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Abstract

This thesis investigates music education as it is currently theorised and practiced in New Zealand primary schools. The project arose from professional concern for the quality of music teaching in primary schools. The aim of the project was to gather ideas from some key informants about perceived barriers to the effective implementation of the music component of the current arts curriculum and, most importantly, to consider possible solutions to these barriers, so that an effective model of music education for primary schools might be identified and described. The key informants were people working in leadership roles for music education at a national level. They were selected because of their breadth of knowledge and experience within early childhood, primary, secondary and tertiary settings, and for their involvement in advocacy, school advisory work, teaching and research in music education. Each key informant participated in a semi-structured interview. They each suggested that music education is a specialist area requiring a teacher with a depth of pedagogical content knowledge. They advocated for specialist pathways within generalist teacher education qualifications leading to an implementation model where specialist teachers work collaboratively with generalist teachers to provide effective music education programmes.
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Chapter 1

Introduction: The Context

In this search, I believe the best place to look is to our own personal experience with music. Sad is the day when we forget what brought us into the field in the first place or what music or any of the arts for those engaged in them has meant as a source of personal enrichment (Eisner, 2001, p. 6).

The motivation for this project has arisen out of a lifetime of musical involvement and enjoyment as well as fifteen years of work in music education, as a primary school teacher, lecturer in music education, and music advisor to schools. My music-making, learning and teaching experiences, particularly within a context of a music-loving family, have given me a strong belief in the power and importance of music in social and cultural life and a conviction that a quality music education is beneficial for all and justifiable for a multitude of reasons. These reasons will be presented later in this chapter.

I consider myself fortunate to have had a musically rich and varied childhood, with parents, grandparents, aunts and uncles who loved music and were actively involved in community music making. Both of my parents were accomplished singers. Both of my grandmothers were piano teachers. My family involvement in community music-making included the yearly production of a musical in the small rural town where I grew up. My parents would co-produce, my father always sang the male lead role, my mother made costumes and painted the sets, my aunt was musical director and provided the piano accompaniment. My brother and I, along with our grandmother, various cousins, friends and neighbours would provide the chorus and other roles on or behind stage. These musical productions form some of my earliest and happiest memories of music making. They were very important community events, replicated in many other surrounding towns. I remember
often travelling to neighbouring towns to hear with critical ears that town’s version of Annie Get Your Gun or Brigadoon which, we felt, could never measure up to the quality of our productions!

My formal music education was a traditional one, made possible by the ability of my parents to pay for lessons and access quality teachers to provide individual tutoring in piano, singing, cello and guitar. Had I expressed an inclination to learn any other instrument, I know they would have done what they could to facilitate this. They valued music and music education of this kind. My perception now of my childhood and adolescent music-making and learning experiences is one of loving to play and sing, in fact, spending hours at the piano lost in a very happy world of musical sound, joyful singing at home, in musicals, community concerts, church, and in many choirs, and of being a fan of popular music, being an enthusiastic collector of the “Solid Gold Hits” records. I remember that instrument practice could be hard but rewarding, and that theory, taught separately from playing, seemed at the time to be boring and irrelevant. I regret that I can’t improvise, play the blues, play jazz, but this is perhaps a downside of instrumental learning restricted and shaped by prescriptive examinations. I have no recollection of learning music in the context of my primary school education, apart from the occasional assembly sing-a-long.

Now, as a parent of two teenagers, I gain a great deal of pleasure from seeing a musically rich upbringing, including years of extra-curricular tuition, bear fruit for them. I listen to them play the piano, guitars, drums, and sing with friends and believe that it is a positive, productive, creative way to spend leisure time. My children make music for pleasure, because they are musically curious and interested, and because they are motivated and skilled. They talk about music. They are critical and discerning, according to their musical interests
and preferences. They are musical children, nurtured to be so, and, arguably, with music in their bones.

Currently, I am a Senior Lecturer in Music Education at the Dunedin College of Education. In 2002 and 2003 part of my work was as a music advisor to primary schools in Otago and Southland. These two roles have been particularly significant in terms of shaping the questions that this project will investigate. The Dunedin College of Education provides generalist teacher education. Every student enrolled in a primary teaching qualification completes a course of Curriculum Music, regardless of musical background, prior knowledge or interest, with the expectation that all students will exit their teacher education able to adequately plan and teach music to primary-aged children. Music, as one of four arts disciplines included within one curriculum area called The Arts, receives a slice of the course time allocated for the arts. Students completing the three-year bachelor’s degree currently receive around 40 hours of curriculum lecture time in music in their second year. They may choose to do a further twelve hours in their final year. There is no music qualification or skill requirement for entering college. The students may or may not get an opportunity to teach music in their three years. They may or may not observe music being taught during their three years of training. I feel conscious of the inadequacy of the curriculum course time that is allocated to music education. For the many students who enter college without prior skill and knowledge of music, 40 hours of course time is, I believe, woefully insufficient time to address their lack of subject content knowledge as well as their curriculum and pedagogical knowledge.

As a music advisor over the past two years I have worked as a member of a six-person team, contracted by the Ministry of Education to deliver professional development in the arts to teachers in Otago and Southland. The need for this professional development has come
from the publication of a new curriculum document – *The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2000). This document is the last of seven to be developed in response to the seven essential learning areas which are set out in the Curriculum Framework (Ministry of Education, 1993).

My advisory work with teachers in primary schools has included; providing discipline content workshops, demonstration music lessons in schools, collaborative teaching with classroom teachers, and observing teachers and giving them feedback about their music teaching. This work has frequently put me in what I perceive to be a professionally compromising position, where my musician brain tells me that much of what I am observing in primary classrooms in the name of music education is inadequate when delivered by people who, in my opinion, lack the skill and understandings needed to think, behave and express themselves musically. Teaching music requires aural perception – the ability to sing in tune, feel a beat, imitate and create rhythm. It also requires an understanding of the elements of music and the ways that composers and performers manipulate these to create a mood or effect. If the teacher lacks these skills and understandings it is difficult to see how children can be musically supported, guided, motivated and challenged. How will they receive feedback about their work? How will the teacher without musical skill and knowledge recognise and articulate the next possible learning steps? How will the children receive musical models?

The family and work experiences described above have led me to the point where I feel strongly that research is needed to investigate the issues surrounding the implementation of the curriculum and the possibilities for raising student achievement in music. Such personal experiences echo the following questions that represent issues widely debated in New Zealand and internationally.
Should music be in the curriculum at all? Is 'school' music inevitably so different to 'real' music that it is socially and culturally irrelevant to children? If it is left out of the curriculum, and formal music education is only available to people who can afford it, is this a problem? If it is left in the curriculum then who will teach it? How can people with limited skill and knowledge in music provide a quality music programme? If specialist teachers are needed to teach music, how can they be trained and funded? Is the cost justifiable? What about the other arts disciplines and other curriculum areas? Is music different from these in some way? Do we need two kinds of music in schools – music for social and cultural purposes that is facilitated by the generalist staff, and skill-focused music programmes taught by appropriately skilled and qualified teachers? What skills and understandings are fundamental and essential for quality music teaching? What do we know about effective teaching in general that is relevant to this debate? How can music be adequately resourced and located within a crowded curriculum? Should music be integrated with other subject areas or taught as a separate discipline?

Discussion with colleagues around the country, who are also involved in music education and advisory work, has provided evidence that I am not the only one experiencing a significant gap between the musical skills and understandings of teachers in primary schools and the requirements of the music curriculum. The difficulties that arise from juggling competing discourses – in my case that of generalist teacher education with what I believe are the specialist knowledge requirements of the music discipline, will be a central theme in this project.

At an Arts Hui (September, 2003, Auckland) I participated in some lively and wide-ranging discussion about the perceived success or otherwise of the professional development contract to date. While the discussion began positively as people shared evidence of
improvement in teachers’ attitudes or understanding of important music concepts, it soon became apparent that the improvements were in many cases only reflecting a shift from no confidence in teaching music to an emergent level of confidence and competence. Other issues were shared, in particular, lack of resources, timetabling pressures and so on, but the issue of teacher knowledge and confidence was identified by those present as the most significant barrier to the successful implementation of the music component of the arts curriculum.

These issues are not new, and in many ways represent a rather circular and seemingly impotent debate among teacher educators and music advisors over many years. The new arts curriculum document (Ministry of Education, 2000) and its accompanying professional development are in some ways a distraction from these issues as they reflect an assumption that music can be effectively taught by the generalist teacher, and that children will be able to progress towards the stated achievement objectives, if their teachers receive a defined package of professional development. The views of those attending the hui, confirmed by comments from others involved in music education advisory work besides myself, suggest that this may be far from the case.

The next section presents the findings of recent and historical reports on the quality of music education in New Zealand primary schools as well as some reported recommendations for the improvement of music education across educational settings. Our schooling system regularly undergoes external evaluation via Ministry commissioned reports, research projects and reports from the Education Review Office. Some of these reports have commented on the standards of children’s achievement in music and the effectiveness of music programmes. It is interesting to consider some of these past recommendations as a context for the present study.
Past Evaluations of the Quality of Music Education in Primary Schools

In 1970, Tait carried out a comprehensive survey of music education in New Zealand on behalf of the Queen Elizabeth II Arts Council and partially funded by the New Zealand Council for Educational Research. The aim of the survey was to examine and evaluate the state of music education in schools, colleges and universities as well as the private music teaching profession and to make recommendations for the development of music education in the future. This project identified a problem of definition and expectation in music education. The author described the music syllabus of that time as vague and failing to “make explicit the particular musical understandings, skills or attitudes expected in children of different ages or abilities” (Tait, 1970, p. 11). Tait’s investigation included fifty written submissions from interested individuals and organisations, a questionnaire sent to 1100 teachers across educational settings, including private music teachers, and a comprehensive field study where discussions were held with school principals, district music advisors, university and teachers’ college staff, and professional musician groups around the country. The results of the investigation highlighted a perceived lack of teacher knowledge and confidence in music as a significant issue at that time.

If music teaching in schools were the enjoyable experience most schools would like it to be, the feelings of inadequacy may not be so significant. Unfortunately music is not an enjoyable experience for many teachers and neither is it enjoyable for many pupils. One-third of the primary, one-half of the intermediate and two-thirds of the secondary schools said they face problems of motivation and discipline in music teaching. Although many of these problems may be due to a shortage of equipment, or classes that are too large for effective teaching, the root of the problem probably lies in the teachers’ inability to plan and implement music programmes which are relevant to the pupils and which excite their imaginations and stimulate musical growth (Tait, 1970, p. 55).

In 1978 the then Director-General of Education, Bill Renwick, presented a review of standards in state schools that was subsequently published (Department of Education, 1978).
His review was based primarily on reporting from school inspectors. The following is a selection of evaluation comments and recommendations from this report.

No other subject displays so obvious a variety in standards of attainment as music does (p. 58).

The survey shows that the great range of music skill found among teachers is the main factor in the extremes of quality observed in music programmes (p. 58).

There is a shortage of primary and secondary music specialists. Many primary teachers find the broad musical outline for students in the primary school syllabus a challenge that is difficult to meet. They often feel insecure about their ability to teach music, and this affects their confidence and their competence (p. 58).

Despite these favourable developments, the full musical potential of most students is not being realised. This will happen in primary schools only when there are more teachers with a background in music, and when schools emphasise it in their programme, using fully the music strengths they have (p. 61).

The review concluded with two recommendations, that:

1. The status of music in our education system be urgently reviewed, and that this review include staffing, accommodation and equipment;
2. Immediate steps be taken to remedy the shortage of specialist music teachers in intermediate and secondary schools (Department of Education, 1978, p. 62).

It is interesting to compare these comments and recommendations with the situation as it is described more than twenty years later in an Education Review Office (ERO) report entitled Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum (number 2 autumn 1995). This report aimed to provide information about the quality of the provision of arts education at that time and to give guidance to schools about improving practice. The information was derived from ERO Effectiveness Reports and some specific case studies. The report focused on two key issues: the place of arts education in the curriculum; and the effectiveness of the delivery of arts education (p. 3). The report found that from 79 Effectiveness Reports that were analysed, only one third of classroom programmes were “delivered well and in accordance with the national
The report summarised the key components of good practice in arts education in the following way.

Good arts education in a primary school:
• is a regular component of the balanced classroom programme;
• requires competent confident teachers;
• uses displays and performance to celebrate achievement;
• is thoroughly planned; and
• promotes high achievement for all children (p. 18).


On the one hand, we have a Syllabus which has been accepted by Government and the general teaching community. Yet, all of us here know that it is extremely unlikely that a child going through primary school education at the present time will have anything like the experiences suggested in the syllabus and that it is most probable that in terms of developing skills and understandings the syllabus objectives will not be met. Proof of this is now supplied by the NEMP Report, the results of which were summarised as follows:

_Overall, aural skills are weak. More than half the children surveyed were unable to sing two notes in tune and a similar number were unable to recognise beat and simple rhythmic patterns ..._

(Buckton, 1993, p. 105).

The National Education Monitoring Project (NEMP) referred to above is a project that commenced in 1993. It aims to assess and report on the achievement of New Zealand primary school children across the curriculum, at year 4 and year 8. Each curriculum area is assessed on a four year cycle. Music has been assessed twice to date, in 1996 and in 2000. The 2004 assessment cycle for music is currently underway.
The above evaluations and reports on the quality of music education all suggest that there may be more effective ways to provide music education for children in New Zealand primary schools and that despite specific recommendations there has been little progress over the past 30 years. Each report identifies some particular barriers and challenges that need to be overcome in order to improve the quality of music education. Such ideas about the keys elements of quality music education and the changes that need to be made to policy and practice to achieve this clearly have a long history to them.

The purpose of the present research was to investigate perceived barriers to the successful implementation of the music component of The Arts within the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2000). Data was gathered through semi-structured interviews with people who are in leadership and advocacy roles for music education. In New Zealand, the world of music education is relatively small. Those working in music education as teachers, advisors and advocates, particularly within colleges of education and school support services, tend to know one other. The New Zealand Society of Music Education provides networking opportunities via conferences and a magazine, and the national professional development contracts for the arts has meant frequent gatherings at conferences and hui. It was therefore possible to identify some key people who have had significant involvement over many years as music educators, advisors, political advocates, curriculum and resource developers. These people have contributed to the body of research literature about issues in music education and have had much to share at conferences and hui. They each agreed to be the key informants for the present study. During interviews with them it was hoped that while perspectives on the barriers to delivering quality music education programmes in our primary schools would be explored, this would also lead to some creative problem solving, and practical suggestions for the future. Also, from the experiences and ideas provided by the interviews it was anticipated that information would be available on the
wider context of theory, policy and practice that influences music education in the primary school years.

