinking-skills activities at a level, pace and complexity far below the ability of precocious youth” (p. 71).

In contrast, Heartland findings indicate that meaningful creative and integrated experiences evolved. Firstly, the work appeared to be more in depth than children creating for the primary purpose of supporting music skills (rhythm or pitch playing), which in my view, are implied in the content suggestions of authors such as Merrill (2004) or Guderian (2003). Secondly, three of the examples analysed earlier (Journeys, Trash Band and Three Little Pigs) eventuated out of wider
subject or thematic interest. Exploration of themes such as the environment, historical awareness and story-telling occurred because of a musical purpose. Further, I perceived that in performance, the children conveyed respective subject themes clearly: for example *Journeys* portrayed tension amongst the diversity of settlers in early New Zealand. Hence, in my view, sustained and creative application of music skills, knowledge and understandings enhanced the insightfulness of products as well as reflected a genuine intensity amongst the young composers. Similarly, with some parallels to the advanced performance ensembles, the evidence suggests that wider curricular understandings promoted the diversity of music skills displayed in these pieces, thereby representing a knowledgeable appreciation (Henderson, 1998) of integrated topic learning (for example, the *Sailors Song* in *Journeys*).

Finally, the overt responses of public and in-house Heartland audiences to creative projects, leaves little doubt about the credibility of the pieces and respect for their transition to a performance medium reflecting child participants’ skills and musical understandings. Feldhusen (2005) suggests that if the focus is creative achievement, a large base of declarative and procedural knowledge is essential. Thus, while earlier in this report I concurred with David Elliott’s (1995) dismay that integrated arts programmes can render music education less musical, the findings are convincing, I suggest, that quality outcomes are possible. Even though the pedagogy was open ended rather than outcome based, elements of the music such as choice and use of tone colour and instrumentation, verbal and visual devices were indicative of musical understanding being applied to meaningful representation in other subjects, including social capital messages (Gardner, 2007; Renzulli, 2005b; Ziegler, 2005). This is well illustrated in *Trash Band*. As Fraser (2004) asserts, “The unprecedented social, moral, environmental and political problems the world faces require creative redefining, creative investigating and creative solutions” (p. 158).

Another learning implication is the extent to which Heartland fostered musical creativity. Csikszentmihalyi (1996) suggests that because of the growth in complexity evident in most domains, new work is less likely without training. In addition, comments by Renzulli (2005b) and Gardner (1999) that curiosity and romance are integral for a learner’s growth to mastery in a domain, in my view, highlight the importance of sustained experiences which allow creativity (or novelty as Csikszentmihalyi describes it) to flourish. Finally, albeit concerning differentiated gifted education programmes, Riley (2004a) emphasises that potential for learners to engage in abstraction emerges from the authenticity of the learning experiences, about which I think the data supports the notion that creative experiences were regarded as central in consideration of authenticity for all participants.
The findings clearly show that while working in groups, the child participants developed and presented synthesised creative material. I judge, that their music represented advancement on what one typically expects in creative work from the generalist classroom, or even some specialist music programmes for respective age groupings. This professional observation is supported by comparison with models available in the New Zealand Arts Exemplars (Ministry of Education, 2003a) and descriptions of creative processes by international authors such as Merrill (2004), and Guiderian (2003). In these descriptions, even in specialist teacher situations, creative work appears to be somewhat remote in comparison with the intensity and ownership found amongst the Heartland child participants. For example, Heartland work could be positively evaluated against a range of musical and creative criteria, rather than just how well students used time and correct notation.

Given an apparent growth of creative understandings germinating from development of group compositions, what can be said the growth of individuals, or as Fraser (2004) puts it, potential for individuals to respond to the beat of a different drummer? Tracing individual involvement in pieces seems a useful path. At the end of 2004, the older child participants such as Josh were soloing in small group improvisations in response to blues chord sequences, something that was not apparent in 2003. At best, the creative and accuracy elements were moderately successful and early improvisation attempts were perhaps limited by emerging trombone playing skills. However, in the 2005 interview, his comments about jamming and improvising on guitar which he had begun learning in Heartland revealed that the desire to compose was on-going. Also in that interview, Li Xiang was overt in her appreciation of having opportunities to make up pieces, and as noted, her keyboard contribution to Three Little Pigs showed marked growth in independence from 2004 work. Here again, Matapo’s independent initiative in developing the foundation for his group’s song seems relevant. While much of each individual’s development must be attributed to the pedagogical approach to exploration set up by the specialist tutors, analysis of 2004 and 2005 compositions and observation of rehearsal suggests that individuals were working with more understanding and confidence as they applied and manipulated musical elements. This was not only to suit the purpose of the composition but also, I think, reflected volition to complete as well as speak through sound in a musically satisfying manner. In a sense, Matapo’s nonchalance can be interpreted as him taking space to muse, contemplate and create (Fraser, 2004), but in full awareness of the critique to come from the rest of the group and tutor, as reported by a tutor participant.

Probing further into individual creative development, I think that Journeys and Where We Belong demonstrated the highest levels of individual creative diversity and confidence. Video analysis suggests that perhaps apart from Anna, children making strong progress instrumentally also
appeared to be creatively empowered. Observation of creative processes showed favourable creative catalysts, including on-going self-evaluation (Piirto, 2003), wait time, incubation, and a learning frame in which children’s ideas were allowed to ferment without an expectation of hasty cognitive decisions (1984). Hence, at this point, I cannot say if creativity was being learned or taught. From a holistic perspective, the creative energy and skills demonstrated by most child participants also seemed to spur instrumental development because of the inherent and authentic performance expectation. The commentary of child participants in 2005 reflected distinct curiosity about music and a growing belief in personal potential to create in a diversity of musical situations. In line with Fraser (2004), and I think enhanced by the group activity, the creative products also appeared to enhance child participant’s ownership and positive reflection about creative potential. As Simonton (2005) states about the development of high level musical ability, it is dynamic according to a mix of volition and preference, “As new components begin to initiate their development, the youth may discover a greater proclivity for some related domain of achievement. For instance, a child might start out playing piano, transfer to composition, and end up becoming a conductor.” (p, 317)

A final theme in this discussion is evaluation of child participants’ creative product against the expectations of the field. Here I have adopted themes of originality, the effects of on-going creating and performing, aesthetic qualities and markers of innovation. To remind the reader, writers such as Runco (2005) suggest that woolly feelings about being creative or involving oneself intensely do not necessarily constitute creative product, however well-tailored. Similarly, David Elliott (1995) seems to place the outputs of children in the category of insignificant musing. In somewhat of a contrast, the findings in this research indicate that child participants developed understandings about creativity at their level of expertise or declarative knowledge (Renzulli, 2005b). Similarly, the child participants were reflective and self-correcting in creative processes, signalled as an expectation by Dunmill (2004). Hargreaves (1999) acknowledges a complex set of social and musical understandings as necessary for creative output, but states that creative product can emerge from informal improvisatory activity at home or school. Heartland child participants showed willingness to work and explore as individuals or in groups. In line with Hargreaves’ thinking, they demonstrated adherence to parameters of structure but also arbitrariness in the exploration over a sustained period. Similarly, because of the group situation, they were able to simultaneously explore multiple components of a piece. Hence, it could be said that as new product emerged, child participants were actively negotiating a pathway between the need to freely explore and the many constraints synonymous with effective use of music elements (Hargreaves, 1999).
I have already stated my view that the music children created could not be considered original to the domain. The issue then becomes the extent to which the pieces can be accepted for their situated creative significance (Regelski, 2000), notwithstanding the reciprocity with general musicianship already discussed. For example, *Where We Belong* with its message of turangawaewae (this is our place) reflected increasing speed and cohesiveness in the innovative application of music knowledge that individuals had developed over the previous two or three years. This was a song with a complex structure, an expressive and appealing melody built on a repetitive but interesting harmonic progression, and striking instrumentation. On that basis, it seems to me that as Hargreaves (1999) and Folkestad (2005) suggest about evaluation, both the development process and creative product were representative of the child participants expressing themselves in musically novel, authentic, and clearly communicative ways. The ballad could be regarded as successful in any popular music performance environment, spoke in a way beyond what I previously would have expected of the age group, and certainly delighted the target audiences in Wellington and Dunedin.

Alongside this creative achievement, the performance persona of children who created *Trash Band* hardly reflected the quality of music that had evolved. On the other hand, 2005 pieces such as *Three Little Pigs* (Year Four to Six child participants) and *Where We Belong* (Year Five to Eight child participants) revealed children who enjoyed engaging with an audience. That is, their poise, use of facial expression, on-stage communication, audience interface and general persona were integral to the music, and based on responses endeared them to the respective audiences. I think that Subnotik and Jarvin (2005) are correct in observing characteristics of mature artists, including confidence and being able to heighten engagement through personal charisma and risk taking. However, the development of such qualities observed in the persona of most child participants, albeit to varying degrees, suggests that these are malleable and can boost personal confidence from early on, given sustained and repeated creative opportunity. Hence, from a theoretical perspective, I concur with Subnotik and Jarvin (2005) that plasticity is needed in how we see intrinsic motivation, charisma and musicality as part of musical giftedness.

Furthermore, the evidence suggests that my expectation of domain originality was subsumed by a confidence to create that grew amongst the most musically able children of Heartland. Charisma and risk taking appeared to gain momentum in their pieces and how they were performed, seemingly on the back of comprehension that people were not only listening, but were enthralled by what they were hearing. Does this bring into question the claim by Subnotik and Jarvin (2005) that creativity cannot be taught? After all, it was direct teaching that brought the child participants to this level of risk taking and product that was original relative to their experience. I
think that Gagné’s (2005) DMGT and its broad notion of environmental catalysts for accelerated learning better reflects what occurred through Heartland’s inclusion of creative projects. The extended nature of the provision gave musically gifted children the opportunity to work together, be taught by skilled tutors, and respond to diversity amongst their peers. In doing so they achieved meaningful products (Taylor, 2004), which cannot be underestimated in significance for schools seeking deliberately to accelerate creative development.

In the literature review chapter, much was made of the importance of aesthetic qualities in evaluation of performance and creative activity. There, I shared Plummeridge’s (2001) concern that aesthetic qualities, which are sometimes considered the property of the talented few, are regarded as a diversion to efficient curriculum delivery. While most Heartland pieces were programmatic in inception, musically the evidence suggests that they were also effective in an abstract sense (Reimer & Wright, 1992). Analysis showed that child participants utilised quite sophisticated cognitive processes as they wove purpose with compositional techniques. As VanTassel-Baska (2005) puts it, “The true authentic achievement of gifted students necessitates the use of tools that require higher order thinking and problem solving, the use of advanced skills in a domain, and open-endedness in response” (p. 373).