Music Education and the Curriculum

The purpose of this chapter is to undertake a critical review of issues and theories about music education and curricula that underpin the present research. To this end, I have summarised and critiqued perspectives that are reported from classroom teachers, music advisors, tertiary music educators, and researchers in the field of music education and curriculum development. These perspectives are from both New Zealand and overseas sources. The literature included in this chapter provides commentary and reflection on the factors which are likely to be impacting on the quality of music education in primary schools, and the way that music learning is viewed and valued by parents, teachers, and children. I have selected literature that sheds light on the philosophical and theoretical underpinnings of music education in general, and music education as it is specifically described within The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2000) as well as considering particular models of curriculum development. Possible political influences on education in the arts as evidenced in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework (1993) are also discussed. This chapter also includes some consideration of the concept of ‘being musical’ and the ways that notions of musical talent may impact on teacher’s attitudes and values in music education. Children’s attitudes to school music are also briefly explored, along with some thoughts on access and equity issues in music education.
The focus areas for this chapter are:

- Curriculum viewpoints.
- Theories of music education.
- Music within The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum: introducing the document.
- The impact of the Curriculum Framework on the Arts Curriculum.
- Valuing Music Education: intrinsic and extrinsic intentions and outcomes.
- School music versus 'real' music.
- Equality of opportunity for music learning.
- Being musical – giftedness and intelligence.

The nature of musical experience is the focus of rich, ongoing debate among musicians, music educators and researchers in this field. As a music educator it is very stimulating and rewarding to participate in this debate and to critically contemplate the many different viewpoints to be found in music education journals and other research-based literature. Questions frequently posed and investigated include versions of the following:

Is music a language? If so, is it a universal language? (Issue No 29, 1997 of the Journal of the International Society for Music Education was dedicated to discussion of this question (Koopman; Letts; Mukuna; Reimer; Rivera; Shehan-Campbell, 1997). In what ways is music meaningful? If it has meaning, from what does it derive its meaning? (Koopman; Mukuna, 1997). Should music education be justified for intrinsic or extrinsic reasons? (Eisner, 2001; Plummeridge, 2001) To what extent do all the previous questions reflect a western, colonial world view? How can plural musical expressions be studied with integrity and sensitivity? (Kwami 2001).
While this body of literature reflects many different viewpoints about the nature of musical experience, the cultural meaning, functions and intentions of music making, and the justification of music in the curriculum, there are some common underlying concepts that underpin these discussions. These may be summarised as:

- Music is a unique human phenomenon.
- There are as many different musics as there are societies that produce them (Mukuna, 1997).
- Music-making and appreciating are important cultural activities and behaviours.
- The music that people make is most meaningful for the people who make it, that is, music expresses and communicates most authentically within its own cultural context, however, sensitive study of music from other cultures can enhance awareness of cultural differences and promote mutual appreciation and respect (Kwami, 2001; Mukuna, 1997; Shehan-Campbell, 1997).
- Music education when well conceived and well taught can be a very rewarding and valuable undertaking for a whole range of tangible and intangible reasons.

The following section discusses models of curriculum development and construction and considers the implications of particular curriculum models for music education.

**Curriculum Viewpoints**

Grundy (1994) describes two different, but complementary ways of thinking about curriculum (p. 27). In simple terms, one way is to consider the curriculum as an object and the other is to think of it as an action. The ‘curriculum-as-object’ or ‘syllabi’ perspective is that
the curriculum is something that is developed outside of schools by experts and becomes tangible in the form of syllabi. The syllabi are then interpreted and adapted by teachers and delivered via the teacher to the students. From this perspective the students can be seen as passive receivers of the curriculum. The curriculum is provided for them and its successful delivery is dependent on the skills of the teacher. This way of thinking about the curriculum has also been analysed and critiqued by McGee (1997). He refers to the 'curriculum-as-object' as a technocratic conception of curriculum, where the curriculum is decontextualised from the activity and relationships happening in the classroom, and is seen as an uncontested, neutral and pre-determined body of knowledge that all children will learn and benefit from (p. 45).

In contrast to the 'curriculum-as-object' described above, Grundy (1994) describes the 'curriculum-as-action' where the curriculum frames dynamic interactions between teachers and students. From this perspective the curriculum may be understood not as a thing, but as a dynamic process that engages all participants, especially teachers and students, in its active construction. That is, teachers and students, through their work, construct the curriculum, just as players in a football match construct the game as they play it (p. 33). Grundy, however, describes a gap that may occur between an intended curriculum and what is, in fact, learned by students, that is, the actual outcome for children of a teacher's interpretation and delivery of the curriculum content.

In thinking of the curriculum in this way, I am moving beyond a perspective that assumes that it is an expression of the intentions of the stakeholders, principally the curriculum policy-makers, the designers and the teachers. Rather, I am concerned to understand the curriculum from the point of view of what is learnt – that is, the outcomes for the students of the teaching/learning encounter. And outcomes here refers to what the actual outcome is, not what the intended outcome might be. By making this distinction I am signalling an important consideration about the curriculum of schools, which makes the pedagogical [curriculum-as-action] view crucial. That is, what students learn in school is both more and less than, and in some cases even a contradiction of, that which is contained in the
officially documented curriculum (that is, policy statements, syllabus documents and teachers programs) (Grundy, 1994, p. 30).

Elliott (1995) describes curriculum development policy as being dominated by the thinking of Ralph Tyler, who, in the 1950s, described a ‘technical-rational’ procedure for curriculum making. Elliott claims that the Tyler approach to curriculum development still holds influence today as is evidenced in the typical classroom planning process of reducing learning to specific outcomes that are worded in behavioural terms. According to Elliott, the Tyler approach has been modified by the “structure of disciplines” approach that emerged in the 1960s.

The structure-of-disciplines approach to curriculum making (advocated by Jerome Bruner, Philip Phenix, and others) was based on the assumption that every subject has a foundational pattern of verbal concepts that, when understood by teachers, and students, enables all other aspects of that subject domain to fall into place. This idea had two other implications: (1) curricula ought to be sequenced according to verbal concepts about a subject’s inherent structure, and (2) subject matter experts (not teachers) should take responsibility for deciding the structure of each subject and stating instructional objectives for teachers and students to follow (Elliott, 1995, p. 244).

However, despite the modification described in the above quote, Elliott believes that the emphasis in curriculum development continues to represent a linear, technical-rational approach. Elliott believes that the application of a linear, ‘Tyler’ approach to curriculum is problematic for music education, although he sees why the planning processes that emerge from this conception of curriculum can be attractive and comforting for teachers. He also sees that curriculum developers for music have been motivated by the perceived need to give music the status of other core subjects such as science and mathematics, and so have adopted technical-rational procedures in order to give music the same look and feel as other curriculum areas. This thinking is evidenced in the current New Zealand arts curriculum document, which has conformed to achievement objectives, specific learning outcomes, and hierarchical levels in keeping with the other curriculum areas.
Elliott is critical of both the ‘Tyler’ and ‘structure-of-disciplines’ approaches for four reasons. He suggests that:

1. A technical-rational approach to curriculum development is mechanistic. It separates means from ends and has an underlying assumption that knowing is different from doing. The teacher’s role is to interpret the curriculum document in order to deliver its content to the student consumers.

2. A curriculum organised around behaviours and verbal concepts is essentially motivated by a need to manage and control student's learning and behaviour.

   Requiring teachers to compose ultra-specific objectives and implement step-by-step lesson plans is an effective way to “manage” teaching toward a simplistic end point: a change in a learner’s behaviour. The goal is not knowledge, nor growth, nor enjoyment, but the achievement of reductionist objectives (Elliot, 1995, p. 245).

3. Conventional curriculum making assumes that all learning can be described verbally. This fractures music programmes into activities based around a list of verbal concepts which describe musical style, elements, and processes, the result of which is artificial ‘school music’, bearing little resemblance to music in the real world. He describes this reduction to a pre-defined list of verbal concepts as hostile to any kind of cultural insight or authenticity.

4. Elliott is critical of the assumption that is central to the ‘structure-of-disciplines’ approach, that all subject have an “inherent structure that can be identified, broken-down, specified, and organised in relation to verbal concepts” (p. 246).
In terms of best practice in music education, Elliott's preference is for a curriculum-as-action model where the focus is on the development of musicianship through reflective musical practicums. Drawing on the work of Dewey (1902), Schon (1987), Clandinin and Connelly (1988), and Gardner (1991), Elliott likens the reflective practicum to an apprenticeship model, where learners learn by doing, within an authentic musical context (p. 260).

This is the heart of the music curriculum: a musical teacher inducting students into musical practices through active music making (Elliott, 1995, p. 285).

Although he acknowledges that verbal concepts contribute to the development of musicianship, he believes that 'doing' is more important than 'talking' and that the nature of the 'doing' cannot be reduced to a pre-determined set of outcomes.

Cain (2001) is also critical of a linear model of progression inherent in centrally prescribed curricula. With specific reference to the English National Curriculum he refers to the influence of graded examinations in music as well as the simple-to-complex sequential approach to teaching in mathematics as problematic for music education.

Especially for primary teachers, notions of progression in music are likely to be closely allied to notions of progression in other subjects. In school mathematics, it is largely true that progress happens in sequential steps. Children need to learn to count before they can add, and to add before they multiply, and so on. The line of progression goes from easy to difficult, and from simple operations to complex ones. The same is true for most skill-based activities and there is a parallel with graded examinations in music, which can exert a powerful influence on teachers' understanding of progression, perhaps because many teachers have been through the grades themselves (Cain, 2001, p. 106).

Cain expresses concern that this model of linear progression is also influenced by a hierarchical or pyramid view of achievement in music, with a gifted few at the top, and a large number at the base, who fail to progress along this pre-determined pathway. He is also critical
of the concept of a ‘broad and balanced’ (p. 110) music education provision which does not reflect notions of individual choice and preference within a diverse range of possible musical experience.

In summary, Cain lists the following as criticisms of a linear model of progression.

- There are factors outside our control, which mitigate against linear progression.
- Linear progression inevitably leads to hierarchical pyramids: lots of people only get halfway to the destination. This really isn’t good: in my working life, I constantly meet prospective primary teachers who are terrified of engaging in simple musical activities because, like many people, they think of themselves as ‘unmusical’.
- Linear progression sits well with some views of music making, but is at odds with other, equally valid views.
- The higher levels appear to meet the needs of those pupils who have certain sorts of extra-curricular music, but may be too high for even successful musicians who don’t have this experience. For example, despite earning fame and fortune from the music business, it might be considered doubtful whether all the musicians that appear on Top of the Pops would gain National Curriculum Level 8.
- The notion of progression happening at the same rate in several different areas at once, seems to have no foundation, either in the world outside school or in theories of development. Most musicians simply aren’t broad or balanced— they sing or play or improvise or compose or analyse or dance or use IT. The musical polymath, if she or he exists, is extremely rare.
- The emphasis on analysing and evaluating would appear to mitigate against those pupils who have well-developed musical skills but poorer language skills (Cain, 2001, p. 111).

Kushner (1994) is similarly concerned about the behaviourist theoretical underpinning of National curriculum statements where learning is described as predetermined outcomes. In particular, he is concerned about a lack of trust of teachers’ professional decision making and judgement that he feels underlies centrally prescribed curricula. With reference to the English National Curriculum, he expresses concern about the lack of negotiation with teachers and the ‘product’ view of curriculum as opposed to a view where “Curriculum development flows
from the logic of the educational and personal needs of a particular classroom, a particular teacher, a particular school” (p. 38).

The key is the capacity to describe the object behaviour beforehand. This is a product-centred view of the curriculum A (Stenhouseian) process-centred view would have it that there are many objectives that can be striven for but not pre-specified. Educated children will create their own patterns of behaviour – so long as you have the self-confidence to let them. ‘Teach your children well’, sang Crosby, Stills and Nash – not ‘Teach your children the right thing’ (Kushner, 1994, p. 37).

Kushner is also critical of the simple-to-complex approach of the British curriculum for music, seeing this as just one possible strategy for teaching music. He is concerned that the primacy of this strategy within the curriculum negates the potential for teachers and children to investigate other ways to make meaning from musical experience. He describes a constructivist approach where music experience can grow out of a child’s prior knowledge and links to the child’s particular world view.

A constructivist approach requires the teacher to understand how pupils think about and act upon the world before introducing them to different ways of thinking. This might involve exploring with children, not just their own experiences of music with their families and friends, but also their views on rhythm, harmony and musical order itself (Kushner, 1994, p. 42).

According to Kushner, the teacher’s role in education, and music education in particular, should not be that of a technician who ‘delivers’ the curriculum as it is prescribed but someone who is free to adapt his or her teaching to better meet the needs of the children.

What this argument says is that a teacher should treat a centrally prescribed curriculum as a proposal to be tested through practice, subjected to the teacher’s own logic rather than a teacher feeling she has to submit to an objectives-based logic reflecting national goals (p. 43).

Trevor Thwaites, one of the writers of The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2000) describes the writers’ intention to provide guidance to the generalist teacher, while still allowing some autonomy and choice for the specialist teacher.
So, while fitting into an outcomes-based Tyler model, the current document can be seen to be relatively open-ended and broad in its objectives.

Accompanying each achievement objective is a set of indicators which demonstrate what students can do to achieve the specified learning. These indicators are not intended to be prescriptive: they aim to clarify the potential of the achievement objectives. The achievement objectives themselves are written as openly as possible so that music specialists and creative teachers are not shackled, while the outcome/indicators still give guidance to the generalist teachers who include music in their programmes at the primary levels (Thwaites, 1998, p. 28).

Within the present investigation I was interested in discussing participants’ viewpoints on the structure (that is, the strands, levels, achievement objectives) of the arts curriculum document, and, in particular, to consider whether adherence to the structure of the other six curriculum statements is considered relevant and advantageous for music education.

The following section considers the historical, theoretical background to music education and describes ways that particular theories of music education can be seen to have shaped and informed the current arts curriculum document.

Theories of Music Education

Plummeridge (2001) describes three theoretical frameworks for understanding the practice of music education over time. All three of these theories can be seen to have influenced the philosophical underpinnings of the current arts curriculum document and it is helpful to consider these in an investigation of current issues in music education. By considering these theories it becomes easier to identify and critique the particular viewpoints held by those engaging in debate about the aims, benefits of and problems with music
Plummeridge uses the terms traditional, progressive, and eclectic to describe the three theories. It is useful to compare these with Cox (2001), who identifies four major influences on the practice of music education, using the work of Kliebard (1995) with regard to the American curriculum.

...first, the humanists, who were the keepers of the tradition, tied to the finest elements of the Western canon, and committed to the traditional skills associated with it; second, social efficiency educators who looked upon the curriculum as directly functional to the adult life-roles of future citizens, they applied the standard techniques of industry to the business of schooling; third, the developmentalists, who were committed to a curriculum in harmony with children's real interests; fourth, the social meliorists who maintained that schools and the curriculum should act as major forces for social change and justice (Cox, 2001, p. 9).

Traditional Theory of Music Education

According to Plummeridge, writing from a British historical perspective, a traditional approach to music education was a significant feature of education in the '50s and '60s. The traditional approach reflects a broad educational view where education is concerned with...
... the development of intellectual skills, the preservation of the best of the cultural heritage, and the preparation of students who, as responsible citizens, can contribute to society according to their abilities and interests (Plummeridge, 2001, p. 26).

He describes traditional music programmes as being particularly focussed on skill development for performance as well as the acquisition of music theory knowledge, for the purpose of enabling students to participate in singing, playing and music appreciation activities. According to Plummeridge, within a traditional view, the arts are not seen to have a particularly significant part to play in the overall curriculum, except for students who are considered to be an elite, gifted few who might be expected to genuinely achieve in music. This reflects a hierarchical view of knowledge as well as a belief that talent is distributed to only some in the population, and is likely to result in the placement of music as an extra-curricular choice, rather than a whole class activity for all students (p. 26). The teacher of music working within a traditional methodology holds the discipline knowledge and imparts the rules of music to the student from the position of expertise and authority. Appreciation of great works, and acquiring the aural and technical skills needed to play and sing, form the key elements of a traditional programme of music learning.

In similar fashion, Reimer (1997) describes the traditional Western style of music education as being rooted in formalism which emphasises the products, rather than the process of musical creativity. According to Reimer, formalist beliefs continue to underpin traditional music education practices today as they have for a century or more.

Focusing on the great works of music (the counterpart of the ‘great books’) as the appropriate examples for study, cultivating the musical talents of those with special gifts as being the main purpose of music education, elevating the taste of the masses to be able to better appreciate the exemplars of music as an additional obligation of music education, improving the level of culture by supporting its ‘classical’ or ‘serious’ music as opposed to its ‘popular’ or ‘transient’ music; all these are remnants of formalist beliefs... (Reimer, 1997, p. 10).
Progressive Theory of Music Education

Whereas the traditional music educator emphasises the importance of students acquiring recognised skills, techniques and knowledge, the progressivist is more concerned with the development of certain qualities of mind such as sensitivity, imaginativeness, creativeness and a sense of the aesthetic (Plummeridge, 2001, p. 26).

According to Plummeridge, the teacher working within a progressive music education model fills the role of facilitator, rather than expert. The teacher is there to guide and motivate the children through creative musical experiences within an environment conducive to learning. Where the traditional model emphasises performance, the progressive model emphasises creativity and experimentation, underpinned by the belief that music-making and sharing should be accessible to all children. The expression of feeling and emotion through the arts is seen as an important vehicle for individual growth and fulfilment.

In the background paper to the arts curriculum document, Foley, Hong and Thwaites (1999) describe progressivism within the context of the historical practice of education in the arts in New Zealand. They criticise the lack of emphasis on skill and knowledge development within a progressive approach to arts education.

With its focus on the innate and spontaneous expressive abilities of the child, however, Progressivism neglected to develop knowledge about the techniques and traditions of art making. Bresler (1998) has pointed out that expression and interpretation are complex processes and involve more than permission to be spontaneous and creative (Foley, Hong, Thwaites, 1999, p. 5).
Eclectic Theory of Music Education

This theory includes elements of traditional and progressive education theory, in that it encompasses the traditional belief that music is a distinct way of knowing, as well as the progressive valuing of creativity and expression through the arts. However, the eclectic theory emphasises the provision of a broad range of musical experiences and the inclusion of a broad range of musical style and genres within the programme. Students working within an eclectic model of music education will have the opportunity to explore a wide range of music through performing, composing, and listening to music. According to Plummeridge (2001), this is underpinned by a wider societal goal.

Education is conceived of as a process that aims to develop children’s individual capacities through the provision of broad experiences; a wider educational aim is the improvement of society as a whole through the promotion of democratic principles (p. 27).

Within the eclectic theory, music learning happens through a broad range of experiences in performing, composing and listening to music, with a strong emphasis on the connection to and understanding of the cultural meaning and purpose of music making. This model of music education can also be understood within a broad conception of educational needs for a pluralist, global, multi-cultural society.

The next section introduces the current curriculum document and considers its structure, goals, and aspects of its philosophical and theoretical underpinnings.
Music Within the Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum

The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2000) is one of seven curriculum statements that support The New Zealand Curriculum as it is described in The New Zealand Curriculum Framework (Ministry of Education, 1993). It is the curriculum statement for the 'essential learning area' entitled The Arts. The structure of the arts curriculum document is consistent with the other previous curriculum statements, indicating achievement objectives at eight levels, which are intended to guide the planning of programmes from years 1 to 13. Four arts (visual art, dance, music, and drama) are included in the document as separate disciplines, linked together by common strands. The strands are: Developing Practical Knowledge in the Arts, Developing Ideas in the Arts, Communicating and Interpreting in the Arts, Understanding the Arts in Context (Ministry of Education, 2000, p. 13).

The aims of The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum are: to enable students to develop literacies in dance, drama, music, and the visual arts; to assist students to participate in and develop a lifelong interest in the arts; to broaden understanding of and involvement in the arts in New Zealand (p. 12).

In the background paper to the draft curriculum statement, the writers identified some theoretical positions and other trends and practical issues that informed the development of the draft statement (1999). In particular, the theoretical concept of multiple literacies in the arts appears central to the philosophy of the draft and current curriculum. The writers locate this within post-modern thinking about language and culture.

The Conceptual Frame for The Arts embraces the nature of literacy and literacies in the arts as distinct ways of knowing. Literacies in the arts are developed as students learn in, through, and about different art forms within
the arts disciplines and use their languages to communicate and interpret meaning. The conceptual framework defines an approach to literacies in the arts which is critical, culturally based, and reflects current arts practice and theories of cultural pluralism (Foley, Hong, Thwaites, 1999, p. 29).

The interpretation and valuing of art works as social texts, that is, as objects or activities that ‘speak’ about the social, historical, and political contexts within which they are produced, is also an important underlying concept in the curriculum document. This concept is central to the “Understanding the Arts in Context” strand of the current document.

The aesthetic experience, although recognised by the post-modernist, does not by itself provide sufficient reason for the inclusion of art in education. Value is placed on the outcomes that result when works of art are created and interpreted from social, historical, and iconographic perspectives. Postmodernism places art works in the context of their social, cultural, political, philosophical and historical settings and locates them as texts to be interrogated (p. 6).

The current curriculum document describes the arts as having communicative, expressive intent, within particular social, historical, political settings. Also, each arts discipline in the document is considered to have a distinct body of knowledge. Arts literacy is described as the acquisition of skills, knowledge and attitudes in a particular art discipline, enabling the learner to “communicate and interpret meaning in the arts” (Ministry of Education, p. 10). The document reflects post-modern ideas about learning in a multi-cultural world, where diversity is acknowledged and celebrated. In the document, the extrinsic benefits of learning in the arts are promoted, and the skills and knowledge specific to each discipline are identified and described.

The following ideas about music education appear central to the goals and philosophy of the music component of the arts curriculum document.

- music is a unique way of knowing
- music is a means of personal and cultural expression
to create musical works we organise sounds by manipulating pitch, rhythm, dynamics, harmony, timbre, texture, and form.
through music we can develop understandings about our own and other cultures.
through music education students can 'contribute to the cultural life of their schools, families, and communities' (p. 53).

It is possible to trace the influence of the three theories of music education described in the previous section, on the current New Zealand curriculum document for the arts. The background paper to the arts curriculum document describes the theoretical and philosophical framework that has informed and shaped the current document (Foley, Hong, Thwaites, 1999). This paper emphasises the importance of the arts as a vehicle for developing cultural understandings and awareness, for developing knowledge of and transmitting cultural values, and articulates a belief in the possibilities for the improvement of society through the arts. There is also strong emphasis on the extrinsic, instrumental value of learning in the arts. These ideas can be seen as a merging of traditional, progressive, and eclectic theoretical ideas and values. This is evidenced in the following summary of the theoretical positions that are described as being central to the underlying philosophy of the arts curriculum document.

- Education in the arts has both intrinsic and instrumental value.
- The disciplines of the arts are a source of knowledge, beliefs, and values about the self and the world.
- Arts literacies enable students to develop imagination, critical thinking, perceptual skills, and higher order cognitive processes.
- The arts are essential to the development of educated and multiliterate citizens within bicultural New Zealand and a multicultural world.
- Both creating and responding to art works are important forms of inquiry through which human experiences can be understood and cultural values transmitted (Foley, Hong, Thwaites, 1999, p. 52).

The first bullet point (above) combines a traditional belief in music as a discipline that has value for its own sake, and a progressive view, that music learning will be instrumental in helping a student to develop other, not specifically music related, behaviours and attributes, such as sensitivity, good self-esteem, and imagination (Plummeridge, 2001, p. 26). The second bullet point describes an eclectic belief that music is a particular way of knowing, that
is culturally constructed. The third and fourth bullet points reflect a traditional and eclectic belief that music education can improve society. The final bullet point articulates an eclectic viewpoint about the transmission of cultural knowledge and values through education in the arts.

It is also possible to recognise the descriptions of Cox (2001), using Kliebard’s categories, referred to at the beginning of the previous section, in the theoretical stance and philosophical goals of the current arts curriculum document described above. The emphasis on the transmission of cultural values and knowledge fits within a humanist tradition (Cox, 2001, p. 18), while the emphasis on the development of imagination and self-knowledge through learning in the arts reflects ‘developmentalist’ thinking. The ‘social efficiency educators’ described by Cox (2001, p. 9) would appreciate the goal to develop educated and multi-literate citizens, and the social meliorists would concur with the idea that the arts have instrumental value, including the power to improve society.

The arts are powerful forms of personal, social, and cultural expression. They are unique “ways of knowing” that enable individuals and groups to create ideas and images that reflect, communicate, and change their views of the world. The arts stimulate imagination, thinking and understanding. They challenge our perceptions, uplift and entertain us, and enrich our emotional and spiritual lives. As expressions of culture, the arts pass on and renew our heritage and traditions and help to shape our sense of identity (Ministry of Education, 2000, p. 9).

The current curriculum document acknowledges both the uniqueness of musical experience, and the potential for extra-musical outcomes. It describes the meaning of music as culturally constructed and considers the investigation of social, historical and political contexts for music to be a vital part of a balanced music programme.
As stated earlier, this reflects an eclectic theoretical underpinning, in combination with traditional and progressive ideas about the value and justification of music within the curriculum.

It is important to acknowledge that teaching music whether from a traditional, progressive or eclectic theoretical standpoint requires a depth of subject content knowledge. This is particularly evident in the teaching requirements of the traditional music educator. The emphasis on subject knowledge is less evident within the progressive theory of music education, where the skills of facilitation, and strategies for fostering creativity and the imagination take a more prominent role. However, the eclectic nature of the current arts document suggests that both and content and pedagogical knowledge are needed to effectively teach this curriculum.

The following section discusses the impact of the political ideology evidenced in the New Zealand Curriculum Framework (1993) on the ways that the arts may be viewed and valued by schools and the wider community.

The Impact of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework on the Arts Curriculum

The New Zealand Curriculum Framework document was released in 1993. It describes seven essential learning areas which are: Language and Languages (Te Kōrero me Nga Reo), Mathematics (Pāngarau), Science (Pūtaiao), Technology (Hangarau), Social Sciences (Tikanga-ā-iwi), The Arts (Nga Toi), and Health and Physical Well-being (Hauora). These essential learning areas were subsequently developed into seven curriculum statements, the
last of which, The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum, was published in 2000. Each curriculum statement is required to facilitate the development of eight “essential skills”, as well as particular attitudes and values that are set out in the Framework. The essential skills are: communication skills, numeracy skills, information skills, problem-solving skills, self-management and competitive skills, social and cooperative skills, physical skills, and work and study skills. The Curriculum Framework also describes eight levels of achievement covering years of schooling one to thirteen, with achievement objectives specified for assessment purposes at each level.

Sullivan (2001) suggests questions arising from the ideological and political agenda underpinning the content of the Curriculum Framework.

It could be asked why, for instance, an area such as the social sciences is encapsulated in only one essential learning area. After all, it comprises a number of important, separate and well-established disciplines that study human social activity: anthropology, geography (often considered a science), history (often considered a humanity) and sociology. What is more, why was economics (a subject more central to business than social issues) included? In a similar vein, why was technology, which has never existed as a curriculum subject in its own right, given single learning area status? In our globalising world, information technology, in particular, is seen as leading us into the future, but is it appropriate to reify it by putting technology on an equal footing with the multidisciplinary social sciences? It could also be argued that the lumping together of a wide range of arts subjects is similarly undervaluing. A major issue is that if seven essential learning areas are created, does it mean that their development and implementation are funded in an equal fashion and, if so, would the arts and social sciences end up under-funded and under-valued? (Sullivan, 2001, p. 186).

Similarly, Langton (1999) is critical of the Curriculum Framework, particularly with regard to the status and valuing of the arts. Drawing on the work of Manins (1999), Langton criticises the emphasis in the framework on skill development and preparation for the work force. She expresses concern at the lack of “vision” in the framework, and in particular, its
lack of consideration of the kinds of skills and understandings necessary for learning in the Arts.

...is the NZCF sufficiently visionary to off-set these skills-based curricula? Critics say it is not an adequate framework for what is important in teaching and learning in Art. It does not list creative skills in its definition of essential skills and does not acknowledge the holistic approach to education. Manins (1999), while expressing deep concerns with the arts curriculum, blames flawed principles in the NZCF which are not in keeping with 21st century learning needs. His argument is that the “awe” factor is missing. He maintains that the framework is... “biased towards scientific knowledge and that it needs to be re-written with appropriate balance between the verbal, scientific, technological, competitive aspects of contemporary society and other ways of thinking. This revision would give appropriate recognition to experience that can transcend the domination of the three-dimensional world, experience that is not measured by quantification or economic efficiency; whose goals include beauty and quality of life” (Manins, 1999) (cited in Langton, 1999, p. 161).

Aikin (2001) describes the essential skills, attitudes and values outlined in the Framework as emphasising work-place knowledge and skills. She believes that this is motivated by a political view of the need to respond educationally to technological change, market-place needs and global influences.

Desirable attitudes and values as stated within the framework are expected to underpin the culture of any school. O’Neill et al. (1998) see the guidance provided by the curriculum as an endorsement of the ethics and values of business, with the key features being personal and global competitiveness and consumerism. These values and those embedded in school and class practice are the messages which surround students (Aikin, 2001, p. 151).

Mansfield (2003) is concerned that the educational goals of learning in the arts have been ‘hijacked’ by the vocational training and skill development emphasis in the Framework (p. 68).

The representation of the arts within the forced constraints of ‘essential skills’ appears to construct students as controlled automatons subjected to disciplinary measures. That is, through the arts, they are to be subjected to the development of ‘self-management and competitive skills’ and to ‘physical skills (Ministry of Education, 2000: 100), the ‘disciplines’ contributing in no uncertain manner to this ‘disciplining’. The economic
rationalist character of this ‘generic’ document, despite rhetoric to the contrary, is nowhere clearer than in this section (Mansfield, 2003, p. 70).

In describing the Scottish National Curriculum, McPhee and Stollery (2002) express concern about the utilitarian nature of the National curriculum, particularly with regard to the notion of core skills. It is interesting to note similarities between the Scottish National Curriculum and the essential skills of the New Zealand Curriculum Framework. Each has grown out of a similar domination by market-driven goals in which education is predominantly seen as a preparation for the world of work. McPhee and Stollery comment on what they see as a lack of balance in the Scottish curriculum and an undervaluing of the aesthetic and cultural dimensions of life.

At the moment, a utilitarian philosophy seems to have the upper hand over wider cultural interpretation of the notion of core skills. For example, the core skills defined within the most recent interpretation of the Scottish curriculum include communication, numeracy, problem-solving, working together, use of information technology and learning and thinking skills. This certainly will fit within a definition of core skills which encompasses the majority of those that might be produced by a committee of industrialists assembled to undertake this task, but it would not in any way address a concept of core skills required for living a balanced and fulfilled cultural life (McPhee and Stollery, 2002, p. 96).