It appears that as child participants worked in a sustained creative environment, aesthetic understanding was enhanced by their cognitive appreciation of quality markers. This is based on liaison teacher’s comments about children’s chatter concerning creative projects and growth I observed in aesthetic sophistication. Pieces analysed showed growth in child participants’ ability to incorporate effective structure, surprise in one or more music elements, make innovative use of tone colour, often include innovative and sometimes purposively unresolved musical motifs, and build in albeit limited ebb and flow in emotional intensity.

According to Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe (2000), one challenge for new art or innovation is to win affirmation in the field, notably from domain experts. Another perspective comes in the form of Regelski’s (2000) rejection of Elliott’s (1995) formalistic requirements of quality, in short, that all audiences are due more respect in terms of the aesthetic understandings which underpin their evaluations. Particularly in Journeys, overt responses from both domain specialists (Southern Sinfonia players) and community (parents and children) supports a tentative claim of aesthetic integrity, in spite of the fledgling composers performing in an intensely authentic situation. Similarly, as the first holistic audience impressions (Swanwick & Franca, 1999) held sway in response to Where We Belong in Wellington, the persona of the child participants changed from rather determined apprehension to delight. In both cases, it seems reasonable to suggest that an
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essentially aesthetic rather than analytic response was empowering for the children’s creative musical ability and acumen.

In this consideration of field expectations it is appropriate to ask; to what extent did the children’s work constitute innovation? Subnotik and Jarvin (2005) write of the battle for a young performer to be innovative, sometimes against the weight of the field, or to play the game when the licence to break moulds is a distant barrier. The view aligns with Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe’s (2000) claim, albeit about performance, that there is slow acceptance of innovation. Hence, would innovative devices have been a reasonable expectation from child participants, especially given possible stricture on ideas and individuality in the group situation? (Fraser, 2004)

In line with Swanwick (1999) and with Zimmerman’s (2004) citation of Sternberg (2001), the data suggests that Heartland child participants grew to make musical connections, incorporate some deviation from expected practices and produce original product relative to their experience in this situated learning. In support, while Runco (2005) is clear about the importance of originality, he notes that creative product is the most tenable outcome of original capability. Runco claims that individual discretion is important and therefore considers personal choice and motivation are integral in creative productivity. Reflective of most Heartland child participants, I think, he identifies a personal creativity (Runco, 1995, 1996) ascribable in adult or child forms:

> Obviously [adult and child] use personal creative talents to different ends, the adult often producing something tangible and perhaps socially impressive (e.g. a work of art, an invention) and the child often just creating a useful and original interpretation of his or her own experience. There are differences between the adult and the child, of course, but not in creative potential (p. 306).

The findings in this study suggest that the range of genre, from popular to chamber music, served to enliven and broaden child participants’ creative strategies, and gave children opportunities to show some uniqueness (Runco, 2005). If one that accepts training is ever more necessary to produce novel thought because of domain complexity (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996), without focused creative provision it is unlikely that meaningful musical innovation could have eventuated from the child participants, except by accident or serendipitous means (Runco, 2005). It was clear that most child participants were motivated to create. Further, the later projects showed more overt attitude and will to be involved than the earlier ones (Piirto, 1999; Winner & Martino, 2000). By my observation, this was particularly the case in the cognitive flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996) and emotional involvement (Stollery & McPhee, 2002) apparent during the creative sharing times. Yes, adopting Elliott’s (1995) concept of supervisory musicianship, where the learner is making decisions and addressing problems, the child participants showed only emerging understanding of being doers and makers. However, I suggest that innovation occurred in line with Paynter’s
(2002) call for explorative appreciation of proportion and beauty, that is reflective of personal involvement, and application toward special child oriented product (Koehne, 2003). Whether or not the product was of lifelong significance or a guarantee of future child participant involvement (Runco, 2005), based on informal interactions with adult participants, the innovative qualities of the music have been appreciated long since.

In summary, creative capability and a will to create appears to have been enhanced for most child participants in this study, and overtly for some, as part of their music learning in Heartland. In addition, by virtue of vertical and cross school grouping of children, it appeared that socialisation and collaborative learning amongst children of similar aptitude encouraged creative and cognitive flow (Csikszentmihalyi, 1996; Taylor, 2004). From a logistical perspective, evidence suggesting that creative activity was valued by the child participants is traceable, I think, to the sustained framework for the creative projects, tutor qualities, authenticity of purpose, diversity of styles which tutors could and did facilitate, and (as suggested also for advanced ensemble work) reciprocity with instrumental development.

As an observer and listener, at first hearing I was willing to accept the child participants’ product as quality work from an aesthetic perspective. Analysis served to provide a more rational basis as far as one can reach in an art form, for the tentative claim of enhancement of child participant’s creative skills and musical understandings from the composition activity. While remembering that this study incorporated only a small group of child participants, I begin to question the idea that creativity cannot be taught (Fraser, 2004; Subnotik & Jarvin, 2005). Ignoring differences in potential at this juncture, as a frame for creativity Runco (2005) cites Runco and Charles (2003) in suggesting that appropriateness and aesthetic appeal (Runco, 2005) differentiate originality from creativity. For example, crime may be original but not regarded as significantly creative, except perhaps in Hollywood. Further, Renzulli (2005b) adds novelty as a means to distinguish creative productivity. From these three elements, situated novelty, aesthetic appeal and appropriateness, that the findings suggest evolved in Heartland creative projects, it seems possible that what cannot be taught rests in the upper echelons of creative output. As Csikszentmihalyi (1996) explains in his conception of upper level phenomenon, those are things that can change the world or culture, as differentiated from stimulating thought or novel interpretations. Hence, since according to Runco (2005) the beginnings of creativity can be traced to original insight, or as he puts it interpretive (cognitive) capacity, trainability at the lower levels seems feasible.
Elements of Fraser’s (2004) framework for encouraging creativity, and suggestions of Parkyn (1984) such as wait time were observable in Heartland’s creative processes. However, I believe that just as significant was a distinct commitment from project and tutors to being musically creative for the joy of it, and holding to the concept that the product would be valued through authentic performance. Here I think there is a distinction from creative work in the other arts. Typically for music, primary and intermediate age school groups focus on existing repertoire in performances, which as discussed is unlikely to even be interpreted in a creative manner at early stages of competence (Subnotik & Jarvin, 2005). In other words, even the seemingly hapless bashing, blowing, and scraping creative outputs noted earlier are rarely heard, therefore, affirmed in a school community. It seems feasible that from the first sparks of creative activity that made Heartland child participants want to try, reciprocal factors of teaching and exploration of personal creativity (Runco, 2005) began to germinate in product.

Is it possible that a false consciousness operates in the debate about whether or not creativity can be taught? Perhaps barriers have emerged because of resource or curricular factors which have meant infrequent investment in creative development, sufficient to empower commitment, aesthetic awareness, insight and application of declarative knowledge. I think the findings made clear that the emergence of quality and situated creativity was not a simple matter. Rather, it was fraught with challenges and required commitment of significant and costly resources. However, the extent to which child participants learned to be musically creative gave credence to this commitment; how Heartland valued, planned, taught, and evaluated creative projects.

The child participants’ products also seem to address one dilemma about Renzulli’s model highlighted by Moltzen (2004a); should creativity be expected as an identification criterion without comprehensive foundational knowledge? The project’s findings suggest that the information gained in the group auditions about creativity, a one-off experience, had little predictive value of a child’s creative skills. It took the sustained, community-wide investment in creativity built on declarative and procedural knowledge (Feldhusen, 2005) for the aspirations and creative potential of child participants to develop. Aptitude emerged quite quickly and in parallel with practical skills for most child participants in the focused environment of Heartland, which according to the data implemented a policy of on-going performance and evaluation.

Csikszentmihalyi (2002) suggests that it is all too easy to worry about how children perform musically rather than about what they feel. I wonder if this might equally apply to creativity,

---

101 Deborah Fraser’s (2004) suggestions for fostering creativity in the classroom include encouraging creative behaviour, attitudes and ideas, taking time to play around with new ideas, enjoy and value humour, convey the benefits possible from making mistakes in the learning process, incorporate creative thinking strategies and employ metaphor and analogy to approach new concepts.
based on the evidence about the social bonding, collaboration and apparent social emotional well-being amongst the child participants in the creative ensembles/projects. The manner in which the child participants talked about being involved seemed central to their recognition of the impact of creative products alongside instrumental skill. This would be an interesting topic to pursue through further research. In differentiating exceptional performance from true personal creativity, Runco (2002) notes exceptional performance often gives rise to social acclaim, however:

it can be creative even if it does not impress an audience. If it impresses other people, it is ‘impressive’ and it may have impact, but the creative part of the performance is a function of the originality and discretion of the individual. (p. 308)

This is a tenuous argument in favour of concurrent emergence of creativity and declarative knowledge and skills. However, it leads me to suggest that assessment of creative outcomes needs to be alert to the framework and resources committed to teaching and development of creativity in the first place. Fraser (2004) cites Renzulli (1996) in highlighting the importance of special extension for some gifted children’s creative, intellectual and commitment aptitudes to be revealed. As to creativity, Renzulli (2005b) indicates that the integrity of domain provision is necessarily different to deductive thinking processes:

Creative-productive giftedness also implies acting on what one knows and believes rather than merely acquiring and storing knowledge for its own sake. The role of the student is transformed from that of a learner of prescribed lessons to one in which she or he uses the modus operandi of a firsthand inquirer. In other words, creative-productive giftedness is simply putting one’s abilities to work on problems and areas of study that have personal relevance to oneself and that can be escalated to appropriately challenging levels of investigative activity (p. 255).

As noted, the creative product that emerged in Heartland has been found to be fundamentally different to that emanating in typical classroom work in my experience, even where processes are led by specialist teachers. In forty years of teaching, I have witnessed nothing like the Heartland products analysed in this report in terms of diversity, integrity, and innovative application of musical understandings, and declarative skills and knowledge. In regard to social collaborative aspects, the resources and the tutors which brought together musically gifted children in an open sense of community as part of multiple projects seemed to generate credibility and momentum for the children about the idea of being musically creative. Not only that, while the thematic and integrated basis of numerous projects represented authentic cross curricula understandings, as well as sometimes comment on social capital issues (Gardner, 2007; Renzulli, 2005b), as Swanwick (1999) reinforces about composition, the development of pieces began with musical ideas. Similarly, as Bennett Reimer (1995) cites Goldman (1992):
Thus music is not only another world. It is a world that can be completely satisfying and fully revealing of the creative powers of other minds. Its peculiar value lies in the purity of its revelations of the human spirit. (p. 10)

Considering all that has been discussed about creativity in Heartland, I would argue that while at the time its creative programme was primarily a heightening of expectations of the New Zealand Curriculum’s (2007) intentions, the child participants’ work demonstrated the upper of Renzulli’s (2005b) Three Ring Giftedness Conception operating with some integrity. In addition, the work addressed requirements cited by Riley (2004a) and (Van Tassel-Baska, 2005) about fidelity and variability of quality where schools apply conceptions, such as Gardner’s multiple intelligences. In Heartland, I think there was at least reasonable balance between generating high expectations of children to find out what was possible, and being inclusive of a diversity of children. I believe, the range of creative product addressed the concern I share with Csikszentmihalyi (2002) about dissolution of conventional musical integrity: it overcame fears that the work might not constitute my or community perceptions of creativity. It also supported the thoughts of composer Graeme Koehne’s (2003) address:

> We look with pity on these poor little bastards who are thought weird by well intentioned parents who try to protect them from the forms of low and middle brow culture. What a nightmare it must have been for a kid to grow up of a diet of cultural experience chosen by his parents. Mozart to stimulate your little brain, proper art where ever you look, and only reading books in which you will learn something edifying. Such protectionism is not necessary it can in fact be harmful to the spirit. The actual content of our early cultural life had nothing in common with the Mendelssohn’s but it was culture and it was art, and it was ever present in our childhood (Koehne, 2003).