Young (2001) has highlighted aspects of the socio-political context for teaching in Britain, including the National Curriculum, which she believes have been detrimental to music education in primary and secondary schools. She has investigated the impact of politically driven changes on the construction of the teacher as a professional in ‘marginalised’ subject areas such as music.

The top-down, prescriptive approach of (interestingly) both previous and current governments has meant that the relative autonomy enjoyed by teachers throughout the 1970s and early 1980s has become a thing of the past (Hargreaves and Evans, 1997). The National curriculum now not only dictates content in terms of subjects, areas of study and assessment criteria, but in some cases (i.e. numeracy and literacy hours in primary schools), the recommended methodology to be used by the teacher to ‘deliver’ the curriculum is perceived as prescribed. With no clearly articulated rationale,
certain subjects have been accorded high status, while by definition, others have been marginalised. Even within the ‘high status’ subjects themselves, certain aspects (i.e. numbers, reading and writing) have been elevated at the further expense of the so-called ‘minority’ subjects. Music, it could be argued, may be argued, may be the biggest casualty of this prescription of content, particularly in the primary sector (Young, 2001, p. 210).

In New Zealand, music, as a discipline, is one quarter of the essential learning area of The Arts, which is one of seven essential learning areas. As a separate subject it is mentioned only once within the Framework document, in the final sentence of a one page description of The Arts.

In particular, schools will provide for learning in visual art (including craft and design), music, drama, dance, and literature (Ministry of Education, 1993, p. 15).

Bracey (2003) questions the generic nature of the arts curriculum and the choice of Dance, Drama, Visual Art and Music as the four Arts that constitute ‘The Arts’. He comments on what he believes is an unsupported claim made in the curriculum document that the arts function as an essential element of daily living (p. 185).

If the arts are indeed ‘an essential element of daily living’ (p. 9) we should ask why it is that only four arts are included in the alleged essential learning area called by that name. Does this mean that only these four arts constitute an essential element in everyday living and that the other arts do not? If that is not the case, it is simply misleading to call the so-named ‘essential learning area’ ‘The Arts’? Would it not be more accurate to call it ‘Four Arts’ or, perhaps more accurately, ‘Four Randomly Selected Arts’? And if there is doubt about which of the arts are essential to our daily living, a further doubt arises about what the four arts in question actually involve (Bracey, 2003, p. 185).

Given the lack of visible status for music within the Curriculum Framework, and the emphasis placed on science, technology, literacy and numeracy, the lack of progress towards an adequate model of music education in primary schools is perhaps not surprising (Manins, 1997; Bracey, 1997).
The following section describes and critiques the different ways that music education is viewed and valued from the perspective of music educators, and also those interested in music education from a social and psychological viewpoint.

**Valuing Music Education: Intrinsic and Extrinsic Intentions and Outcomes**

Cox (2001) has explored the nature of the claims made in the name of music education from a historical perspective. He has investigated changing socio-political ideologies over time which have impacted on the reasons for including music in public schooling and shaped the goals for music education in terms of its perceived benefits for the individual and society. In particular, he recognises the influence of the belief that music may have ‘extrinsic outcomes’. This belief is a common thread in much music education advocacy today.

There are certain ideas that permeate the justifications and aims of music education. The belief in music as a ‘spiritual’ or ‘divine’ force was being expressed at the start and end of our chronological survey and in many ways is connected with the humanist tradition centred on the belief in the transcendence of music. But there is also a link to the social meliorist position: music has the power to regenerate society. After all, if music is so elemental and fundamental there is no limit to its power. A conviction that melody is ‘our mother tongue’, that music is our ‘primary language’ reinforces the belief that it has that power to effect a cultivated outlook on life, and to play a key role in a pupil’s performance in other subjects (Cox, 2001, p. 19).

The need to advocate for music, and to justify and defend its position in the school curriculum and its importance in the classroom, has led to many claims for the wider benefits of music education, such as those described in the quotation above. According to these claims, music learning can benefit children as they transfer skills, knowledge, attitudes and values developed through musical engagement to other areas of life and learning. This extrinsic
justification for music in the curriculum is underpinned by a belief in the power of music to improve the human condition (Plummeridge, 2001). Music is seen to have educational value because of its ‘spin-off effects’ (p. 23). This has proved to be a popular view and has provided a very useful, effective tool for music education advocates. However, Plummeridge warns against claims that are not accompanied with evidence from rigorous research.

...the study of music is said to promote thinking skills, self-discipline and creativity across the curriculum. At first sight this may seem convincing but there is no evidence to show that creative behaviour developed in music makes children more creative in mathematics, home economics or history (Plummeridge, 2001, p. 23).

Plummeridge is concerned about the benefits of music being assessed in terms of an individual’s improvement in areas other than music itself. He sees this as a very tenuous link to be making, unless accompanied by valid research evidence. He is also concerned that such claims are a distraction from discussion of the important issues related to good practice in music education and the intrinsic benefits of music making and learning.

Many of the benefits associated with studies in music can be accounted for in terms of learning to learn: good study skills and habits acquired in music transfer to other activities. But such skills could just as likely transfer from studies in any other discipline. It is one thing to say that the study of music has transfer effects but quite another to claim that this makes music unique which in turn provides its justification as a curriculum subject. The point is that transfer of skills, attitudes, techniques and knowledge from one discipline to another occurs all the time in everyday life, and is, of course, a vital part of the educational process (Plummeridge, 2001, p. 24).

Plummeridge believes that we must look for justification for music’s place in the core curriculum elsewhere, with our focus on practice. He describes extrinsic justification as potentially self-defeating and unable to stand up to close scrutiny. He believes that the strongest arguments for music must come from the practice of music education, and that the effectiveness of this practice will be dependent on the skills of the teacher. He agrees with
Reid (1980) who makes the point that “it is only really possible to understand the value of the arts from within” (p. 28).

In those schools where music is being taught effectively, questions of justification seldom seem to arise. To see children taking part in activities and working with a sense of commitment, purpose and delight is to recognise that they are participating in something worthwhile and of intrinsic value. The practice is the justification (Plummeridge p. 28).

Reimer (1997) is also critical of a ‘referential’ or extrinsic view of music, where music’s value is sought from without, rather than from within. While acknowledging that musical engagement can lead to all kinds of positive consequences for those involved, he is concerned that this view can result in distraction from the unique forms, functions and processes of music.

... in looking outward from musical experience in seeking to locate its value, referentialism ignores or denigrates the philosophical attempt to explain how music has values inherent within it; values peculiar to and obtainable only from musical engagements. … The combination of seeking outward rather than inward for benefits of music, with the inevitable result that any benefits identified will also be achievable without music, puts music education on shaky ground as to justifications for supporting it and as to decisions about what and how to teach it. (Reimer, 1997, p. 14).

Eisner (2001) is also unhappy about justifications for music education based on its proposed extra-musical benefits. He believes that while the ultimate function of music education is to enrich human experience (p. 10) this enrichment comes from students being given opportunities to undergo the experience that quality music education, uniquely, can provide. Eisner (2001) is concerned that the value of music education is misunderstood and that this misunderstanding influences the way that educators attempt to justify the value of music educational experience. He sees that many either dismiss music as a ‘fringe activity’ or as something that has value only in terms of extrinsic benefits.
The educational functions of music, like the educational functions of the other arts, are not well understood by parents or by those who shape educational policy. The general public does not think of music as the product of complex forms of thinking. In terms of educational priorities music is regarded as nice, but not necessary. It occupies a place on the rim of education, not at its core. Music begins to become important when the public believes it contributes to extramusical outcomes, such as its highly touted contribution to spatial reasoning and math performance, for example (Eisner, 2001, p. 37).

Similarly, Robinson (2000) describes arts practices as being unique ways of knowing that have been misunderstood and undervalued in the western world, which he believes has a narrow definition of academic intelligence, often limited to numeracy and literacy.

There’s a very interesting contrast in this respect in universities, which are the apotheosis of the academic system. If you’re a chemist in a university department doing research, you do chemistry. If you’re in an art department at a university, you don’t paint; you write about painting. The reason is that our dominant model of education doesn’t recognise that the arts are essentially ways of knowing. Research is defined as a systematic inquiry for new knowledge. Yet, really, music, poetry, dance and painting are ways of knowing things that we couldn’t know in any other way. There are ideas, feelings and sensations that can only be understood in these ways. The arts are ways of understanding (Robinson, 2000, p. 5).

The following section examines some perspectives on the ways that children may view and value music learning at school. It also considers the challenge for teachers of negotiating with children the socio-cultural meaning and relevance of musical experience at school.

**School Music Versus ‘Real’ Music**

In 1999 Buckton carried out a study aimed at investigating children’s attitudes to music, using data gathered by the National Educational Monitoring Project (NEMP) in 1996. In this study, Buckton expresses concern at the fact that according to the NEMP data, school music
loses popularity between Year 4 (around ages 7 to 8 years) and Year 8 (around ages 11 to 12 years), whereas participation in musical activity out of school is increased. He emphasises the idea that music by its nature should be one of the most enjoyable school activities for all ages.

Given this evidence about an increase in musical interest outside school, it is surely of concern that in school, music loses popularity from 4th to 5th place behind art, physical education and maths at Year 4 and in addition, technology at Year 8. In addition, if one believes that there is a significant element of “enjoyment” in the aims of aesthetic subjects such as art and music, then popularity and enjoyment are important indicators of success.... Should not the very nature of the subject mean that music should be with art and physical education as the most popular subjects? If school music is not cultivating positive attitudes towards music what other purpose does it fulfil? (Buckton, 1999, p. 10).

Shehan-Campbell (1993) describes a phenomenon where the joy of musical experience may be undermined by the formal practice of music education in school classroom. She comments that school music can lack authenticity for children if it is over-prescribed and unconnected to the children’s actual musical needs and interests.

British music educator Keith Swanwick has observed “Music education is not a problem until it surfaces in schools, until it becomes ‘formal’ and ‘institutionalised’”. If children want to sing, or move- groove to music- play a guitar or keyboard, they just do it. The informal music “student” can listen to the radio or to her choice of CDs, and can learn chord patterns and melodic “riffs” without the help of a curriculum committee. Formal instruction in music may not be necessary for some children – and yet for most of them, formal systems of music, in schools, may be crucial points of access, the beginning of a long and vital road to musical knowledge and skills. They may simply be unable to excel musically without what we can offer them, if we are careful in how we deliver! (Shehan-Campbell, 1993, p. 20).

Shehan-Campbell believes that in order to avoid putting off some children who have been effectively self-educating in music, teachers must teach in a way that is sensitive to children’s prior knowledge and musical world-view. In particular, she believes that observation of children’s musical play at an early age can become the key to planning relevant teacher interventions that will nurture a child’s musical development.
Children’s musical enculturation is already well underway by the time they enter their school years. Although by no means completely set, their sensitivity to certain musical styles, their uses of music for particular occasions, and their musical vocabularies and grammars are already gelling. Their family and community experiences have influenced their perceptions of what music means to them, and they enjoy and value particular types of music as a result of these experiences. With schooling comes most children’s first formal education in music, even as their informal learning continues at home. Lessons may follow, even as enculturation continues. In important ways, the home and school – and the efforts of parents and teachers – can take children from whom they musically are to all they can musically become (Shehan-Campbell, 1993, p. 21).

In a Swedish study of young people’s experience of music, Stålhammer (2000) concluded that young people’s values and attitudes and musical practices were often in conflict with their school experiences of music education. He describes some models of music education teaching as a one-way communication from teacher to pupil without real connection between the teacher’s and the pupils’ experiences. He also describes a problematic difference between the holistic world of musical encounters in life outside the classroom where there are “no strict boundaries between subjects, nor is there dissection of a subject into fragments” (p. 42) and the way that different subjects are typically packaged and delivered in school programmes.

In EMT – [Experience and Music Teaching] project interviews with Swedish and English youth, a picture emerges which shows that young people today have emotional, intellectual and pragmatic connections with music. Music is described as part of the personal identity. It is remarkable, however, that when the young people talk about the school’s or the adult world’s values of musical experience and knowledge, then music is separated from personal feelings and social togetherness. They then present music as a freestanding artefact which is judged by people on the basis of well-established value norms. Similar thoughts can be found in Stålhammer (1995) where young people interviewed in a school project were of the opinion that music could be described in two terms, either as ‘the school’s music’ or ‘the real music’, with the latter meaning their own music (Stålhammer, 2000, p. 41).

According to Shehan-Campbell (1993) and Stålhammer (2000) relevance and holism are particular challenges for music education, requiring teachers to have in-depth knowledge.
of children’s music learning needs and interests as well as insight into the musical world inhabited by children outside of the school classroom, in order to better engage and connect with them.

The following section considers issues to do with equality of access to music education and the ways that some children may experience an economic barrier to achievement in music.

**Equality of Opportunity in Music Education**

Music education, perhaps more than any other subject area, can involve issues of equity and access. Outside of school, some children have music learning opportunities that are unavailable to other children for economic and other reasons. Philpott (2001) considers music education to be unique in the way that extra-curricular music learning opportunities, generally paid for by parents, may impact on outcomes for children in school. According to Philpott, research in Britain on the influence of extra-curricular music tuition on musical achievement in school shows that children who learn out of school are greatly advantaged. Philpott also believes that the nature of instrumental tuition out of school influences classroom teachers’ ideas about what kinds of musical behaviour should be most valued.

Many writers feel that music teachers tacitly identify with the values bestowed on the instrumentalist as the basis for a sound music education, i.e. the value of technique, the ability to ‘read’, and an acquaintance with Western classical music. These attitudes could determine the nature of the curriculum in schools at a local level, again putting non-instrumentalists at a disadvantage (Philpott, 2001, p. 163).
Philpott argues for a rethink about musical achievement in terms of what we typically measure and value in school programmes. He is concerned that success in music should not be linked to a family’s ability to pay for extra tuition, and that a more diverse range of students should be able to succeed within the music learning opportunities offered within the curriculum.

The implications of rethinking what counts as musical achievement involves rethinking the criteria for success and progress. As has been seen, current criteria seem to be imbued with values which model progress as linear, moving from the simple to the complex, as exemplified by the western classical tradition. Such a model denies certain types of learning and progress important to the arts in general and also to other cultures (Philpott, 2001, p. 166).

The National Education Monitoring Project (NEMP) results (2000) confirm that music education achievement in New Zealand is affected by economic factors.

There were statistically significant differences in the performance of students from low, medium and high SES (decile) schools on 57 percent of the year 4 tasks and 27 percent of the year 8 tasks. The results suggest that private music lessons and other organised music experiences boost the musical development of students from economically advantaged families, particularly in the early years of primary schooling when school-based lessons are not widely available (Crooks and Flockton, 2000, p. 50).