In my view, this signals the importance of not regarding musically gifted children’s needs as distinct from the social and emotional needs of other children. Rather, that the school understands that the provision of an authentic creative-productive music environment may be a useful tool for musically gifted children to understand more about how they might fit in and contribute. As Swanwick and Tilman (1986) recorded more than twenty years ago, “Much soul searching will be needed in order to transfer present opportunities into something that more nearly matches the development of children and the demands of music, including appropriate instruments and purposeful student groupings (p, 336).

Hence, I believe that a school needs to be mindful of the social and musical investment required to bring children’s creative work to a level that will challenge and excite them to a point of engagement and flow. The alternative, in my view, is the kind of atrophy about creativity observed by Keen (2004), resulting in students recognising a diminishing value being placed on affective or imaginative responses as they pass through school. It is of little surprise then, that
Csikszentmihalyi and Wolfe (2000) comment that creative process and product is more likely to occur outside of a child’s school.

Like Elliott (1995), I do not see appropriate creative learning as about accepting all that children offer. Rather, it could be a matter of working collaboratively toward carefully wrought creative product, accorded respect as genuine markers of situated creative development (Hargreaves, 1999), which is reflective of peak aesthetic pleasure (Swanwick, 1999). Hence, the final plea for greater integrity in the way musical creativity is encouraged in musically gifted children rests with Reimer (1995), as he calls for better matching of challenge and competence:

We must be far more conscious, in our musical creating activities, and far more in control of the need to reach for the edge at which technical capacities and music richness merge with the experiencing self in moments of deepest meaning. We know this can happen at every level of competence, if the musical repleteness aspect – the level of musical meaning sufficiently abundant to challenge and sufficiently accessible to be ‘taken within’ – is sufficiently provided. (Reimer, 1995, p. 18)


In forming conclusions and tentative conceptual implications, I have drawn on this report’s data and findings, summaries of cited literature, and discussion which explored the ramifications of Heartland’s ensemble and creative development. As noted, additional themes emerged in the findings which also demanded probing discussion. These included identification strategies, the effects of an externally based supplementary learning community, school-wide responses to Heartland, and links between provision and community-based learning. Where credibility was more assured through corroboration of data sources (triangulation) (Stake, 1995), piquant elements of these were included in the previous discussion sections, and where relevant, they have been incorporated into the conclusions for the study.

I again draw attention again to this being a qualitative study. Maykut and Morehouse (1994) cite Lincoln and Guba (1994) in outlining matters of trustworthiness in regard to qualitative approaches. Maykut and Morehouse (1994) list multiple methods of data collection, an audit trail, a team approach, and member checks. At this juncture, I am relatively comfortable with each of these areas. While member checking has been informal, it has been ongoing. Furthermore, a trail of research activity has been sustained in electronic files and handwritten notes, the team aspect has been sustained through constant interrogation of my work by caring supervisors, and finally, multiple forms of data collection were employed.

A matter about which I am less assured is the selection of data from the quite extensive array that was available to me, and how I made decisions about the significance of particular pieces. This has been a source of continuing internal debate. In clarifying this challenge for qualitative
researchers, Ely, Vinz, Downing and Anzul (1997) draw an analogy with the choices required of a movie director. These concern everything from plot selection to angles, character profile, matters about which there be no representation, which themes will be left for the viewer to make their own choices about, and how to best utilise the movie’s affective and effective complexity over another medium such as a single image. As they put the task of a qualitative researcher:

'It is our task to write in order to communicate people’s emotions, their life cycles, and how researchers face what they learn about themselves and other in the process of the research. This is not to say qualitative research writing focuses solely on emotions. Indeed, useful products present data and interpretations through a variety of lenses – from the very intimate to the very abstract. (Ely et al., 1997, p. 53)

Here, I reiterate my wish to meaningfully represent the learning, perceptions and feelings of the twenty three research participants. I have never felt confident in my ability to do this well, but for the reader’s benefit, I did feel the licence to interrogate as well as carefully celebrate the child participants’ growth and achievements, the nature of which revitalised my vision about what is possible, given relatively modest resources. Furthermore, I declare that conceptual frameworks from literature influenced the choice of material for considered analysis, in some cases in corroboration, and in others, to offer alternative perspectives in theoretical induction (Hennink, et al., 2011). As one significant example, I have been ever conscious of Riley et al.’s (2004a) important caution concerning the implementation of withdrawal programmes by schools, rather than:

a continuum of differentiated provisions. The literature review, however, demonstrates that pull-out withdrawal programmes can be part time, short term, mismatched, and fragmented solutions to meeting the needs of gifted and talented students if they are not carefully planned and evaluated. (p. 275, original emphasis)

As noted, through the progression of the study I have remained comfortable with the original research questions. Similarly, the proposal’s intent to explore theoretical possibilities as applicable to facilitation of appropriate programmes, school accommodation of these, and conditions which favour self- determinant behaviours from musically gifted children has guided my choices of data and reflective thinking. In drawing conclusions, I met a critical issue of how to ensure the reader might be assured of the links between the research questions and potential implications, and the conclusions of the study. Simply speaking, the questions and implication indicators were themselves integrated, and in my hope for meaningful conceptualisation from the data, it did not seem useful to attempt placement of the conclusions against single or particular questions.

Now then, just as a musical product comes to a form, it is timely for my possibly meandering exploration of Heartland children’s musical development, to be brought into recognisable end points (Langer, 1942; Parkyn, 1984) and cogent theoretical responses in the form of conclusions.
At best they are a partial representation, and acknowledged to be influenced by the biases and limited research expertise declared in the introduction to the study.

**A general conclusion**

From the literature surveyed, I deduce that a preference for thinking programmes or fostering academic domains in New Zealand gifted provision may be politically expedient, and possibly a path of least resistance in the current curriculum environment. However, given the framework of this study’s research questions\(^\text{102}\), an alternative perspective can be induced from the collected data; that celebration of passion in diverse domains can have positive effects on school-wide vibrancy and tone, as well as broaden parameters by which children are recognised as excelling. Furthermore, based on the Heartland experience, growth in gifted children’s self-efficacy, their will to strive for higher levels of musical achievement, heightened personal learning expectations and self efficacy are possible outcomes. In a socio-political frame, school policy and curriculum that allow sustained domain provision could produce more celebratory attitudes in regard to teachers’ efforts to engage with children’s learning strengths and passions. This may be particularly relevant in the case of children who require less consistent time in the home room situation to achieve at appropriate levels.

**School wide conclusions concerning domain giftedness**

- A clear relationship can be demonstrated between school policy and the rate and quality of domain development of identified children.
- One to two years of engagement in musical domain talent development by a school community appears to positively influence attitudes of classroom teachers, (seemingly) as they observe the effects of domain provision on children.
- The data affirms that cross school and vertical groupings of children can be effective for accelerating domain growth, as well as build personal confidence and self-belief about the worth of domain outputs. A sense of cohort amongst children in same or different schools is a worthwhile goal in domain provision. It can assist positive adjustment concerning their and other children’s drive for skill and innovation in a domain.
- Data from adult participants, in particular, appears to confirm that expectations of gifted children to organise themselves, prepare, and perform well in both the classroom and in provision are legitimate. These can be seen as character forming for roles in adult life.

---

\(^{102}\) Research Questions for this study:
1. What are discernible effects of the programme on gifted children’s achievement and self-efficacy?
2. How is enriched music learning viewed by child, parent, teacher and community?
3. On what basis can communities, schools and other providers legitimately define and take ownership of approaches to musically gifted children? What are useful processes for scrutinising process effectiveness and child efficacy identifiable as the result of any unique approach?
Music learning conclusions

1. Given comparably positive policy and management, the socio-economic status of a school does not appear to impact significantly on the ratio of musically gifted children in a school population\textsuperscript{103}.

2. Early signs of gifted musical acuities are most likely to be rhythmic confidence and appreciation of musical structure combined with volition to immerse oneself in musical opportunity. There appear to be distinguishable differences in individuals’ aesthetic responses, speed of development, instantiation quality, and perspicacity in creative applications. I propose that these constitute a tentative framework for a theoretical understanding of musical giftedness. However, evidence of musical giftedness may not be overt or represented by the existence of established skills. Hence, the qualities of a core programme\textsuperscript{104} can be central to the integrity of identification.

3. The cultural background of a musically gifted child is not highly predictive of musical preferences, passions, or (respective) skill sets. It may be more helpful to foster a child’s ability across musical cultures or genres rather than through a single culture or genre, as I observe in the engagement of most adults who remain effective in the domain.

4. The data suggests that provision for musically gifted children needs to include instrumental learning, even if in the form of small group ensembles. The suitability of keyboard/piano as a first instrument appears to be confirmed. It is typically available in school situations, has advantages in regard to harmonic and improvisation understandings, and offers some clarity if a child is assimilating musical notation. The guitar offers some of the above qualities and has advantages in being a populist instrument. Children, families and teachers appear to regard music learning as synonymous with learning an instrument. Some instruments, particularly strings, are more challenging, and hence may require innovative tuition approaches in the early stages, including more intense tutor/student contact.

5. Elementary levels of musical creativity appear to be able to develop from meaningful experience in the domain, including sustained teaching and authentic challenge, relative to a child’s demonstrated domain expertise. A child’s ability to produce innovative product appears to be enhanced by:
   a) collaborative learning;
   b) empowerment of self-determination, guided exploration, and conscious application and questioning of rules about the use of music elements;
   c) the child’s likely transition from external to internally motivated personal engagement;
   d) opportunity to contextualise and amplify instrumental skills.

The evidence in this report strongly suggests that an instrumental skill-base offers a child an advantage in creative learning, at least in the early stages of development. Pronounced and rapid musical development can occur when there is sustained and complementary creative, ensemble, and instrumental learning.

\textsuperscript{103} The ratio recommended from literature review and practice in Heartland is up to 20\% at least in early stages of provision.