The next section considers issues to do with perceptions of musical ability or potential. Philpott (2001) has argued that this is an important issue to consider because of the way that a belief in innate talent and ability may limit access to music education for some children and may influence teachers’ expectations of children’s achievement in music. As Philpott comments, there is a need to deconstruct the … “elitist tag and the mystique which often surrounds being musical” (p. 167).
Being Musical – Perceptions of Musical Giftedness and Intelligence

Literature in this area appears to fall into two distinct camps: those that see musical giftedness as an inherited characteristic and those that see it as something that all have the potential to develop given adequate opportunity. McPhee and Stollery (2002) define musical intelligence as “the capacity to engage with and respond to music at a personal level” (p. 89). This signals something that all can participate in depending on the quality of and accessibility of opportunity for musical experience, which, according to McPhee and Stollery, is a reflection of the value placed by society on this particular kind of intelligence (p. 97).

Writing from the perspective of the Scottish education system, McPhee and Stollery describe an increasing social and educational interest in the concept of giftedness and the way that a suitable education may be provided for children identified as gifted. This may be similar to the current situation in New Zealand where the Ministry of Education is emphasising the necessity for better provision for ‘gifted children’. This is evidenced in the increased availability of professional development courses on giftedness as well as the recent publication of a ministry handbook entitled “Gifted and Talented Students: Meeting their Needs in New Zealand Schools (Ministry of Education, 2004). From the beginning of 2005 it will be mandatory for schools to demonstrate how they are meeting the needs of children identified as gifted and talented.

McPhee and Stollery reject the idea that giftedness is predominantly an inherited characteristic, believing instead that musical excellence can be taught. They identify a number of myths associated with the notion that ability is hereditary, including the idea that to become excellent in music, one has to be excellent to start with (p. 91) and prefer an environmental view of the development of talent. Drawing on the work of Skinner (1991) they describe
musical ability as being within a wide and dynamic spectrum of educational need and difference and agree with Skinner's rejection of creativity tests, checklists, or IQ tests that purport to detect giftedness.

Rather, he [Skinner] believes, an optimistic view of the learner should be taken and assumptions should be made that 95 per cent of children rather than 5 percent can become gifted (p. 90).

Murphy (1999) has researched how psychometric testing is used to determine musical ability and is concerned that use of the terms “musical intelligence” and “musical giftedness” can lead to elitism in music educational practice. He questions the validity of much testing in music and is concerned that music aptitude tests construct rather than measure musical ability, and are often narrow in their focus.

The extent to which some tests of musical ability, based as they are on reductionist assumptions regarding the uniform auditory components of music, are truly representative of musical intelligence is open to question. In any event, such tests may not measure those specific abilities that they purport to with any accuracy, if at all (Murphy, 1999, p. 47).

Murphy describes musical intelligence as a way of knowing, which involves the ability to think musically as performer, composer or listener (p. 40). He believes that musical intelligence can be developed through musical experience and good teaching. However, he is concerned that narrow concepts of intelligence and ability have had an adverse affect on the quality of music education provision in schools.

The view of innate musical ability has, in my view, tended towards a proliferation of elitist practices in music education in which many children have been denied access to worthwhile musical encounters. I have, for example, lost count of the number of students I have taken for private instrumental tuition who were initially turned down by their school on the grounds that they failed a musical ability test or were considered 'unmusical' (Murphy, 1999, p. 40).
Elliott (1995) is convinced that musicianship is a form of knowledge and not an accident of birth. He believes that some of us are born with greater knowledge-building capacities than others, but that musicianship is a form of knowledge that is “applicable to and achievable by most children. He describes notions of talent and giftedness as ‘romantic myths’ (p. 235).

No one is born musical. Instead, people are born with capacities of attention, awareness, and memory that enable them to learn to think musically- to make music and listen for music competently, if not proficiently. Musicianship is achieved through music teaching and learning; it is neither a gift nor a talent. True, some people seem to have high level of musical intelligence and high levels of interest in learning to make and listen for music well. These factors may enable such people to develop musicianship and musical creativity more deeply and broadly than other. Nevertheless, the vast majority of people have sufficient musical intelligence to achieve at least a competent level of musicianship through systematic programs of music education (Elliott, 1995, p. 236).

Elliott also describes a political and economic agenda underpinning the construction of musicianship as talent. He believes that the notion of musicianship as talent is a politically driven way to marginalise the place of music education within the curriculum.

To call something as talent is to put it beyond the reach of most mortals. The unexamined association between music and talent causes parents, administrators, and the general public to assume, wrongly, that music is inaccessible, unachievable, and, therefore an inappropriate or unnecessary subject for the majority of school children. In this way, the talent notion serves a political purpose; it saves public education a great deal of money that would otherwise have to be spent hiring qualified music teachers to teach all children music in the same way that all children are expected to be taught math or reading (Elliott, 1995, p. 235).

Rutherford (2001), in a paper presented at a New Zealand Annual Review of Education (NZARE) conference in Christchurch, analysed “the construct of the word ‘gifted’ as it is used by New Zealand principals to explain and justify student differentiation and programme prescription” (p. 1). She found that principals typically conceived of giftedness as an innate
and stable characteristic located within an individual (p. 3). She comments on the implications of expressing giftedness as a ‘noun’ rather than a ‘process’ (p. 4).

If giftedness were expressed as a process it would take on a different perspective in terms of educational programming. It could be something any child could have an opportunity to do, rather than something a child either is or isn’t. Giftedness as a process would insinuate a more temporary procedure open to outside influence. Expressing giftedness as a noun suggest that this attribute of giftedness is a stable one, unlikely to change. Further, making such a distinction in discourse lessens the need to make reference to neither the causality of nor the responsibility for the giftedness … (Rutherford, 2001, p. 4).

Rutherford believes that educational planning needs to take into account the complex and fluid nature of children’s individual strengths and needs, and should avoid the stereotyped assumptions of homogeneity that may underpin the use of the label ‘gifted’. She concludes that the best learning environment for any student is based on a comprehensive knowledge of them as an individual and that the needs of “gifted” children should be catered for automatically by an education system which recognises the holistic complexities of all students (p. 19).

The present study is underpinned by the belief that quality music education is a vital part of the curriculum and should be available to all children. Linked to this is the belief, shared by Elliot (1995), McPhee and Stollery (2002), Paynter (2002) and Philpott (2001), that all children have musical potential and that achievement in music is dependent on opportunity, and nurturing within the contexts of family, friend, school and the wider community rather than on innate ability. According to Paynter, based on this conception of children as learners, the skilled and knowledgeable teacher will be able to teach a rich and carefully differentiated programme where children who need it are musically extended and challenged and all are nurtured and supported.

This is important because when we begin to consider why music might have a place in the school curriculum we must believe that a teacher’s
commitment is to all the pupils, not only to those with conventional talent. Music may have a role in school life socially but, if it is to be a valuable *curriculum* subject, what is done in the classroom must reach out to every pupil; that is to say, it must exploit natural human musicality (Paynter, 2002, p. 219).
Chapter 2
Teaching the Curriculum

Introduction

Chapter 1 has described a curriculum document with an eclectic theoretical base, with aims that encompass a wide variety of music playing, creating and appreciating experiences within a socio-cultural context. Implicit within the expectations of this document is the knowledgeable teacher, who has the skills, understandings and commitment needed for quality music education to happen. Chapter 2 explores issues related to the teaching of the curriculum. It aims to set the scene for teaching and learning music in the primary school classroom by considering some of the wider socio-political issues that may impact on teacher’s work. This includes the work pressures for teachers in an era of almost constant professional development and up-skilling across many areas of curriculum knowledge and teaching pedagogy. This chapter also discusses the issue of teacher knowledge needed for the effective teaching of music and considers the advantages and disadvantages of specialist and generalist delivery of music education.

This chapter also includes some comparison between the implementation challenges for music and those for other curriculum areas, in particular, the science curriculum, and the dance component of the arts curriculum. This chapter concludes with some viewpoints on integration as an approach to teaching in the arts.
In summary, this chapter includes the following focus areas:

- the impact of work and compliance pressures for teachers
- teacher knowledge and confidence to teach music
- specialist and generalist models of music teaching
- a comparison with curriculum implementation issues for science and dance
- integrated approaches to teaching the arts

**Work and Compliance Pressures for Teachers**

As new curriculum documents are developed, reviewed and modified, and as different pedagogical content knowledge is developed, particularly in the area of assessment, schools are beset with in-service programmes for professional development which involve them in workshops and other development work. Teachers are required to provide evidence of change to their practice and improved student achievement in particular focus areas over time. There is an expectation by the Ministry of an enthusiastic nationwide response to initiatives aimed at targeting the needs of particular groups within the school community, or with a focus on the implementation of a new curriculum document, or advocating particular pedagogical approaches to teaching and learning. The areas of literacy, numeracy and assessment have been particularly targeted for emphasis in teacher professional development programmes in recent years. Schools are expected to supply evidence of their compliance with Ministry requirements, and must report to the Ministry on the success of these initiatives in terms of measured outcomes for children (Hawk, Hill, Taylor, 2001). For individual teachers, this work may be linked to performance appraisal of particular professional competencies (Clark, 1998; Smyth, 2001). Given this overall work pressure, it is perhaps understandable that
professional development expectations in subjects that are believed to sit outside those areas proposed by government to be of particular educational focus and concern, have sometimes stretched teachers’ enthusiasm for making changes to their practice. Hawk, Hill and Taylor (2001) evaluated the experiences of twelve New Zealand schools that participated in a Ministry of Education contract aimed at rethinking professional development practices. They found that teachers were sometimes overwhelmed by professional development requirements within a tight time-frame.

There is a danger of overloading teachers with professional development. It was common for staff to have three or four professional development topics to work on in any given year. Sometimes this was planned and, in other instances, it was a result of Principal or other senior staff seeing an opportunity, such as the chance to participate in a Contract, and deciding to apply in case they did not get the chance again. Invariably, this work got added to what they had already planned. In many of the contract schools, teachers typically had three or four appraisal goals to work towards in addition to the whole school goals. It was common for teachers to complain that there was not enough time for professional development. For a number of schools it was not lack of time that created problems but that they were trying to do too much (Hawk, Hill and Taylor, 2001, p. 7).

Grootenboer (2000) has examined the relationship between teacher appraisal and quality education. He believes that schools and education have become bureaucratised as a result of educational reforms that have been “motivated by economic factors with concerns for international competitiveness (p. 123). He has described the way that a bureaucratic managerial perspective of teacher appraisal may work against the development of healthy school climate and the professional growth of teachers. He comments that the stress and anxiety caused by a managerial model of performance appraisal, within a workplace culture of accountability and compliance means that teachers are unlikely to feel empowered or motivated to reflect on and change their practice. He believes that teacher development needs to take place within a context of trust, co-operation and collegiality, in a school community with shared goals, but where the professional autonomy of the teacher is maintained.
Teachers who are reflective practitioners thrive on collaboration, knowledge sharing, collegiality, freedom, self-efficacy, professional practice and democracy. These ideals are the antithesis of bureaucracy that depends on individualism, hierarchy, competition, rewards and sanctions, secrecy, compliance, accountability and procedures (Darling-Hammond, 1990; Rizvi, 1998; Wildy & Wallace, 1998). As educational reforms are increasingly being motivated by economic factors with concerns for international competitiveness, schools and education are being bureaucratised (Carter, 1997). This has been to the disadvantage of school teachers and students and by implication, to the process of ensuring quality (Clark & Meloy, 1990; Credlin, 1999; Haertel, 1991; Rizvi, 1998) (Grootenboer, 2000, p. 122).

Young (2001) from the perspective of the British education system writes with concern about the relationship between teacher development and the provision of quality music education. She believes that the changing construction of the teacher as a professional (p. 215), has lead to a situation where teachers are working as ‘technicians’ delivering imposed prescriptions, driven by institutional rather than individual needs. She believes that dissent and critical inquiry are discouraged in a climate of performance appraisal, where teachers are ... “carrying out the plans of others and held accountable for certain quantifiable and pre-specified outcomes (Helsby and McCulloch, 1997, cited in Young, 2001). Young believes that effective teacher development for music education needs to maintain a critical perspective.

A critical approach demands open and receptive (rather than defensive) schools and teacher training institutions as well as confident teachers and students who have time to reflect and question, in other words, a culture which welcomes enquiry (Young, 2001, p. 217).

Chapters 4 and 5 of the present study present analysis and discussion of the key informant’s perspectives on professional development for teachers in the area of music education.

The following section considers the issue of teacher competence to teach music. Literature included in this section addresses the problem that while music education may be
valued for both intrinsic and extrinsic benefits for children, lack of teacher competence to teach music may be a significant barrier to quality music education. The effectiveness of pre-service and in-service teacher education in addressing the need for adequate teacher knowledge in music is discussed in Chapter 4.

Teacher Knowledge and Confidence to Teach Music

In 1999, when the draft New Zealand arts curriculum document was released for consultation, schools made use of the opportunity to respond to the draft, as did music advisors and other interested parties. As part of this process, the New Zealand Education Institute (NZEI) consulted with teachers and wrote a detailed submission to the Ministry of Education. The submission acknowledged with enthusiasm the importance of the arts for children’s “intellectual aesthetic and social development” (NZEI, 1999, p. 2). However, the submission also emphasised many potential difficulties for schools, who despite good intentions, are faced with some significant barriers to the effective provision of education in the arts. In particular, the submission gave very clear messages about the need for significant, ongoing professional development for teachers. In the submission music is highlighted as an area where teachers feel most insecure and the document expressed doubt about the likelihood of teachers teaching effectively beyond level 2 without specialist support. The document links lack of confidence in teaching music to inadequate pre-service opportunity to develop skills and knowledge in the music discipline.

Teachers at the consultation meetings were very nervous about the requirements for music. They did not dispute that students should have an opportunity to have a structured music programme. They were concerned about their own ability to fulfil the requirements as stated in the draft statement. Minimum competency levels are required in literacy and
numeracy on entry to teacher training. But there is no requirement that trainees should, say, be able to sing in tune as a minimum. Preservice education for primary teachers also suffers from a crowded curriculum, particularly with shortened courses. There are very limited opportunities to develop musical skills within the preservice programme for those not specialising in music. It is not surprising that ERO (1995) found the quality of arts education in primary schools to be patchy (NZEI, 1999, p. 8).

The 1995 Education Review Office (ERO) report on the health of the arts in New Zealand schools highlighted lack of teacher confidence as a major impediment to effective music programmes. The ERO study was based on an analysis of Office effectiveness reports and case studies and focused on two key issues: the place of arts education in the curriculum; and the effectiveness of the delivery of arts education. The study found that only one third of the primary schools investigated for the report were teaching music in a way that met the demands of the music syllabus. The report attributes this to lack of leadership and policies which would lead to appropriate programme planning in music. According to the report, good intentions were not being realised, and teacher insecurity about implementing a music programme was a significant problem for schools to solve.

The perception is that a bad music lesson is public. The teachers in neighbouring classrooms, parents, and other visitors to the school, can hear the disastrous mistakes. Just as in the case of art teaching, without the support of a school programme and school administration and policies which clearly value music learning, teachers who lack confidence risk disapproval, and embarrassment in the delivery of their isolated music lessons (ERO, 1995, p. 14).

Kushner (1994), from the perspective of the British education system, investigates what he perceives to be the potential disadvantages of a centrally prescribed curriculum where teachers lack the knowledge and competence to teach it. He recommended a solution in the form of ongoing professional development for teachers.

The importance of this issue to music education is heightened by the current international interest in developments which may well be taking music teachers beyond their level of professional competence – exacerbated where few of the primary school teachers responsible for music are music trained.
The most immediate need is for the professional development of music teachers, not for compliance with sophisticated national music strategies (p. 15).