\textsuperscript{104} In Heartland the Year One Heartland Ensembles were for most child participants a core music programme.
6. A programme planned and executed around withdrawal is the most effective and cost-efficient form of music provision where schools seek outcomes that are more genuinely reflective of musical giftedness. Generalist teachers’ critical roles include empathetic support for children involved in sustained provision, meaningful dialogue with tutors/experts leading the provision, and positive expectations of children affirmed as musical leaders and valued models for the classroom and school.

7. The qualities of specialist tutors are critical for engaging with musically gifted children. Diverse musical expertise and modelling are givens, but pedagogical strength, inclusiveness, and warmly supportive interactive skills are equally significant in the complex process of inspiring children’s musical growth.

8. The evidence does not appear to support a claim of improved achievement in other curriculum areas emanating from musical provision or accelerated musical growth. However, based on the comments of all categories of participants and on Independent Education Plans, a tentative claim is appropriate: that music provision can positively influence internal motivation and the value placed on learning by children. This includes enhancement of leadership, social confidence, personal organisation and knowledge transfer. It is apparent, that musically gifted children appreciate that learning music comes more to them readily than other children.

9. The data suggests that children, teachers and adults understand that while schools need to make choices about the application of resources and options for curriculum enrichment, music is an appropriate focus. The reasons revealed in the data include perceptions about:
   a) complexities evident in fostering a musically gifted child’s development;
   b) a wide diversity of school music programme outcomes;
   c) a lack of systems or referral processes amongst school and community providers in relation to the needs of musically gifted children;
   d) limited awareness and confidence about identification of potentially talented children;
   e) the lifelong value and contribution of music observed in the lives of adults.

**Limitations of the Study and Possible Future Research**

The diversity of data sources, length of data gathering and the rather special access to the research setting that was available to me provide some assurance about the credibility of the findings in this report. However, I note several matters that might have provided alternative, or more comprehensive insights. The voice of children who participated in the initial group experience from which the Year One Ensembles were selected is silent, as is the voice of their parents. Similarly, the data gathering did not include the voice of child participants withdrawn by Heartland after the event. In addition, a significant component of the findings included commentary about the success of the core music tutors relative to that of non-core tutors in instrumental teaching. However, the viewpoints of non-core tutors’ are not heard. Finally, while quite a diverse range of participants have been included in the study, in retrospect, the child
participants’ classroom teachers could have provided more acute information about wider achievement over the period of the data gathering.

This study was primarily music focused and reflects my professional commitment to that. In terms of replication, another researcher might have limited the extent of data pertaining to music to allow space for more data concerning achievement across the curriculum. Alternatively, a focus on more acute or measurable indicators of musical gifts evident in first experiences could have been adopted. The result of both of these limitations would have likely been fewer child participants but perhaps deeper understandings about their musical growth and wider achievement.

In regard to future research, Heartland ceased with the termination of funding. However, approximately half of the schools have sustained or enhanced aspects of the programme, in particular more consistent ensemble activity. The outcomes of this residual work would be of interest in a future study. Similarly, the child participants of this study will always hold significance for me. I meet some of them in a variety of educational and performance circumstances from time to time. There are indications in this report of how they see involvement in music as adults. These are essentially affirming. However, as all will be approaching mid to late teens in 2011, learning about their individual pathways from the closing of Heartland would assist our understanding of any long term effects of quite intense domain experiences in primary school years for musically gifted children. The relevance of this future study would stem from the theoretical perspectives appearing in the conclusions and epilogue to follow, and implications for mainstream schools. How do the longer term effects of Heartland match the kinds of development that occurs where private training, or more deliberate music education has been available to learners, in an independent school for example?

Finally, in the current New Zealand education environment in which numeracy and literacy are clearly dominant curricula priorities, why and how might schools best offer a challenging curriculum outside of these? There could be much to be learned by exploring attitudes to learning and achievement, where schools nominate additional priority curricula and allocate resource for implementation of enriched programmes. Be the intention to develop gifts in science or languages, what more can be learned about the effects for children and the wider school community from in depth development being celebrated in the curriculum for a selection of children in respective domains?
Chapter 6: Epilogue

Suggestions for developing musical talent in schools

It is doubtful that the Heartland programme could be replicated in a school without appropriate expertise, access to equipment\(^{105}\) resources and policy that allows for a quite substantial programme. Therefore, outcomes of this study would be significant where the passion of teachers and a school community leads them to allocate or seek additional resources\(^{106}\) in order to empower the musically gifted children who are undoubtedly present in the school's population.

The game of soccer is presented to us in international events as the beautiful game. In a subjective view, I think the mantle has been adopted for many reasons, including illusive strategies, personal fitness and lithe skill, and sometimes extraordinary precision through the power of a large-motor limb, the foot. I draw the parallel to music, because, for me, it offers similar mystery, feint and illusion, and undoubted power of expression through its numerous sub-domains. The audience, be it one person, niche, or millions, made ever more possible by technology, get involved at multiple levels of sophistication, and is free to critique this fleeting art form that appears to gathers momentum in nearly every facet of human activity in New Zealand.

Hence, in making recommendations, it is to schools and respected colleagues to whom I appeal, simply because of their potential influence on the attitude(s) of our young people about musical involvement as more than consumers. In some rather special ways, the data from this study shows quite clearly that opportunities offered to the identified children carried appeal, and evoked conviction about the worth of music learning. Hence, I concur with Swanwick (2002), who emphasises that children are drawn into learning which seems worthwhile and makes a contribution to well-being of the mind.

How to present recommendations? In answer, I return to the stance of a teacher educator and music specialist with forty two years of experience, desperately concerned about equity of music opportunity in schools, and aware of a paucity of models available for scrutiny, particularly concerning musically gifted children. Hence, it is not surprising that this study's proposal included parameters for constructing implications regarding possible significance to the whole school. They were:

- Facilitation techniques with musically gifted children;

---

\(^{105}\) Equipment pools are available in Dunedin.

\(^{106}\) To provide a similarly intensive programme to 20% of children in a school of 200 children is estimated at under $250.00 per child, including individual/small group tuition (for a half to two thirds of the group), three ensembles and three creative projects, supply of external teachers/tutors, and a leadership/administration allowance in the school.
• Guiding acceptance of programmes for musically gifted children in schools and community;
• Guiding the development of self-determination/self-efficacy in musically gifted children;
• Guiding gifted children’s approach to the wider community (Ethics approval, 2004).

I agree with Hopkins (2008), who claims that adopting a school approach is likely to produce more powerful and integrated strategies for change by linking the classroom with whole school activity, and move people beyond dabbling to innovative policy. Consistent with this, by my observation, whole school approaches by the MoE to professional development have been the norm in New Zealand for a decade now. However, during my time as a leader of arts professional development in Otago, I found the process of supporting the many teachers who brought little or no music confidence constantly gave rise to a question; to what extent does whole school mean the same for all staff? Given a perennial limit on resources, in particular time for confidence building with teachers, I still believe that the impact of professional development is largely dependent on the understandings and confidences about the learning area that teachers bring to the experience.

Hence, my recommendations from this study are deliberately couched for those who might first make use of the implications: practising music teachers who I hold in enormous respect, and who might have already experienced/implemented aspects of what constituted Heartland’s programme. I hope that is not interpreted as suggestion of lesser implications for the field. Rather, it is true to Ely et al.’s (1997) lead of revealing how the data has penetrated me as the researcher, and my conscious self as teacher/researcher. With that in mind, and also acknowledging beginnings (Moore, 2007) in the professional magazine of Music Education New Zealand Aotearoa, I adopt a more collegial form of narrative.

A framework for working with musically gifted children: Creating talent…a wee bit broadly

Why will your school offer an extension programme?

There are numerous reasons to foster a culture of music extension or gifted provision in the school, beyond what we understand about the lifelong engagement that many people enjoy with music. There could be the wish to do more for children who seem to achieve easily in music, or appear to do it once well, then lose apparent interest. You might be responding to the knowledge that about half of the children identified as gifted have a passion for music. You might also be
thinking about how to improve the vibrancy of the school learning environment, and recognise
the importance of models of excellence in that.

**What might the philosophy of the provision be?**

When developing a challenging programme, the Arts learning area of the *New Zealand Curriculum*
(Ministry of Education, 2007a) offers a fitting scope for gifted children, including a
comprehensive approach to the four strands\(^{107}\). In addition, a framework for approaching
giftedness can offer a foundation for benchmarking the musical development of children. For
example, theorist Joseph Renzulli (Renzulli, 2005b) suggests some taster activity, skill building
and authentic and applied creative opportunity. For taster activity, you might include an
ensemble\(^ {108}\). For the skill building element, some access to instrumental learning is probably
needed, as well as more intense and diverse ensemble work. The applied creative element can also
be achieved in an ensemble or group situation. The participating children need to understand the
purpose of each, and that there is expectation that their products will develop in complexity and
reflect growing independence as a result of the involvement.

Your intentions need to be tempered by who is to teach the programme. It may not be a
specialist, but in an effective programme, the selected children will be quickly functioning at a
level that will challenge any teacher who does not enjoy thinking in musical ways and has some
practical confidence. A caution is appropriate here. Children’s musical potential may not show up
in a general classroom unless a child is engaged in music outside of school. However, those
children who have had outside opportunities to develop skills may not be the most potentially
gifted in the school population.

Your final thinking could be about how the programme dovetails with the rest of the school, so
that the whole community can increasingly enjoy ownership. Easier strategies include
performances in assemblies and special occasions. More complex but worthwhile practices
include supporting individuals to assist with peer learning, and even teachers who wish to engage
their class in music. This may be possible because leadership and social confidence are likely to be
outcomes from the extension opportunity, alongside specific musical growth. Another direction
is greater independence in approaching cross curricular projects, once children have developed
skills that would make the challenges manageable and the products authentic and satisfying.

\(^ {107}\) In the *New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007) the four strands are understanding in context,
practical knowledge, developing ideas and communicating and interpreting.

\(^ {108}\) For music, following nomination, taster activity would likely need to be ten to twelve hours of ensemble
experience over a relatively condensed timeframe, say two weeks. This is likely to offer the basis of selection for
further provision.
The school should be happy for the selected children to feel a little special. All of us need to feel somewhat special, and this relies on the whole school environment being specific and positive about the gains all children can make across the school curriculum. A base position could be that, while advocacy and courage may be needed to achieve policy that allows children to celebrate their musical attributes, the dividends can be extraordinarily rewarding for the whole school community. As part of that accord, a good percentage of the programme should be within the school day. Classroom teachers can expect children involved in music provision to catch up in other areas where the expectations are meaningful, rather than just completion of tasks.

The programme will be open to scrutiny by families, since their emotional support can positively influence the outputs, and may even contribute in a musical way. Indeed, families should be involved in decisions about initiating the provision. However, someone with music specialist knowledge needs to be on hand to clarify what the provision might offer children and the school, in the long term. This might include discussion about what kinds of music making, cultural outputs, and the extent of group or individual activity. Once the programme is running it is most beneficial to remain open and report honestly to the community. For example, continued involvement may not be appropriate where a child is not responding, or not turning up. On the other hand, a child who missed out on selection first time round, or did appear to respond appropriately in early experiences may warrant new opportunity at a later time. Signs of readiness might be a child showing up to talk to the tutor, popping into break time activity, or continuing to take an interest in what the group is doing.

**What might the programme look like?**

While instrument tuition works best with regular frequency, it can be effective in tandem with other aspects of the provision and over part of the year. This is not only about stretching resources effectively. Expectations of independent development appear to take hold as children self-engage in music. To minimise disruption and fit with the school timetable, a modular programme for ensembles and creative work is recommended, each occurring two or three times a year. These can be focused as an ensemble performance project for school or community, or integrated or pure music creative projects. A modular approach also provides natural opportunity to re-evaluate goals and children’s responses in relation to future participation, and any parameters you adopt about wider achievement. The music provision is unlikely to assist the children’s achievement in other subjects like mathematics. However, if the child is responding positively to the opportunity, the involvement will not be detrimental to other subject learning, and benefits of better personal organisation and self confidence are quite likely to be observable.
In selecting children for particular parts of the programme, it is recommended that you work across age ranges and consider having your group being involved with children from other schools. To have an ensemble which is passionate about getting together and working on a creative project, for example, can be very exciting. The added momentum of sufficient like-minded children in a group can help lift the child’s achievement lens.

Children participating in the school’s provision may well be the ones who finish mathematics early. Will you consider allowing them to head off and practice keyboard or guitar in a side-room or have access at lunchtime, before and after school? Sometimes a child could be ready to help a friend as well. Could that be an expectation? Hopefully, the children will realise that the community values what is happening, because other children want to come and listen, or adults will sometimes stop by and say something like, “That piece is sounding more like a lullaby now.”

Music is an ideal subject through which to involve the community with the school, and it is excellent if the children can have access to mentors. There are many musical niches so mentors might be professionals, they might explore music and IT, blow the bagpipes, or be songwriter. Mentoring can support children’s self efficacy, let them know that it is ok to be musical, and help spread a sense of value about the musical community.

Evaluation is a very important part of provision. As a part of the school programme that is benefitting from resource allocation, evaluation and assessment is going to need to be more than a successful concert performance. To keep credibility and children’s involvement in focus, some facets you might look out for in the children are:

- Gaining strengths as performers, creators and instrumentalists and singers (if singing is adopted as a focus). Signs that a child is developing a broad sense of musicianship.
- Showing ability to learn quickly, enjoy independent tasks, respond to music’s aesthetic qualities, be flexible, listen well and show signs of intuitive responses, and probably do well at turning skills to creative or improvisation tasks.
- While they will probably primarily enjoy making and performing, growing conceptual understanding of music elements and their interrelationship in diverse cultural and genre contexts can be expected, and demonstrated in practical work as well as conversation.
- Growing ability to clarify goals, their progress toward these, what they hope to learn soon and balancing of music activity with other school work and recreation.
- Showing a range of collaborative, leadership and social engagement qualities. These reflect the children taking ownership of their musicianship, as well as determination, diligence and consistent work toward improving, and meeting musical challenges.

**What might the programme sound like?**

The music at the centre of the provision can reflect the schools’, children’s, and community and cultural interests. Built into this I recommend a commitment to instrumental and ensemble work
since it meshes effectively with the development of creative applications. An eclectic approach to styles and genre is appropriate, since the music children produce and perform can have its own character (Kwami, 2001), as long as it reflects a thinking response to the original stakeholders. Whether the music children play is Pasifika, classical, or arrangements or New Zealand popular music, the aim is to achieve a high quality of involvement and product, and for children to feel that the learning is a genuine invitation to music (Swanwick, 2008).

Music reading and theory are appropriate inclusions in provision. However, the growth of musicianship takes time and within that, personal/cultural background are not good indicators of theory interest or likely competence, or the instrument that might inspire a child. Having selected children “a wee bit broadly”, take care in decisions about what musical directions might suit them.

The biggest thrill for the children will probably come from performance, and you are likely to find that this influences other children toward wanting to be involved. After the first year, those who are re-selected are likely to become models. You can anticipate that return children will respond better to deadlines, why and what to practice independently, and be increasingly communicative in performance. You will probably find that learners from Yr 4-8 get the highest aesthetic or emotional rewards from performing, rather than talking or analysing a great deal about their music.

With planning and school conversation, a possible curriculum gain can be the manner in which classroom topics can be linked with creative projects. Substantial creative projects are an exciting music learning strategy in their own right. However, they also give possibly the best payback in terms of cross curricular goals, and offer alternative but credible ways of expressing responses to big questions of topics. In addition, relative to their demonstrable skills, the children can produce genuinely innovative music that is indicative of enhanced collaborative skills and personal confidence. If encouraged, these can reflect a genuine sense of community, thereby a positive model for all children.

To close, you might consider the following creative charter for children you select to experience music provision, a subject in which their learning needs are recognisably different to most children in the school.
A charter for responding to musically gifted children’s musical insurgency

Musically gifted children are likely to:

• want to explore sounds and their qualities, and look for sound potential in events going on around them at school or home;

• want to investigate how sound can be manipulated and to incorporate this with a growing skill base in their musical expression;

• want to think and talk about how to combine and change the character of sounds to achieve meaning and effect;

• respond to the demands of musical patterns and elements, a natural order being tone colour, dynamics, rhythm, structure, texture, pitch (melody and harmony);

• understand and apply elements of repetition, contrast, unity, as well as ‘surprise’;

• want to record (audio and notated) their music and experiment with a range of technologies;

• be motivated to perform and record their music and create a portfolio of informal and formal pieces that reflect home and culture, celebrates other music learning, and amplifies other school learning;

• want to investigate how composers use sounds in different contexts (community, cultural, ceremony, genre), and evaluate their own pieces alongside the work of others;

• not be pressured by the environment to truncate the development of original pieces;

• want to have on-going evidence that the school values their commitment to creative output through opportunities for sustained activity, and receiving musically perceptive and engaging feedback about their products and performance.
References


Archer, C. (2003). NCEA for gifted and talented music children’. *ARTS ON LINE*


Heath, A. (2006). *An investigation into the new policy initiatives relating to assessment and qualifications in secondary schools, namely the national certificate of educational achievement (NCEA), and it's ability to address historic underachievement in Māori males.* University of Waikato. Hamilton.


Merrill, J. D. (2004). Rhythmic and vocal creativity builds music skills. ME:NC, the National Association for Music Education (U.S.), 17(3), 14-20.


Taipei, B. (2007). [Class teaching for the culture of music and myth].


### Appendices

#### Appendix 1: Music Heartland 2005 Programme

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Group in</th>
<th>Year One</th>
<th>50% of teaching and meeting budget.</th>
<th>Year Two</th>
<th>30% of teaching and meeting budget</th>
<th>Year Three</th>
<th>20% of teaching and meeting budget</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Term One</td>
<td>Identification Process for new children to project in 2004 (20 – 30 children). Similar to 2004 but variation to give children emergent space.</td>
<td>For 20 approx students instrumental programme for equivalent of 20 to 25 weeks over Terms 1 and 2. String players will have 25 weeks. Developed on a case by case basis. Likely to be cross school ensemble or master class projects.</td>
<td>For 15 approx students 21 weeks over Terms 1, 2 and 3. Nature of the packages to be developed by tutors in December and February when we know student confidence and skills.</td>
<td>Specific ensemble programme with Yr 1, 2, 3 students as appropriate.</td>
<td>Additional weeks may be purchased by family, school or sponsorship.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Two</td>
<td>Ensemble Programme. Cross school groupings as appropriate to numbers (8-12 children).</td>
<td>Keyboard and theory learning programme for up to 16 children (15 weeks).</td>
<td>Creative Projects</td>
<td>Creative Projects</td>
<td>Creative Projects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Three</td>
<td>Yr 1, 2, 3 Children</td>
<td>Where possible school based (20 hours)</td>
<td>Yr 1, 2, 3 Children</td>
<td>Where possible school based (20 hours)</td>
<td>Yr 1, 2, 3 Children</td>
<td>Where possible school based (20 hours)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term Four</td>
<td>Creative Projects</td>
<td>20 hours</td>
<td>20 hours</td>
<td>20 hours</td>
<td>20 hours</td>
<td>20 hours</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Objectives and principles for the music heartland project
A project for developing musical talent in gifted students

Objectives and Principles

29/1/03

Objectives (as detailed in the ministry contract).

- For a specific group of gifted and talented children to be excited and challenged through music learning;
- To identify children with a range of musical talent and foster those attributes as part of the children’s wider learning and social participation;
- To provide opportunity for acceleration through interaction and performance with students across a wide age and ability range;
- To identify ways in which intensive music learning can contribute to the children’s social, cognitive and emotional growth;
- To provide opportunity for children to develop independent learning skills;
- For children to be cognisant of music learning’s wider community context.

Programme Principles

- The programme will seek to respond to learners who are talented musically, and learners who are identified as gifted across a spectrum of abilities.
- The Music Heartland Project celebrates the development of musical responses, knowledge and processes in their own right for any individual in this community
- The Music Heartland project aims to be a model of collaboration amongst education sector and community providers with the intent of providing children with challenging, progressive and seamless musical development pathways.
- The programme will be rooted in the strands of the Arts Curriculum. i.e. PK, DI, CI, UC.
- The Music Heartland staff will know they work with the support of the reference group, director, administration, the children’s school staff and other facilitators. There will be an open classroom policy in place. The goals for delivery of any process with children will be known to all involved. There will be paid meetings once per month to reflect and develop strategies. Teachers will develop and share resources along with members of the reference group and director as appropriate.
- Classroom teachers and facilitators will engage in a collaborative approach to each child’s learning. The intention is to foster musical achievement, social confidence that influences learning across the curriculum.

The Students

- The programme aims to foster excellence and achievement but not necessarily in a classical sense. The intent would be to train the abilities the children have. It is a given that the language of music is a programme requirement. However, some children may
flourish in improvisation and ear playing and others through playing from notation. Ideally children will develop a mix of reading and improvisatory approaches.

- Individual and group performance in informal and informal situations will be an expectation of the Music Heartland project.
- The children in the Music Heartland Project will be encouraged to share their learning with other children and show leadership in classroom music activity.

While the programme can focus on giving opportunity there must a clear emphasis on children achieving at a high level, appropriate to the quality of the programme they have experienced.
Appendix 3: Individual Education Plan format developed for Music Heartland in conjunction with Val Rowe of Queens High School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDIVIDUAL EDUCATION PROGRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Level:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classroom teacher:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Facilitator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Classroom teacher Please complete the following questions**

Describe briefly the child's competency across the curriculum, giving the curriculum level the child is working at where appropriate.