In contrast, Fletcher (1987) doubts the potential for professional development packages to have any real impact on the quality of generalist music teaching. He is a strong advocate for specialist models of music education, as a solution to the barrier to effective music education resulting from inadequate teacher knowledge.

Any re-thinking over deployment of human resources must take into account the fact that no amount of in-service training can atone for the lack of an able specialist on the staff of an individual primary school. Acquisition of musical skill is something that, as we know, should ideally start at an early age. The best teachers excel largely because of the ease with which they can read, think, and play music ... and this is usually the result of over ten years' regular training from childhood (Fletcher, 1987, p. 132).

Hallam (2001) describes the teacher as being central to the creation of an effective music learning environment. She believes that 'great' teachers of music have a depth of subject knowledge as an important characteristic. She also describes the way that teachers who are secure in their subject knowledge will have more positive relationships with their pupils and will be able to more successfully create an environment that is conducive to learning (p. 71).

The outcomes of learning also affect the teacher. If learners have been successful, the teacher will feel that they too have been successful and will approach their teaching in the future with increased self-efficacy. Teachers' self-efficacy has been found to be one of the best predictors of the success of pupils (Hallam, 2001, p. 71).

Jones and Moreland (2003) argue that teachers' pedagogical content knowledge is a major determinant of the quality and effectiveness of teaching practice.

Pedagogical content knowledge is a complex blending of pedagogy and subject content and includes aspects related to an understanding of what is to be taught, learned and assessed, an understanding of how learners learn, an understanding of ways to facilitate effective learning, and an
understanding of how to blend content and pedagogy to organize particular topics for learners (Jones and Moreland, 2003, p. 78).

Jones and Moreland also comment that there is a strong evidential link between teacher’s confidence and their level of subject knowledge.

Where teachers’ subject knowledge is weak, confidence is low, leading to restricted classroom practices (Jones and Moreland, 2003, p. 78).

The next section of this review examines literature concerned with specialist and generalist models of music education delivery. This has long been a source of debate among music educators, in New Zealand and overseas.

Specialist and Generalist Models of Music Education Delivery

Perhaps you are very humble about your musical equipment. Perhaps you are one of those teachers, of whom there are not a few, who are actually afraid of music and who shrink even from trying to do anything at all with it... are you defeated before you even start? No, in fact you are not!... you cannot long resist the conclusion that the reason for bringing music to children is not to teach them the musical techniques, but to help them become better and happier human beings, now and later on (Mursell, 1951, p. 6).

The quotation above reflects a viewpoint at an extreme end of the debate about who should teach music in primary schools – the specialist or the generalist. Mursell clearly believes that the extrinsic benefits of music learning are of greater significance than learning music for its own sake. More recently, this view is still being argued, with an emphasis on the strengths that the generalist teacher can bring to the teaching of music, without necessarily having personal music skills and knowledge. Mills (1991) believes that music teaching is for
all teachers. She argues that many teachers have had their confidence destroyed by self-comparison to a specialist model from their own school background.

Most primary teachers received their primary music teaching at the hands of music specialists who displayed formal skills such as piano playing and conducting... There are, as we shall see, hardly any situations in which display of these skills is crucial to children’s success; teachers usually have a number of options concerning their teaching style. Specialists use specialist skills out of habit or preference, not necessity. But because they often appear to use these skills as a matter of course, their performance can seem intimidating and unachievable to outsiders. Primary music can seem to be about the demonstration of teacher skill, not the promotion of child learning (Mills, 1991, p. 4).

Mills reminds teachers that when generalist teachers teach music they bring to it their understanding of the rest of the curriculum, and this enables them to make important links between music and other areas of the curriculum. Barnes (2001) agrees with Mills that specialist delivery models can undermine a progressive, egalitarian underpinning to the core curriculum which emphasises music for all. Like Mills, Barnes recognises that the generalist teacher may experience feelings of inadequacy about his or her own perceived lack of musical ability and therefore lack the “musical self-esteem” (Mills, 1991) needed to teach music with confidence. Barnes (2001) believes that primary school children’s musical needs are best served by a musically confident generalist, because this will give...

Powerful messages to the participating children: music is for all, music is active, music making does not necessarily require high levels of technical proficiency before embarking on creative projects (p. 101).

In the literature that supports a generalist model of music education delivery, the specialist teacher is often characterised in a particular way (Barnes, 2001; Cain 2001; Mills, 1995; Spruce, 2001). This characterisation includes the following assumptions about the behaviour and disposition of the specialist teacher. The specialist teacher is traditional. She or he teaches as she or he was taught. She or he is locked into a belief in a pre-determined, inflexible, linear sequence of skill and knowledge progression as can be found in graded
examination systems, such as The Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music or Trinity College. She separates the composer, the performer, and the listener, and objectifies the musical work as "art", focusing on form and structure. Her programme is teacher centred, expert-driven and elitist. She devotes her attention to the gifted few. Progressive educationalists, for example Paynter (1970) argued in favour of generalist teachers in primary schools providing music education for all children, in order to avoid the kind of traditional programme of learning that might be taught by the 'specialist' described above. He emphasised, in particular, creative music making activities, which, he argued, did not require significant music discipline knowledge from the teacher, who was in the role of facilitator, rather than expert. In contrast, Plummeridge (2001) questions the quality of music experience for children that has resulted from the "music for all", generalist-friendly, approach to music teaching advocated by Paynter (1970).

The music curriculum has been strongly influenced by the 'music for all' movement which argued that all class teachers should teach music at least to their own class... This was taken up enthusiastically by educators keen to find a solution to the loss of 'floating' specialists in primary schools and to the perceived and actual elitism of traditional music education, a tradition which focused on performing (largely singing), knowledge about music, and music theory (Plummeridge, 2001, p. 243).

Plummeridge is particularly concerned at the lack of evaluation of programmes taught by the generalist teacher. He believes that in the effort to develop activities that can be taught by the non-musician teacher, depth and integrity of learning in music may be at risk.

In the eagerness to demystify music subject matter for primary generalists, games, graphic notation and group composition have all become widespread in primary classrooms. But without the underpinning of some musical understanding through which music is made, they remain enjoyable activities, but may only accidentally give rise to coherent, progressive learning. There has been no research which looks systematically at the effects of these teaching approaches on children over time (Plummeridge, 2001, p. 243).
The New Zealand Curriculum Framework (Ministry of Education, 1993) is based on the assumption that the generalist teacher should be able to teach each curriculum area equally well. Renner (1996) a teacher educator in the area of dance education, comments on what she perceives as the inadequacy of a generalist model of teacher education.

At present in New Zealand, teacher-training for the primary classroom is of a generalist nature. In order to accommodate the demands of an increasingly crowded curriculum, teacher-trainees are expected to be knowledgeable and competent in a wide range of subject areas, with limited opportunity to become expert in any (Renner, 1996, p. 2).

As indicated in the NZEI response to the draft curriculum document, many teachers are teaching music using an integrated approach, or are using music to enhance the rest of the curriculum. Often they are teaching music based on the belief that arts activities are good for children's general development but do not necessarily require teaching from a pure discipline perspective. Buckton, when speaking at a New Zealand Society for Music Education conference in 1993, commented on the different approaches to teaching music that are currently evident in New Zealand schools.

Of course there has always been a tension between, on the one hand, those who believe that music is a tool for the development of the child not necessarily requiring structured experiences and is in any case, peripheral to the "main subjects" and on the other hand, those who believe music experiences have value in their own right and should be structured to achieve this. The latter view therefore requires a level of musical expertise which may be only provided by a teacher who has background and substantial training in music education (Buckton, 1993, p. 110).

He is doubtful of the generalist teacher's ability to challenge children beyond a beginning level of skill and knowledge in music, observing that schools are increasingly using specialists to take children beyond the basics. He expresses concern about the hit and miss nature of the provision of specialist music education and reality of unequal access to quality music learning experiences.
... it appears that the reality of the present situation is that at best many teachers offer experiences at the stage one level—"receiving" but even if they do so, it does appear that judging from surveys, musical objectives are not being met. At the same time, teachers lack the time and expertise to be able to further allow children to take that vital next step and "respond". It is here that a number of schools are using the services of a “specialist” to provide opportunities for choir, the school musical, recorder groups and so on and with parental support and in combination with opportunities that exist outside school, many children do receive a music education that has meaning for life. But it is a haphazard situation and one that leaves, perhaps a majority of children without any opportunity of music for life (Buckton, 1993, p. 111).

Drummond (1997) summarised some of the key questions that surround the issue of specialist and generalist models of music education. He focused in particular on the implications and practical considerations of providing specialist music educators for primary schools. He also highlighted issues to do with training, equity and access, the possible marginalisation of rural schools, and the potential for competition and elitism.

What do we want the specialist music teacher to be able to do and are we providing appropriate training? If the trained special music teacher is a visitor to rather than resident in a school, does this affect his/her status? What role does the generalist teacher play in a music education system where specialists are to be found? How do generalists and specialists interact? Does the specialist make music appear to be elitist? Is it better to have poor music education in an integrated programme or higher quality music education as a separated activity? Will specialists tend to be city teachers, thus marginalizing the rural sector even more? Can a rural school afford specialist teachers? Will some cities develop music specialists in different cultures? (Drummond, 1997, p. 29).

Upitis (2001) sees the specialist music teacher as absolutely vital if children are to enjoy quality music education. She argues that if learning music is considered to be important, then well-qualified, musical teachers are essential. Upitis sees quality music teaching as a key to the preservation of musical heritage and as also ensuring the realisation of broader education goals, including the fostering of a... “peaceful, tolerant, just, literate (in the broadest sense of the word) and joyful citizenry” (Upitis, 2001, p. 50) through education in the arts.
One of the essential ingredients... is to ensure that there are teachers who have the background and experience to teach the arts, and music in particular... if we consider music education to be important, then we ought to enlist the help of teachers with the skills to teach music in the broadest sense. After all, who among us would trust a well meaning and caring person with an interest in medicine, but with no formal training, to perform a delicate piece of heart surgery? (Upitis, p. 51).

The following section examines some of the implementation issues described by educators and researchers in science education and dance education. These issues include teacher knowledge and teacher perception of the value and nature of the learning area.

**Curriculum Implementation Issues for Science, and Dance Education**

The implementation of a new curriculum can highlight particular challenges for that curriculum area. I have found it helpful to investigate the issues for curriculum areas other than music in terms of the perceived barriers to effective implementation that have been highlighted during this process. In science education and in dance education I have found some concerns and challenges that are similar to those experienced in music, particularly with regard to teacher knowledge and confidence to teach, and the effectiveness of integrated curriculum approaches.

The curriculum area of science is an example of a learning area with similar identified barriers to effective teaching as music. Joyce (2000) writes as the co-ordinator of a course at Wellington College of Education aimed at improving the subject knowledge of pre-service teachers. He has reported on the effectiveness of this course in meeting the learning needs of the students and in this report expresses concern about the lack of science knowledge and negative attitudes toward science demonstrated by some pre-service student teachers. He links
primary school teacher’s lack of science knowledge with poor outcomes for children as evidenced in mediocre NEMP results for science.

For some time it has become increasingly obvious that a large number of primary teachers who have not specialised in science at school or at tertiary level, have limited science knowledge and/or a lack of confidence in their ability to teach this curriculum area. It has been suggested that this impacts negatively on the quality of science education (Joyce, 2000, p. 27).

Joyce comments on the need for teacher education to do more to support students in the area of science in order for them to make sense of important science concepts. He identifies the use of resources and the provision of enjoyable activities as being important strategies for making changes to, and increasing, student’s science understandings as well as improving attitudes toward science. He also states his belief that subject content knowledge needs to precede pedagogical knowledge.

Interactive teaching strategies have been shown to be effective, but only, I believe, if the teacher has a really clear ideas of the science they want the children to learn. Trying to introduce these strategies to teachers with little conceptual science knowledge and negative attitudes is largely a waste of time, because it is extremely difficult to successfully teach a subject you don’t understand yourself (Joyce, 2000, p. 30).

Austin (2000), in a paper presented at a research seminar on science education in primary schools at Wellington College of Education, highlighted the need for teachers to have a depth of science content knowledge before being able to effectively teach science. She believes that knowledge gained from supporting resources is insufficient, particularly with regard to shifting previously held inaccurate science ideas. Teachers need to be confident with the ‘big ideas’ in order to encourage, challenge and extend children’s science thinking at all levels.

... it is vital that teachers understand the “big picture” of science to devise programmes that introduce children to the unifying theories and conceptual ideas that connect the various science disciplines, thus providing a firm foundation for further science study (Austin, 1999, p. 6).
Scott (1997) examined research evidence about "what makes up the implemented science curriculum" (p. 40) in New Zealand primary schools. He describes the way that some teachers have the confidence to meaningfully integrate science ideas into subjects not labelled science- for example, language or the arts, but that many do not. He concludes that despite the fact that many opportunities to teach science in a cross-curricular way can be identified, this does not mean that there is a consistent use of this opportunity in the interests of science education. Scott makes the following comment about the results of a study (Scott, 1997) on teachers' use of opportunities to teach science across the curriculum:

... it must be recognised that opportunities to learn science do not happen by themselves, and the fact that some teachers used scientific ideas in their teaching of other subjects should not hide the fact that others did not. Simply saying that opportunities occur in some classrooms or that the primary curriculum can be integrated does not provide information about any particular classroom. Many teachers seem not to teach reading and language in a way that means that they are simultaneously teaching science. The present study suggests that some teachers would need to change their classroom programmes and environments substantially to provide high levels of opportunities to learn science (Scott, 1997, p. 47).

Hedges (2003) makes a case for teachers in early childhood education settings to have a depth of subject knowledge, particularly in the area of science education. She commented that research has shown that in primary and secondary settings the teacher's subject content knowledge makes a 'positive difference to teaching and learning' (p. 2). She believes that this is also the case for early childhood education.

Research findings support the view that teachers need to have science subject knowledge in order to effectively extend children's interests and learning, and lead children towards accurate understanding and knowledge of their world (Hedges, 2003, p. 6).

Hedges (2003) has emphasised the need for teachers to have a depth of subject knowledge in order to challenge children's factual misconceptions in the context of scientific
inquiry. She also describes the way that a teacher’s content knowledge and pedagogical knowledge interlink:

Possessing subject knowledge enables teachers to provide simple, accurate explanations and answers when needed, and guide children’s thinking and inquiry in fruitful directions during teaching and learning interactions, to avoid promoting “magical” thinking. Teacher’s subject knowledge is a contributor to the types of questions, comments, and other pedagogical strategies that teachers include in their interactions. In promoting children’s thinking and inquiry in meaningful ways, teachers can, at the same time, construct appropriate conceptual knowledge with children. This intersection of subject knowledge and pedagogical knowledge is reflected in the concept of pedagogical content knowledge. Shulman (1986) identified three components of pedagogical content knowledge:

- knowledge of a subject
- knowledge of children’s existing knowledge and beliefs about the subject
- knowledge of effective ways to represent this subject to children (Hedges, 2003, p. 4).