**First Entry - June 2004**

Describe briefly the child's competency across the curriculum, giving the curriculum level the child is working at where appropriate.

**Second Entry - November 2004**
First Entry - June 2004

Observations since the child's involvement in the Heartland Project

Scale: 1 - no improvement, 3 - noticeable improvement – 5 - considerable

Please circle appropriate figure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further comment/observations on level of change and linkage with the Heartland Music Programme

Second Entry - November 2004

Scale: 1 no improvement – 3 noticeable improvement – 5 considerable

Please circle appropriate figure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning independence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge transfer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further comment/observations on linkage of these changes with the Heartland Music Programme
**Appendix 4:**

**Music Heartland Project**

A project for developing musically talented and gifted students

Term Four 2005

My name is ..............................................................................................................................................................................

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Write your ideas in the form as well as tick the best answer for you</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>What I can play</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can find notes like C or F#</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I coordinate both hands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to play from memory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to play from reading the music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things I think I need to learn about playing the instrument</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to make up music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to play by ear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I like it when my teacher</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has me play lots in lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Has me play a piece more than once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrects my mistakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helps me with hard bits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explains how to read the music better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays to me and shows me how the music goes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talks about the music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think I would get better if my tutor ……</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**My Progress and Practice**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>My tutor thinks my progress is</th>
<th>Great</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Not good enough</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think my progress is</td>
<td>Great</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Not good enough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find the music I am to practice</td>
<td>Too easy</td>
<td>Too hard</td>
<td>About right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I practice</td>
<td>For about …… minutes each day or ….. times per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What do I ….</td>
<td>Enjoy about practice?Dislike about practice?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**My Music Goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In my music I am looking forward to</th>
<th>Playing a piece called…</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning more about the instrument I play now Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Playing another instrument called……………………</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being in a group like….</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Playing to an audience Yes/No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My ideas……</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I help other children who are interested in music by….</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Being in the Heartland Project makes me work harder in my class</td>
<td>Never Sometimes Yes mostly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| I am doing well in other subjects like maths and language in class even though I am in the project | No Mostly Yes |

| My Best Experience in the Music Heartland Project has been… | |

| My most difficult experience, or experience I did not enjoy in Music Heartland has been….. | |
### Appendix 5: Music Heartland Child Report Form

A project for developing musically talented and gifted students

**Student Progress Report on Instrument Learning Term 4 2005**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student</th>
<th>Instrument</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Tutor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Level/Experience**
- 1 – 6 Months/
- 1 – 2 Years/
- 2 - 3 Years

**Grade at this stage of learning**
- 1 = Low level child response
- 5 = High level child response

### Playing Skills

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playing fluency</td>
<td>(e.g.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhythmic accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melodic accuracy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memory confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading fluency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Musical Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plays with musical expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays phrases and responds to changes in the music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses dynamics when playing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays in time with an accompaniment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Skills on the Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to pitch and find notes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to read music for this stage of learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of steps/leaps/intervals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate fingering, hand position and coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Creative Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develops own tunes and rhythms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can talk about musical elements &amp; apply in creative work/composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Aural Awareness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of rhythmic response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy of melodic response</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence to improvise on a rhythm or melody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Application to Learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application and consistency in personal practice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal initiative eg listening</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willingness to share and discuss music ideas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overview Comment
Appendix 6: Participant information sheets and invitations

Application Form for ethical consideration of research and teaching proposals involving human participants

Working for Musically Gifted Children

INFORMATION SHEET FOR CHILD PARTICIPANTS

28/2/04
Greetings (Name)

My name is Errol Moore. You will know me as the person who organises the Music Heartland programme that you take part in at school. I hope you will help me gather information about your progress as well as your feelings about being in the music project.

If you agree you will be one of about 15 children who take part in my research which will follow your progress over the next 12 months. It is possible that your parent/guardians, music tutor and teacher may also be involved in the research.
I am interested in finding out about why you succeed at music and what you are good at in music. We would also talk about how being in the music project affects your class work, hobbies and recreation.

I would like to talk to you as one of a group of children once or twice during the next 12 months. I would also come along to some of your music sessions and visit your classroom. At 2 or 3 points I may ask you to keep a diary of your practice and how you see your progress.

The information I gather will be used to write a report for the University of Otago which has given permission for me to complete the research. If you wish to stop being in the research you only have to tell myself, your teacher or parent/guardian. If you do not wish to be part of the research or stop being part of it this will not affect your Music Heartland participation.

Any information that is collected about you will be destroyed at the end of the research. If you wish to see what has been said or recorded about you then you can simply ask myself or your teacher. While the research is going on the information I gather will be carefully stored at the Dunedin College of Education.

At the end of the research I will write a report for the University of Otago. The report will discuss yours and the other children’s progress and talk about what children enjoy in a music programme for gifted children, and how can excellent music learning be stimulated in schools.

If you are willing to take part in the research your parent/guardian will need to sign and return the permission slip. Your parent guardian may also be asked to be part of the research.

Thank you
Errol Moore
Greetings

Your child (Name) is currently part of the Music Heartland Project for musically gifted children. During 2004 and 2005 I will be undertaking a research project to be supervised by the University of Otago.

This letter is an invitation for your child to participate in the research. I have also included an information sheet for your child. Please read these information sheets carefully before deciding whether he or she can participate. If you decide to allow participation we thank you. If you decide against participation there will be no disadvantage to your child of any kind and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the Aim of the Research?
The research will investigate the progress and achievement of a group of children in the Music Heartland Project musically gifted children. It will also investigate the perceptions of music tutors, parent/guardians and teachers of the participating children. I will look at how the children feel about being in the project, how important their musical progress is to them and if there is connection to their learning progress in other school programmes.

I will be completing the research as a requirement for MA in Education at the University of Otago. My research supervisor, word processing staff and myself will be the only people who have access to the data collected. You may request directly to myself should you wish to see the data that has been collected about your child.

What will Participants be Asked to Do?
Should you agree to your child taking part in the research, he or she will take part in a discussion of up to 45 minutes, once or twice during the next twelve months. I will also observe and in some cases video your child in the music programme and observe your child in his or her classroom on two occasions.

Your child may request copies of video material that is made of rehearsal processes. All research materials will be kept securely at the Dunedin College of Education and will be destroyed when the project is completed.

Please be aware that you may decide not to allow your child to take part in the research without any disadvantage to your child. Your child may withdraw from participation in the research at any time and without any disadvantage to him or her of any kind.

What Data or Information will be Collected and What Use will be Made of it?
The research data collected will help me gauge your child’s progress, the level of challenge he she responds to and the qualities of music he or she performs and creates. I will analyse your child’s music making and creative participation with to see how the variety of teaching, programme and self-learning strategies stimulate best learning for the children.
The following general areas will be discussed with children:

- Children's perceptions about how well they are doing, what they are learning in the Music Heartland programme, how hard and at what do they work to improve;
- How children deal with the music project as part of their schooling, seeing themselves as gifted;
- How the response of their families, classmates and teachers affects their music learning;
- How children perceive their music tutors and what could be changed about the project to help them learn more and possibly be more self motivated;
- Children’s musical intentions as they continue or leave the project.

This research involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the discussion develops. Consequently, although the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the discussion, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions to be used.

In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that your child feels hesitant or uncomfortable you are reminded of your child’s right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that he or she may withdraw from the project at any stage without any disadvantage to his or her participation.

Results of this project may be published but any data included will in no way be linked to any specific participant. The school will not be identified except by alphabet letter and children’s names will be changed.

You are most welcome to request a copy of the results of the research should you wish.

The data collected will be securely stored in such a way that only those mentioned above will be able to gain access to it. At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except that, as required by the University’s research policy, any raw data on which the results of the research depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed.

**If you have questions**

If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:-

Errol Moore or Terry Crooks  
Department of Music Faculty of Education  
Dunedin College of Education University of Otago  
Telephone Number:- 479 3809] Telephone Number:- 479 8491

This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee
Greetings

Your child (Name) is currently part of the Music Heartland Project for musically gifted children. During 2004 and 2005 I will be undertaking a research project to be supervised by the University of Otago.

This letter is an invitation for your child to participate in the research. In addition I seek your participation in the project as parent or guardian. I have included the information sheet for your child.

Please read these information sheets carefully before deciding whether you will give permission for your child to participate as well as participate yourself. If you decide against participation we thank you. If you decide against participation there will be no disadvantage to your child of any kind and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the Aim of the Research?
The research will investigate the progress and achievement of a group of children in the Music Heartland Project. As well the research will investigate the perceptions of music tutors, parent/guardians and teachers of the participating children. I will look at how the children feel about being in the project, how important their musical progress is to them and if there is connection to their learning progress in other school programmes.

I will be completing the research as a requirement for MA in Education at the University of Otago. My research supervisor, word processing staff and myself will be the only people who have access to the data collected. You may request directly to myself should you wish to see the data that has been collected about your child.

What will Participants be Asked to Do?
Should you agree to your child taking part in the research, he or she will take part in a discussion of up to 45 minutes, once or twice during the next twelve months. I will also observe and in some cases video your child in the music programme and observe your child in his or her classroom on two occasions.

As a parent guardian participant you will be asked to participate in a group discussion with other parent/guardians of other children in the project.

Your child may request copies of video material that is made of rehearsal processes. All research materials will be kept securely at the Dunedin College of Education and will be destroyed when the project is completed.
Please be aware that you may decide not to take part in the research without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind. You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

**What Data or Information will be Collected and What Use will be Made of it?**
The research data collected will help me gauge your child’s progress, the level of challenge he/she responds to and the qualities of the music he/she performs and creates. I will analyse your child’s music making and creative participation to see how a variety of teaching, programme and self-learning strategies stimulate best learning for the children.

The following general areas will be discussed with children:
- children’s perceptions about how well they are doing, what they are learning in the Music Heartland programme, how hard and at what do they work to improve
- how children deal with the music project as part of their schooling, seeing themselves as gifted
- how the response of their families, classmates and teachers affects their music learning
- how children perceive their music tutors and what could be changed about the project to help them learn more and possibly be more self motivated
- children’s musical intentions as they continue or leave the project.

The following general areas will be discussed with you as parents or guardians:
- observations about your child’s commitment to the project and to school in general prior to and during the project
- observations about your child’s music response at home before and during the project
- Observations about your child’s acceptance of his or her musical ability and personal motivation since being part of the Heartland project
- Ways in which you have been with your child’s musical development and your perceptions of the significance of that to your child
- Your response to the music programme as part of your child’s education at school and in the home environment.

This research involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the discussion develops. Consequently, although the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the discussion, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions to be used.

In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that you or your child feels hesitant or uncomfortable you are reminded of your own and your child’s right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that you or your child may withdraw from the research at any stage without any disadvantage to your child’s participation in the Music Heartland participation.

Results of this research may be published but any data included will in no way be linked to any specific participant. The school will not be identified except by alphabet letter and children’s names will be changed. Parents and guardians will not be identified except as a parent of a ‘changed’ child’s name.

You are most welcome to request a copy of the results of the research should you wish.

The data collected will be securely stored in such a way that only those mentioned above will be able to gain access to it. At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except that, as required by the University’s research policy, any raw data on which
the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed.

**If you have questions**
If you have any questions about our research, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:

Errol Moore or Terry Crooks  
Department of Music or Faculty of Education  
Dunedin College of Education or University of Otago  
Telephone Number:- 479 3809 or Telephone Number:-479 8491

This project has been reviewed and approved by the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee
Greetings

You are currently a music tutor for the Music Heartland Project or have children in your general classroom who are part of this project for musically gifted children. During 2004 and 2005 I am undertaking research into the project that will be supervised by the University of Otago.

This letter is an invitation for you to participate in the research. Please read the following information carefully before deciding whether you will participate in the research. I have also included a copy of the information sheet given to children who have been invited to be participants for your information.

If you decide against participation we thank you. If you decide against participation there will be no disadvantage to you or anyone else you work with in the Music Heartland project and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the Aim of the Research?
The project will investigate the progress and achievement of a group of children in the Music Heartland project. As well the research will investigate the perceptions of their music tutors, parent/guardians and classroom teachers. I will look at how the children feel about being in the project, how important their musical progress is to them and if there is connection to their learning progress and self direction in the other school programmes. As a Music Heartland tutor or classroom teacher of the child participants I would value your insights as part of the research data.

I will be completing the research as a requirement for MA in Education at the University of Otago. My research supervisor, word processing staff and myself will be the only people who have access to the data collected. You may request directly to myself should you wish to see the data that has been collected about you or children you work with.

What will Participants be Asked to Do?
Should you agree to take part in the research during the next twelve months I will ask you to twice participate in a one hour group discussion. I will also seek to observe and in some cases video children in the music programme and twice observe Heartland project children in their classroom.

All research materials will be kept securely at the Dunedin College of Education and will be destroyed when the project is completed.

Please be aware that you may decide not to take part in the research without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind. You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

What Data or Information will be Collected and What Use will be Made of it?
The research data collected will help me gauge children’s progress, the level of challenge they respond to and the qualities of music children perform and create. I will analyse children’s music making and creative participation to see how the variety of teaching, programme and self directed learning strategies stimulate best learning for the children.

In discussion with you we will investigate:

- identification processes used and selection into higher levels of the programme and factors that influence continuation in the project other than musical achievement
- responses to the model used to develop children’s musical giftedness, that is, teaching general ensemble skills, specific instrumental skills, theory and creative applications
- perceptions and forward thinking about specific children’s progress and achievement in the music programme and in their respective classrooms
- perceptions about Heartland Project features such as in school time withdrawal, specialist tutors, resource supply, school sharing, cross school tutoring, school wide ramifications, peer and family response
- perceptions of children’s self efficacy, willingness to take responsibility, commitment and leadership, intra and interpersonal skills, effectiveness of self directed learning processes, within the music project and general classroom both before and during the project
- Perceptions of music within the wider school programme before and during the Music Heartland Project.

This research involves an open-questioning technique where the precise nature of the questions which will be asked have not been determined in advance, but will depend on the way in which the discussion develops. Consequently, although the University of Otago Human Ethics Committee is aware of the general areas to be explored in the discussion, the Committee has not been able to review the precise questions to be used.

In the event that the line of questioning does develop in such a way that you feel hesitant or uncomfortable you are reminded of your right to decline to answer any particular question(s) and also that you may withdraw from the research at any stage without any disadvantage to you.

Results of this research may be published but any data included will in no way be linked to any specific participant. The school will not be identified except by alphabet letter and children’s names will be changed. Parents and guardians will not be identified except as a parent of a ‘changed’ child’s name. Tutors will be numerically named and classroom teachers will be named as part of the school alphabet identification.

You are most welcome to request a copy of the results of the research should you wish. The data collected will be securely stored in such a way that only those mentioned above will be able to gain access to it. At the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except that, as required by the University’s research policy, any raw data on which the results of the research depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed.

If you have questions
If you have any questions about our research, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:-

Errol Moore or Terry Crooks
Department of Music Faculty of Education
Dunedin College of Education University of Otago
Telephone Number:- 479 3809 Telephone Number:- 479 8491
**Appendix 7: Participant Interview Questions and Briefing**

### Interview questions: Child participants

Working for Musically Gifted Children: Child discussion areas (Yr 1 & Yr 2 Project Students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C1</th>
<th>Children’s perceptions about how well they are doing, what they are learning in the Music Heartland programme, how hard and at what do they work to improve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What are you enjoying about being in the project so far? (creative music, ensemble, instrumental work, keyboard and instrument learning)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do you enjoy music more or less since you have been in the project? In what ways?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• What music or tasks have you found the hardest so far? Did you enjoy the challenge? How hard did you work at the challenge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If there was a visitor coming and we asked you to play for them what would you choose to play? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• I am looking forward to seeing you making music in one of the lessons. Is there music or something creative you hope your tutor would to get you to do while I was there? Why that example?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Talk about how you learn a piece of music…what works for you? Here is a piece of music how would we go about learning this one? (eg Shortnin Bread .. Marimba Music). What would be hard or easy about this piece?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C2</th>
<th>How children deal with the music project as part of their schooling, seeing themselves as gifted.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Before the project did you think you were good at music? Have your feelings about that changed?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Do you think you learn more quickly than other children at school? Can you talk about examples?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• How do you feel about the music programme happening at school? What are the effects of that for you?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Does the music programme affect your learning in other subjects? (concentration, missing content, motivation. Describe if so.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Tell me how hard you find work you do in your usual classroom? How does it compare to what you are asked to do in the music programme?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• If a friend asked you, “What are you good at in music?” what would you say? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Some children are good at sport, or maths some at music. How important is it to you to be good at music?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• When have your own space tell me the musical things you do…how much/long? (Prompts: playing, listening, T.V, music web sites, mp3 files). How does that activity compare with before the project?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Commentary | |
|------------|
### C3 How the response of their families, classmates and teachers affects their music learning.
- How do your classmates feel about you being in the project?
- Can you remember when your classmates have helped your music?
- Has the being in the project changed your friendships at school or outside school? How?
- Can you remember an example of when your friends have made it harder?
- What can you tell me about how your teacher feels about you being in the project? Can you remember an example of when you teacher has been especially helpful?
- What can you tell me about how your family feels about you being in the project? Do you talk about the project at home? What do you say at home about the music you are learning...why? How do family members respond?
- Can you remember if anybody at school or home has helped with your practice? If so how did/do they do that? What difference did it make to you.. why?

### C4 How children perceive their music tutors and what could be changed about the project to help them learn more and possibly be more self motivated.
- Tell me about what your tutor asks you to practise or think about? How seriously do you take these between lessons or classes? (extent of practice, habit level)
- What do you concentrate hardest on when you practice? (difficulties, repetition, making up your own material, hard finger work, technical patterns eg scales)
- Lots of musicians enjoy talking about music, great CD’s etc. Do you like to talk about music? What things about music interest you and your friends?
- What sorts of things does your tutor talk about in lessons? (pieces, composers, how to play, reading music, their own music making)
- The Music Heartland project is changing all the time. At the moment we have instrument learning as well as keyboard, creative work and ensembles. If you were in charge what would you change? (Put things in or remove…. Singing, Pasifika, Learning theory). Can you suggest things that make the project better for you?
- If your tutor said practise what you like for the next month what would you do on your own? (personal practise, regularity of practise, time spent, easy/hard material, pieces, learn new music)

### C5 Children's musical intentions as they continue or leave the project
- The project will run into 2005.. how keen are you to stay in it? Why?
- Some of your classmates have been left out of the project part way through. How do you feel about that? Why?
- How did you make your decision about which instrument you would learn? (Itinerant Concert, tutor, family, friends, teacher) Which would you like to know more about? (Yr 2 Chldm)
- What would you like to say to Mr Mallard about keeping on paying for the Music Heartland project? Why?
- Tell me how you feel about being a musician for a job when you grow up? How do you think people start music in music jobs? Do you think the project is making any difference to your job prospects? Why?
For Participants (Explained to child participants):

- The Heartland Project is a vehicle for the research. Feel free to say what you think and feel, as the information will be used to guide future thinking rather than what is happening in the project right now.
- If any question makes you feel uncomfortable, or you do not have an answer for a question then feel free not to answer.
- As we go through the questions ideas about previous questions will possibly occur to you. Feel free to move back to previous questions if you wish.
- In a group interview we get ideas from each other. It is fine to say you agree with or disagree with what another person said. The research will have most value if we are straight up! It is also fine to build on another person’s comments.
- Don’t not be afraid of over positive or over negative responses or comments that disagree with comments of other people.
- We are all part of the project in various ways. Stand back and think about your comment so that you can tell us if it is a knee jerk response or a view that has built over time.
- I remind you that all information is confidential to the project. Alternative names will be used where needed and schools will not be identified.
**Appendix 8: Third and fourth level interview data headings**