In 2003, Buck completed a doctoral thesis entitled “Teachers and Dance in the Classroom”. In his research Buck worked with classroom teachers in order to investigate the ways that they thought about dance and the ways that their beliefs about the nature of dance impacted on their teaching of dance. A key finding of this study was that the meaning of dance as it is constructed by individual teachers may create barriers to effective teaching. Teachers may hold stereotyped ideas “that are largely related to a conception of dance performance – rather than education” (Buck, 2003, p. 293). Using the tools of narrative inquiry, Buck explored the ways teachers understand dance and the ways that a narrow definition of dance may impact on practice and ultimately on the quality of dance experiences for children and teachers.

The term dance education aligns dance with education practices and expectations that teachers can relate to, whereas the word dance conjured images and indeed stereotypes which presented barriers to these teachers, and it was not until they reconstructed their ideas of dance for the classroom context that they started to see possibilities for their participation, their teaching, and the child’s participation (Buck, 2003, p. 293).
Buck's findings emphasised the need for teachers to change their conceptualisation of
dance and considered that this was best done in the context of their own classroom and with
the children they teach. The issues for science education and dance education are similar to
those issues that have been highlighted as barriers to effective music education. Similarly with
Buck's findings, the generalist teacher of music may construct music from a traditional
Western Classical viewpoint where certain kinds of music literacy, for example, reading and
writing conventional notation, may be seen to be valued above others, for example, being able
to sing and play the guitar. As with science education, many generalist teachers lack the
fundamental music knowledge and experience needed to teach music competently.

Integrated Approaches to Teaching Music

The advantages and disadvantages of an integrated approach to teaching music have
long been a source of debate. The fact that in the New Zealand arts curriculum, four arts
disciplines now share the same document, with common strands, has been a major sticking
point with discipline specialists concerned for the maintenance of the integrity of each
discipline. Many see linking of the four arts within one document as artificial and a 'marriage
Integrated? No!” is very clear in his opposition to integration in the arts;

... the idea of ‘integrating’ music with other subjects, or teaching music in
an interdisciplinary way, is philosophically, artistically, cognitively,
developmentally, and practically invalid (p. 11).

Elliott believes that musical thinking is unique and cannot be developed by practical
experience in any subject other that music. According to Elliott we can only develop
musicianship by participating in musical activity. Integrated or ‘cross-arts’ activities are merely a distraction from musical aims and achievement;

... the development of musical understanding depends on (a) inducting students into musical ways of thinking and knowing and (b) targeting students’ attention on progressively more subtle aspects of musical performances, compositions, musical creativity and so on. Neither condition is present when the attention of learners is being directed to non-musical matters, such as balance and focus in a painting, or gestures in a dance. Put another way: learning to notice the qualities of (say) visual textures in paintings will not advance one’s ability to compose, improvise, or listen intelligently for musical textures anymore than learning to watch baseball will help a person understand rugby (Elliott, 1999, p. 9).

However, others view integration with more sympathy, seeing possibilities for holistic, enriched learning experiences which are more reflective of a plural, complex, multi-lensed view of learning and life. This view is in keeping with the post-modern and multi-cultural thinking about the arts that underpins the arts curriculum document (Foley, Hong, Thwaites, 1999, p. 14). Veblen (1999) sees an integrated approach as a potentially holistic, relationship focussed, approach to learning in the arts. However, she is clear about the need for maintaining the integrity of music within an approach which acknowledges the commonalities between art forms. She describes the benefits of what she believes is a “richly contextual” approach to teaching music.

When the process of learning a piece of music deepens through encounters with the structural, contextual, and expressive dimensions of musical works, and when teaching leads outward from a piece of music to meaningful relationships with other discipline, then learning can be magical and transformational (Veblen, 1999, p. 7).

De Vries and Poston-Anderson (2001) have explored the potential of integrated approaches to teaching in the arts through classroom based case studies. While acknowledging the concerns of discipline specialists about the possible dilution and compromising of the integrity of each arts area, as well as the potential distraction from
specific, sequential skill teaching, they emphasise the importance of a broader view, suggesting that:

Such discipline-based concerns, however, must be weighed against considerations of relevance and meaning. Life itself is not divided by arbitrary boundaries. Every day children must make sense of the complex mix of information and experience which bombards them. An integrated arts-based approach to learning is consistent with helping children discover meaning. Starting with the experience and using the arts as strategies for meaning-making is one way to do this (De Vries and Poston-Anderson, 2001, p. 29).

Manins (1998) believes that integrated approaches can only be successful when the children have skills and knowledge in each discipline, therefore, an integrated programme needs to be accompanied by a sequentially planned, skill-focussed programme in each discipline. Children can then integrate from a position of understanding or literacy in a particular discipline, which will allow any integration to be more meaningful, purposeful and worthwhile.

Integrated programmes work better when students bring to them already developed and well-established levels of knowledge and skills, rather than in trying to develop basic skills and knowledge through the programme, perhaps the pooling of expertise is more helpful than the pooling of ignorance! If music is used to enhance other curriculum areas, it needs a programme of its own as well. I suspect that an integrated programme is essential for young children (Manins, 1998, p. 39).

The NZEI response to the draft arts document (1999) comments on historical and current practice in primary schools where music and visual art are already being taught on a weekly basis, mostly by generalist teachers. The NZEI report describes the perceived importance and appropriateness of an integrated approach, which is seen as different to teaching “the Arts for Arts sake” (p. 2).

In primary schools the instrumental value of learning through the arts is recognised as being of possibly greater importance than learning in the various arts disciplines for their own sake and for the sake of becoming competent/fluent in the arts disciplines and forms studies (NZEI, 1999, p. 2).
The current arts curriculum document describes ways to integrate the strands of each discipline with reference to the overlapping nature of the strands. The document also suggests way that collaborative arts projects may be implemented, while emphasising the importance of maintaining the integrity of the separate art forms. It also suggests ways that the arts may enhance learning across the curriculum.

Students' learning across the curriculum can be significantly enhanced through learning experiences that make appropriate and meaningful links between the arts and other learning areas. Such links will tend to be made more frequently in primary and intermediate school classrooms, where teachers often incorporate one or more arts disciplines in units based on topics, themes, or student inquiries. Careful planning is necessary to ensure that programmes allow students to meet the achievement objectives of particular arts disciplines as well as those of other essential learning areas (Ministry of Education, 2000, p. 94).

In summary, this chapter has described an education landscape of curriculum change and work pressure for teachers. Music has been described as having specialist knowledge requirements and therefore is an area of significant professional development need for teachers. However, the difficulties of establishing a climate for professional development where teachers don't feel overwhelmed and over-measured, is a challenge for providers of teacher development. Similar concerns have been described in other curriculum areas, most similarly in the area of science education, where lack of teacher subject knowledge has been identified as a significant barrier to effective science teaching.
Chapter 3

Reflections on Methodology and Description of Research Method

Introduction

... I think, that we can – and – should tell our stories in a number of ways – through lively and coherent language that avoids the kind of jargon that distances the reader from the writer, through narrative, through poetry, through dramatic presentations, through a combination of numbers, words, sounds, and images. But further – and here’s the really significant part – regardless of what form our research stories take and regardless of which research methodologies we employ, whether quantitative or qualitative, we need to be able to show that our findings have had a deep and important influence on policy and practice (Upitis, 2001, p. 46)

This chapter reflects on aspects of qualitative methodology relevant to the carrying out of this investigation and describes the method used to gather, analyse and interpret research information. My intentions in this project were, I believe, straightforward. I had questions and concerns about music education as it is currently taught New Zealand Primary schools. In order to make better sense of these questions and concerns I decided to seek the perspectives of experts in the field. I intended to present some evidence and interpretations about the current practice of music education in New Zealand by identifying issues, and barriers to implementing an adequate model of music education. I intended to also suggest possible solutions to these barriers. I wished to generate something useful for teachers, teacher educators, advisors and others with an interest in music education.

This investigation fits within Patton’s definition of an applied qualitative project (Patton 2002). I have identified a problem as part as my professional work as a teacher educator and
music advisor to schools. I am going to make recommendations about ways to solve problems with regard to the quality of music education in schools. Patton suggests that:

Applied qualitative researchers are able to bring their personal insights and experiences into any recommendations that may emerge because they get especially close to the problems under study during fieldwork. Audiences for applied research are typically policymakers, directors and managers of intervention-oriented organizations, and professionals working on problems (Patton, 2002, p. 217).

**Reflections on Methodology**

Hennessy (2001) makes a strong case for increased research activity in music education. She acknowledges the quantity of psychology-based studies that investigate the impact of musical experience on brain function, behaviour and general skill development, but maintains a sceptical view of the value or validity of such studies. She expresses concern that much of this kind of research draws on positivist 'scientific' methods, which may be seen as less than inadequate in an investigation of the complexity of teaching and learning or in the context of the diversity of teachers and learners.

One of my concerns with much of the research that has been carried out by psychologists into brain function, and music learning processes, is that it tends to focus on the Western classical tradition both in terms of the music learned and performed, and the style of teaching. In these contexts the pedagogy is often teacher-centred (e.g. the Kodaly method) and involves a high degree of skill training, as opposed to being learner-centred and focused on the acquisition of skills and understanding for individual creativity (Hennessy, 2001, p. 242).

Hennessy calls for increased research into the ‘messier’ questions about music education, in particular, questions about models of good teaching practice.
What is lacking is research which looks at the teaching and learning processes involved. What is needed is more knowledge and understanding of good music teaching (p. 242).

Hennessy (2001), comments on the need for a range of approaches to gathering and interpreting information about teaching and learning music, in the context of a busy classroom.

In researching music education there is the additional problem of gathering data which is temporal, transitory, provisional and multi-sensory. Understanding young children composing or responding to music involves more than listening. It demands ‘think description’ (Geertz, 1973): gestures, facial expressions, body language and group behaviour are invariably as important in understanding children’s understanding as what they utter (verbally and musically). Researchers in classrooms need to adopt a range of approaches and practices in order to illuminate what is essentially dynamic, active and practical (Hennessy, 2001, p. 241).

**Qualitative Inquiry**

Qualitative inquiry means different things to different people depending on their socio-political or historical world-view. This project uses the tools and philosophy of qualitative inquiry in order to draw conclusions based on the interpretation of information gained from reading in the field, and from talking to selected people about the meaning of their experiences. The reading and talking will, I hope, help me to gain further insight into some particular areas of interest, and to share these insights with an interested audience. My subjectivity is clearly acknowledged and my interests and agenda are an important thread, influence and constraint in this investigation. Maykut and Morehouse (1994) propose that:

Qualitative researchers understand that they are also subjects or actors and not outside of the process as impartial observers. Subjective researchers are exposed to the same constraints in understanding the world as are the persons they are investigating (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994, p. 20).
Broadly speaking, a qualitative approach to research differs from a traditional scientific approach in its conceptualisation of how the world works. Where a traditional scientific view is of one reality that can be objectively viewed, taken apart, analysed, tested, and put back together again, a qualitative view includes the notion of multiple realities, where the knower and the known are interdependent, and where the goal is to examine the meanings people assign to their lived experiences. According to Maykut and Morehouse (1994), in the qualitative world, values shape how we see the world and cannot be put aside for the purposes of research.

Values are embedded in the research, embedded in the topic chosen for examination, in the way the researcher examines the topic and in the researcher him or herself. If reality is constructed and the knower and the known are inseparable, then values come with the turf. On the other hand, if the world can be divided into parts and if the knower can stand outside of what is to be known then research can be value free (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994, p. 12).

Denzin and Lincoln (2000) define qualitative inquiry as

... a situated activity that locates the observer in the world. It consists of a set of interpretive, material practices that make the world visible (p. 3).

In contrast to a positivist scientific approach to research, current interpretive qualitative research methods do not seek a single truth. Qualitative researchers are concerned with the multiplicity and diversity of realities, voices, meanings within any given context.

Denzin and Lincoln (2000) describe the work of qualitative researchers as involving complex decisions about method, based on the kinds of questions asked in the inquiry and the nature of the research context. Qualitative inquiry is not method driven. Rather, it is question driven, that is, the questions guide and shape the inquiry. Methods for undertaking qualitative inquiry are not fixed and may be adapted, reshaped, or invented to suit the unique qualities of the particular field of inquiry. This multi-method approach reflects the goal of reaching an in-
depth understanding of the phenomenon. Similarly, Patton (2002) describes decisions about method in a qualitative investigation as being shaped by the context, purpose and audience for the project.

The implication of thinking about purpose and audience in designing studies is that methods, no less than knowledge, are dependent on context. No rigid rules can prescribe what data to gather to investigate a particular interest or problem. There is no recipe or formula in making methods decisions (Patton, 2002, p. 2).

Sears (1992) discusses the broad goals of qualitative inquiry. He acknowledges the pivotal role of the researcher in qualitative research processes as someone who has impact on the form, direction and outcomes of the research.

At best qualitative inquiry enables us to come to know and honour the meanings constructed by others. As qualitative researchers we must provide an interpretive framework, which at that historical moment, seems to make the most sense to us (p. 81).

The goals and methods of qualitative inquiry ‘fit’ with the questions posed in the present research. Qualitative inquiry enables me to examine in an in-depth way selected aspects of lives, systems, cultures and discourses in a way that is personal and political, and that considers socio-cultural contexts to form a critical part of the investigation.

**Interviewing**

The qualitative research interview is a construction site of knowledge. An interview is literally an *inter view*, an inter change of views between two persons conversing about a theme of mutual interest (Kavale, 1996, p. 2).

Interviewing was selected for this study as a preferred method of investigation because of the way it may value the perspectives of those with an interest in and commitment to
quality music education for New Zealand children and the knowledge and experience they may bring to discussion of current themes, practices, and issues in education.

Limerick et al (1996) describe a traditional approach to research interviewing as a de-personalised, one-way process which aims for objectivity and ignores context. They comment on the inadequacy of traditional positivist descriptions of the experience of interviewing as they fail to acknowledge the impact of political and social relationships at work in all research encounters.

These assumptions deny the agency of interviewees and disempower the research “subject”. The very terms interviewer and interviewee are problematic in that they embody the assumed passive role of the subjects of the research. The lack of terms that indicate the simultaneously symmetrical and asymmetrical relationship between the interview and the interviewee signifies the extent to which current research is embedded in a discourse that cannot fully describe the interview process (Limerick et al, 1996, p. 449).

Limerick et al’s discussion contributes to a body of literature which discusses the politics and social relations of interviewing and the potential for an alternative model to the positivist model referred to above (Beer, 1997; Tripp, 1983; Scheurich, 1995).

This body of literature explores the issues surrounding power relationships in research interviewing, commenting that power imbalance is something to be acknowledged and somehow ‘managed’ in an interview context. Intimacy and reciprocity are considered to be valid goals or elements of the interview experience (Limerick et al, 1996, p. 450). This view, while making the power dynamics transparent, chooses not to ignore the life history of the researcher and the impact of the researcher’s socio-political worldview on the shape and outcomes of the interview.

Treating the researcher’s experience as central to the research makes space for a new kind of knowledge (Limerick et al, p 450).
Similarly, Beer (1997), has challenged positivist thinking about the nature of research interviewing and the roles of interviewer and interviewee. In particular, he is concerned about the scientific view of data when applied to interviewing, as something that is ‘inside’ a research subject’s head, which is able to be exposed and then analysed by the researcher in a controlled and predictable manner.