**Means no data appeared. While a centre of interest data may have been conflated into other headings or appeared through other sources such as analysis of video music sharing examples**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Catalysts and Challenges to Learning and Musical Development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Nature of learning- Knowing about music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Nature of learning-Practical skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AB1</td>
<td>Learning playing skills**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Effectiveness of learning processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Recognition of essential and enhanced experiences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Fostering individuals within learning processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>Evidence of musical achievement (level and nature)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Evidence about musical giftedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>Evidence about musical and personal confidence (self esteem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Transmission amongst the heartland programme components</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Value Assessment of the Music Heartland Project.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Tracing influence of programme components</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Ensemble activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA2</td>
<td>Creative activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA3</td>
<td>Instrumental learning activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA4</td>
<td>Aural and notational literacy activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>The people factor: Calling musically expert tutor perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC1</td>
<td>Learning process features</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC2</td>
<td>In depth musical conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC3</td>
<td>Influences of musical expertise in facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC4</td>
<td>Impact on teacher/student/family/peer relationships</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exploring the Creative Music component</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Creative Programme Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA1</td>
<td>Independence of students within creative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA2</td>
<td>Motivational factors evident in creative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA3</td>
<td>Working processes within creative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA4</td>
<td>Short and long term outcomes of creative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>Researcher Musical Analysis of Product 2003, 4 and 5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB1</td>
<td>Nature and Structure of creative products **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB2</td>
<td>Level/evidence of creativity within product **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB3</td>
<td>Evidence of inventiveness or improvisation within product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB4</td>
<td>Quality of devices employed (rhythm, melody, harmony, texture) **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB5</td>
<td>Personal skill based contributions to product **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB6</td>
<td>Intuitively based contributions to product **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A Gifted Programme as a musical development fabric within mainstream education school programmes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Tracing influence of schools as hosts, link points and contributors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Delivering the programme in the school environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA2</td>
<td>Comparability with existing classroom and extension programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA3</td>
<td>Tracing the effects of a cohort of schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA4</td>
<td>School music capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA5</td>
<td>Wider curricula implementation of gifted programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>The people factor: Calling classroom teacher perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB1</td>
<td>Quality of the programme and its outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB2</td>
<td>Impact on wider student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB3</td>
<td>Impact on student commitment in the classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Music Heartland: Variable Pathways for music learners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>Me and music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA3</td>
<td>Project connecting with other music in my life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>I am gifted...personal lens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB1</td>
<td>Commitment to music learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB2</td>
<td>What musical children see they are good at</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB3</td>
<td>What musical children say they like/dislike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>I am a contributor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1</td>
<td>Leadership given/requested of me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>Sharing skills and knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3</td>
<td>Applying my abilities at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4</td>
<td>Diversity of student participation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>Acceptance of my musical ability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED1</td>
<td>My friends/peers and the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED2</td>
<td>My school and the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED3</td>
<td>My family and the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED5</td>
<td>Longer term musical aspirations and the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF1</td>
<td>Access to opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF2</td>
<td>Nature of identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF3</td>
<td>Response to or impact of project levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF4</td>
<td>Commitment and identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF6</td>
<td>Students and decisions about other music in their lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Music Heartland: Charting Relationships: Perceptions about student music learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>The nature of the student’s community of learning **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FA</td>
<td>Social implications for participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>The people factor: Calling musically expert tutors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>The people factor: Calling classroom teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC1</td>
<td>Impact on teacher/student/family/peer relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC3</td>
<td>Impact on student commitment **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>Mood Indicators (General state)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friendly Unfriendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assertive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In depth Superficial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry Factual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relaxed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inquiry Factual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accepting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Willing Ignored</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uncertain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In depth Functional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 10: Participant relationship flow representation
### Appendix 11: Evaluation of performance and creative product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Playing</th>
<th>Creative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The involvement of the child.</strong></td>
<td>• Interest</td>
<td>Composing appropriate to mood, purpose, and or musical style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensity of concentration, interaction, wanting to participate.</td>
<td>• Enjoyment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Acceptance of a wide range of music</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Involvement and participation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inspirations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Aspirations (NEMP, P11, 2005). Collaboration and willingness to debate /contribute.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response of the child to musical style</strong></td>
<td>Control given the instrument(s) being played and the level of technical expertise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to ensemble</strong></td>
<td>Tempo, playing in time, nuance, feeling changes and response to that.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Growth of technical expertise</strong></td>
<td>Made evident on respective instrument or voice encapsulating rhythm, melody, range, articulation, fluency indicators.</td>
<td>Application of instrument/voice knowledge and skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accuracy</strong></td>
<td>Attention to correct melody, rhythm and harmony parts learned or improvised.</td>
<td>Utilisation and integration of music elements, in particular melody, rhythm, harmony, dynamics, texture and tone colour. Consideration of these within performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenge</strong></td>
<td>Considered against the time in learning, the nature of performance/group size, breadth of other Heartland activity which influenced the performance.</td>
<td>Level of, inventiveness, meaningfulness of contrasts and repetition, evidence of layering and balance of parts, ability to utilise an element structure such as blues or verse and chorus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cohesion</strong></td>
<td>How musical structure was dealt to, adaptation observed, responding to other's lead, stop/starting devices, providing leadership, responding to group.</td>
<td>Attention to structural elements of the music including balance, blend of sections, musical consistency and diversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reading and recording</strong></td>
<td>How the music has been learned, use of graphic or conventional notation, IT, memorization.</td>
<td>Utilisation of learned and improvisational processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Independence</strong></td>
<td>Students become increasingly autonomous and self-directed and depend less on teacher direction and support. (NZ Curriculum Exemplars, P1, 2003).</td>
<td>Evidence of self determination in the sounds created as specific elements or accumulated effect. Evidence of ongoing action/reflection/ rehearsal and variation ideas amongst participants. Evidence of pure originality in the music.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Appendix 12: First and second level interview themes through compilation with video, documentation and video data to third and fourth level analysis themes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Major Data Collection: Identification and child access to the Music Heartland Project</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Major Data Collection: Music learning evidenced within the Music Heartland Project</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Major Data Collection: The integrity of child participant involvement and the effectiveness of Music Heartland’s operation as a community of learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BC4</td>
<td>Impact on teacher/student/family/peer relationships</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Catalysts and Challenges to Learning and Musical Development</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>Fostering individuals within learning processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA1</td>
<td>Independence of students within creative work</td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Nature of learning-Knowing about music</td>
<td>AH</td>
<td>Evidence about musical and personal confidence (self-esteem)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA2</td>
<td>Motivational factors evident in creative work</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>Nature of learning-Practical skills</td>
<td>BC4</td>
<td>Impact on teacher/student/family/peer relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB</td>
<td>Researcher Musical Analysis of Product 2003, 4 and 5.</td>
<td>AC</td>
<td>Effectiveness of learning processes</td>
<td>BC2</td>
<td>In depth musical conversations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB1</td>
<td>Nature and Structure of creative products **</td>
<td>AD</td>
<td>Recognition of essential and enhanced experiences</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>The people factor: Calling musically expert tutor perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB2</td>
<td>Level/evidence of creativity within product **</td>
<td>AF</td>
<td>Evidence of musical achievement (level and nature)</td>
<td>BC3</td>
<td>Influences of musical expertise in facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CB3</td>
<td>Evidence of inventiveness or improvisation within product</td>
<td>AG</td>
<td>Evidence about musical giftedness</td>
<td>BC4</td>
<td>Impact on teacher/student/family/peer relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>I am gifted…personal lens</td>
<td>AI</td>
<td>Transmission amongst the heartland programme components</td>
<td>CA1</td>
<td>Independence of students within creative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB1</td>
<td>Commitment to music learning</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Value Assessment of the Music Heartland Project.</td>
<td>CA2</td>
<td>Motivational factors evident in creative work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB2</td>
<td>What musical children see they are good at</td>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Tracing influence of programme components</td>
<td>CB2</td>
<td>Level/evidence of creativity within product **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB3</td>
<td>What musical children say they like/dislike</td>
<td>BA1</td>
<td>Ensemble activity</td>
<td>CB3</td>
<td>Evidence of inventiveness or improvisation within product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC</td>
<td>I am a contributor</td>
<td>BA2</td>
<td>Creative activity</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>A Gifted Programme as a musical development fabric within mainstream education school programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC1</td>
<td>Leadership given/requested of me</td>
<td>BA3</td>
<td>Instrumental learning activity</td>
<td>DA</td>
<td>Tracing influence of schools as hosts, link points and contributors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>Sharing skills and knowledge</td>
<td>BA4</td>
<td>Aural and notational literacy activity</td>
<td>DA1</td>
<td>Delivering the programme in the school environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC3</td>
<td>Applying my abilities at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DA2</td>
<td>Comparability with existing classroom and extension programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC4</td>
<td>Diversity of student participation</td>
<td>BC</td>
<td>The people factor: Calling musically expert tutor perceptions</td>
<td>DA3</td>
<td>Tracing the effects of a cohort of schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>BC1</td>
<td>Learning process features</td>
<td>DA4</td>
<td>School music capability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF1</td>
<td>Access to opportunity</td>
<td>BC2</td>
<td>In depth musical conversations</td>
<td>DA5</td>
<td>Wider curricula implementation of gifted programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF2</td>
<td>Nature of identification</td>
<td>BC3</td>
<td>Influences of musical expertise in facilitation</td>
<td>DB</td>
<td>The people factor: Calling classroom teacher perceptions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF3</td>
<td>Response to or impact of project levels</td>
<td>BC4</td>
<td>Impact on teacher/student/family/peer relationships</td>
<td>DB1</td>
<td>Quality of the programme and its outputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF4</td>
<td>Commitment and identification</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>Exploring the Creative Music component</td>
<td>DB2</td>
<td>Impact on wider student achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Creative Programme Outcomes</td>
<td>DB3</td>
<td>Impact on student commitment in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA1</td>
<td>Independence of students within creative work</td>
<td>EC2</td>
<td>Sharing skills and knowledge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA2</td>
<td>Motivational factors evident in creative work</td>
<td>EC3</td>
<td>Applying my abilities at school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA3</td>
<td>Working processes within creative work</td>
<td>EF6</td>
<td>Students and decisions about other music in their lives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CA4</td>
<td>Short and long term outcomes of creative work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF3</td>
<td>Response to or impact of project levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 13: Music Heartland Project School Based 2004 Identification Chart

Identification by observational evidence may be provided by parents and/or teachers, iwi, community or peers. Please tick the boxes that apply for each child. This nomination will be confirmed in a one hour practical session with a Music Heartland Tutor in the last week of school. (Return hard copy of this chart to Errol Moore by Thursday December 11th).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Names</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets involved in music and talks about music with real interest.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keen singer and accurate sense of pitch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneously makes up and explores rhythm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneously plays instruments around home or in the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plays tunes on school instruments or at home without being taught.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already plays an instrument or sings in a choir. (Identify in the box)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other…………</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nominated By</th>
<th>Child</th>
<th>Parent</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

School Principal’s Signature

School…………………………………………
### Appendix 14: Table of child participants’ instrumental learning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Child Participant and year of Heartland selection (Shaded in school groups)</th>
<th>School Year in 2004</th>
<th>Instrument learning outside Music Heartland if any</th>
<th>Heartland Keyboard and Theory Year One</th>
<th>Heartland instrument learning in 2004</th>
<th>Heartland instrument learning in 2005</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helen</td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Violin</td>
<td>Violin</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland entry: 2003</td>
<td>Trombone</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>Moved to high school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland entry: 2003</td>
<td>Clarinet</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cello (Self-withdrawal after part year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainsley</td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland entry: 2003</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Keyboard (Withdrawn at end of year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland entry: Year 7</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Piano (Withdrawn at end of year)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael **</td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland entry: Year 6</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serena</td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland entry: 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Li Xiang</td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>Violin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>Piano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland entry: 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jo</td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>Violin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cello and moved to guitar after part year.</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland entry: 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heidi **</td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>Violin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Cello and moved to guitar after part year.</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(European) Heartland entry: 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matapo</td>
<td>Year 8</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>Moved to high school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland entry: 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td>Guitar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland entry: 2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tulevai</td>
<td>Year 5</td>
<td>Withdrawn post Year One Ensemble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland entry: 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maia</td>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td>Piano</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heartland entry: 2004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** = Child of parent participant in this study