The overused label “data gathering” sounds more like harvesting strawberries than participating in interviews. 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. Far from being a passive “data repository” waiting for the right stimulus to cause him or her to spill out data, a respondent participates in an interview as a motivated, understanding, thinking human being, often giving voice for the first time to some aspect of his or her experience (Beer, 1997, p 112).

Much of the literature in this area (Beer, 1997; Tripp, 1983; Scheurich, 1995) emphasises the unstable, time and context dependent, nature of language. For these writers, the reality of the instability of meaning and interpretation highlights the irrelevance of a structure seeking positivist approach to research interviewing. An understanding of the worldview of both interviewer and interviewee is paramount, but even this understanding can only ever be tentative.

... my post-modernist perspective suggests that the researcher has multiple intentions and desires, some of which are consciously known and some of which are not. The same is true of the interviewee. The language out of which the questions are constructed is not bounded or stable; it is persistently slippery, unstable, and ambiguous from person to person, from situation to situation, from time to time (Scheurich, 1995, p. 240).

Kvale (1996) uses metaphor to highlight the difference between a positivist and a qualitative approach to research interviewing. According to Kvale, a positivist approach is similar to the discovery method of a miner whereas a qualitative approach is like that of a traveller.
In the miner metaphor, knowledge is understood as a buried metal and the interviewer is a miner who unearths the valuable metal. Some miners seek objective facts to be quantified, others seek nuggets of essential meaning. In both conceptions the knowledge is waiting in the subjects' interior to be uncovered, uncontaminated by the miner...

The alternative traveler metaphor understands the interviewer as traveler on a journey that leads to a tale to be told upon returning home. The interview-traveler wanders through the landscape and enters into conversations with the people encountered...The interviewer wanders along with the local inhabitants, asks questions that lead the subjects to tell their own stories of their lived world, and converses with them in the original Latin meaning of *conversatio* as “wandering together with” [emphasis in the original] (Kvale, 1996, pp. 3-4).

Patton (2000) describes the qualitative research interview as an opportunity to explore the aspects of people’s lives that cannot be directly observed, for example, people’s feelings, thoughts and intentions, their past behaviours, and the meanings they attach to their experiences. The qualitative interview allows the researcher to get inside the participants head and to investigate their worldview through the language they use to describe it. In this way, people’s perspectives can be heard and explored, interpreted and directly represented through quotations.

The purpose of interviewing, then, is to allow us to enter into the other person’s perspective. Qualitative interviewing begins with the assumption that the perspective of others is meaningful, knowable, and able to be made explicit. We interview to find out what is in and on someone’s mind, to gather their stories (Patton, p. 341).

This project uses a semi-structured approach to questioning. Patton describes this approach as an “Interview Guide” approach, where questions and issues to be explored in the course of the interview have been pre-prepared. This ensures that the same themes are explored with each participant, providing a framework for a purposeful conversation. The wording of the questions may vary and the feeling of the interview will be conversational, but the focus will be predetermined and clear. This helps to ensure that the interview is used
efficiently, but allows for the flexible and responsive exploration of issues that are relevant to both the project and the particular interests and experiences of the participant.

The guide helps make interviewing a number of different people more systematic and comprehensive by delimiting in advance the issues to be explored...it keeps the interactions *focused* while allowing individual perspective and experiences to emerge (Patton, 2002, p. 344).

However, the participants in this project all have prior relationships with the interviewer, and consequently it is expected that the interviews may have a conversational feel to them. Clandinin and Connelly note that this kind of intimacy can be an acknowledged and legitimate feature of qualitative interviews, in contrast to a more formal and structured interview style.

Research interviews normally have an inequality about them. The direction of the interview, along with its specific questions, are governed by the interviewer. However, researchers who establish intimate participatory relationships with participants find it difficult, if not impossible, to conduct such interviews with participants. Even when they begin with the intention of conducting an interview, the interview often turns into a form of conversation (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000, p. 110).

**Research Design and Procedures**

This is a qualitative project using semi-structured interviews in combination with library-based inquiry to gather information about the topic, to identify conceptual and contextual issues relevant to the topic of music education, and to theorise the findings of the study in ways that may inform policy and practice.
Participants

For this investigation I selected eight participants who I believed would provide a breadth and depth of opinion, based on their practical and research experience in the area of music education. This is an example of purposeful sampling, the aim of which is to "select information-rich cases whose study will illuminate the questions under study" (Patton, 2002, p. 46). The participants were each invited to participate in an interview aimed at canvassing their views on the barriers to the successful implementation of the music curriculum in New Zealand primary schools and other related issues (see interview questions). They were also asked to describe an adequate model of music education and to suggest ways in which this model might be developed and implemented in the future. The participants were given the choice of being a named or anonymous participant. Each participant chose to be named in the study. One participant, Professor John Drummond, was also a supervisor for this project. This was because of his expertise and experience in the field of music education, which were considered to be essential for this investigation. The implications of this dual role were discussed openly and did not cause any constraints or difficulties for the researcher in carrying out this project.

Ethical approval for this investigation was granted by the University of Otago Ethics Committee. This committee requires that participants are fully informed about the research procedures, including their right to withdraw from the project at any time without explanation.
Data Gathering Method

The data gathering method was that of semi-structured, in-depth interviews. The interviews were conducted in person and each interview was audio-taped and then transcribed. The approach to interviewing is best described as semi-structured “interview as conversation” (Clandinin and Connelly, 2000; Kavale, 1996), where the researcher is acknowledged to be an active participant. Focus questions were developed prior to the interview and participants were invited to suggest any alternative issues or themes that they would like to discuss in the interview. The participants were sent an interview guide that indicated the main themes and questions to be discussed. The interview guide also indicated that other areas of interest and relevance to the project that arose during the interview would be freely explored. The interview transcriptions were sent to the interviewees after each interview, in order for them may make changes, add to or remove responses. Each participant received a hard copy and emailed copy, and each chose to make changes on the emailed version and then email the changes back to me.

Interview Focus Areas

- What are the issues for music education that may create barriers to its effective delivery?
- Are there aspects of the structure or aims of the curriculum that may create barriers or present particular challenges for teachers and schools?
- What are the strengths of the curriculum document?
• How might issues associated with teacher knowledge and confidence to teach music be addressed?

• What are problems associated with current models of pre-service teacher education and in-service professional development in music education?

• Is there a place for specialist delivery of music education in primary schools? If so, how might this happen in practice?

• If specialist teachers were to deliver music education in school time, what might be the implications of this, for example; How might specialist-delivered music education be viewed and valued? How would music be linked to the rest of the curriculum? What role would the generalist teacher play? How would the specialist teacher be trained? How would equality and universality of access be ensured?

• What would constitute an adequate model of music education for New Zealand primary schools?

**Interview Analysis and Interpretation**

The goal of qualitative research is to discover patterns which emerge after close observation, careful documentation, and thoughtful analysis of the research topic. What can be discovered by qualitative research are not sweeping generalizations but contextual findings (Maykut and Morehouse, 1994, p. 21).

The interviews have been analysed using an inductive method, where common themes, as well as unique ideas and opinions have been identified in the interview transcripts and then discussed in terms of relevant literature. The analysis process included reading each transcript several times and then summarising the key ideas. These ideas were then categorised according to the interview focus areas and then further grouped into *barriers* and *adequate*
models for music education. After drafting an initial version of the analysis and interpretation chapters the interviews were read again to ensure that important material had not been overlooked. Some of the key ideas represented majority viewpoints and some represented the perspectives and experiences of one or two participants. This has been signalled in the text in the analysis and interpretation chapters.

Issues in Interpreting and Presenting the Interview Information

One of the many challenges in writing this project has been finding ways to integrate verbatim material from the interviews into the analysis and interpretation chapters. I have struggled with questions of who to quote and how much to quote and, in particular, have been aware of the need to critically reflect on and manage the intrusion of own preferences and agenda. Should I include comments from each participant about every theme that is important to this project? Not everyone commented with equal interest or feeling about every question. Because of participant’s different experiences and perspectives, some dwelt on particular issues while some went forward or sideways in their arguments depending on their area of interest. During the interviews we did not work sequentially through planned questions, because that is not how conversations go. Because of the reality of my prior relationships with many of the participants, the interviews were certainly more like conversations, than interviews, in a traditional sense. In some cases, the interviews were like taking up a conversation where it had been left off at some previous meeting or advisory hui. I have always been conscious that I may be selecting material from the transcripts to highlight a particular point, because I agreed with what the participant was saying. I have been constantly aware of the impossibility of a distant or objective positioning in my role as the other
participant in the interview conversations. This has made me alert to the need not to shape the research information into a report which is a vehicle for my own music education interests. I have attempted, therefore, to write with awareness of this issue and have tried to ensure that I am including a range of perspectives that provide an accurate picture of the participants’ views, within the constraints of previously determined focus areas. In some cases, it may seem that a particular participant is over-represented in terms of the number or length of their comments included under a particular heading, but this is because that participant was particularly interested and articulate when discussing that focus area.

Introducing the Participants

Catherine Gibbs

Catherine has worked in the teaching profession for most of her working life. She has been a primary teacher and deputy principal, a music adviser, then senior arts advisor in Wellington. In 1997 Catherine worked at The University of Waikato as music education lecturer then in 1998 she was contracted to The NZ Correspondence School where she created and developed multi media arts resources for levels 1 to 4. In 2000, Catherine was appointed to the Ministry of Education as The Arts Curriculum Facilitator. She was responsible for implementing The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum in schools, the development and publication of resources to support the new curriculum including web based support, and for driving forward an arts education strategy for teachers and schools. In 2002 Catherine’s work took a new direction working as a project manager for the ICT Initiatives team as part of Multi Serve Education Trust. In 2004 she accepted the position of music adviser and lecturer at Wellington College of Education. Catherine has written two music books for classroom teachers and contributed to a large number of resources currently in use in our schools. Catherine is the chair of the Board for the Centre of New Zealand Music – SOUNZ and has been recently appointed to the Board of New Zealand Society for Music Therapy. She has been involved in private music tuition, choral singing, and with the board of NZSME (now MENZA).
**Linda Locke**

Linda is currently teaching music to five to ten-year-old children at Henderson Valley Primary School in West Auckland. Linda trained as a primary school teacher at Dunedin Teachers College graduating in 1975. In the ‘90s she resumed study in both music and education and completed a BA at the University of Auckland in 1995. Since that time she has been teaching music to children in both school and out-of-school settings. She developed an interest in Orff-Schulwerk in the early ‘90s and pursued that interest by undertaking Orff-Schulwerk levels courses at Eastman School of Music, Rochester, New York in 1996 and 1997. She is an active member of the Orff-Schulwerk network of teachers both nationally and internationally. She has taught both pre-service and in-service sources at the Auckland College of Education. She is currently completing her Masters in Education. Her thesis topic is *Artistry in teaching and its relationship to the development of creativity in the child as an active learner.*

**Linda Webb**

Linda has gained a wide range of experience and expertise in the education sector in primary, early childhood, special education, community, secondary and tertiary settings as both a generalist and specialist music teacher. She is a member of the Society for Music Therapy Council and is Chair of the Massey University Music Therapy Programme Advisory Group. She has also been involved in various aspects of the development process of the last two “Music” curriculum documents and their supporting materials, and currently is Project Director for a NZSME contract held with the Ministry of Education that supports secondary music teachers. For the last five years she has lectured in Music, Education & Professional Studies Primary Curriculum at the Christchurch College of Education, and previously for ten years at Auckland College of Education as Coordinator of the BMusEd programme which was run in conjunction with the University of Auckland. Linda is a very active member of the New Zealand Society for Music Education and currently holds office as Immediate Past President. Linda is currently studying part time at graduate level in both the education and music departments of the University of Canterbury. Her undergraduate degrees from the University of Auckland, include a BA in Education and a BMus. She is particularly passionate about having music specialists work in conjunction with generalist classroom teachers in primary schools, and is pursuing research topics related to this area of interest.

**Professor John Drummond**

John Drummond is Blair Professor of Music and Dean of the School of Language, Literature and Performing Arts at the University of Otago. He was President of the New Zealand Society for Education for ten years and has been involved in the leadership of the International Society for Music Education since 1990, being elected President for the biennium 2000-2002. John has written several book chapters on music education matters and delivered keynotes and other papers at national and international conferences.
Nigel Wilson

Nigel is currently the principal of Kaikorai Primary School in Dunedin. He has twenty one years of experience as a primary school principal. He has taught children from Year 2 to Year 8 across a range of Dunedin schools. Nigel has had the opportunity to work in a wide range of educational contexts, including university and college of education lecturing, working with the Advisory Service and the Education Review Office. Nigel is currently involved in Education Review and Policy development at a national level as a member of The NZEI executive.

Robyn Trinick

Robyn is currently employed by the University of Auckland Faculty of Education as a pre-service senior lecturer in music education. She has had fifteen years' involvement in tertiary music education and more than twenty years experience as a generalist classroom teacher and primary music specialist. She has been involved in several national music education projects involving curriculum development and implementation, music education resource writing and reviewing national assessment tasks and results for music. Robyn is currently an active member of the New Zealand Society for Music education and other music education interest groups, and she has presented workshops at a range of national and international conferences.

Merryn Dunmill

Merryn Dunmill has considerable experience as a classroom music teacher, community music educator, performer, conductor and arranger. For fifteen years she lectured in pre-service teacher education in Early Childhood, Primary and Secondary Programmes at the Christchurch College of Education during which time she also served as music adviser to primary and secondary schools. She has been a national qualifications moderator of composition and performance, and a writer, trainer and moderator of unit standards and achievements standards. More recently, Merryn has been involved with curriculum writing and implementation for music and the arts, and is currently contracted by the Ministry of Education as National Facilitator of Primary Music – a position that involves the development of curriculum resources and online materials, contribution to and undertaking of research, mentoring music advisers in the regions, and networking with arts agencies throughout New Zealand and overseas. In her spare time she is the current president of NZSME/MENZA and works part-time as Co-Director and online facilitator for The Arts Online.

Helen Willberg

Helen initially trained as a teacher of English, however, since returning to the workforce in 1983 she has been involved in music education. She followed her children, engaging in teaching music at each stage of their schooling culminating in a position as a senior lecturer in music at Wellington College of Education. There she taught students intending to be both
early childhood and primary teachers. She was the leader of the Wellington music advisory team consulting, trialing and then offering professional development for teachers in the new arts curriculum. Her study for Masters has focused on early childhood music. Her present occupation in the community includes teaching singing, piano and guitar, to children and adults, taking early childhood groups and working with early childhood teachers and parents. She continues to work for music education through the New Zealand Society for Music Education.
Chapter 4

Perceived Barriers to the Effective Implementation of the Music Component of the Arts Curriculum Document

Introduction

This chapter, and the following chapter present an analysis, interpretation and discussion of the interview transcripts. This chapter focuses on the issues identified and described by the participants as creating barriers to the effective implementation of the music component of the arts curriculum.

The barriers discussed in this chapter include:

• The level of musicianship needed to teach music effectively.
• Teacher confidence.
• Pedagogical content knowledge needed to teach music effectively.
• Valuing musicianship and music education.
• Pre-service teacher education and in-service support for teachers.
• The structure and content of the music component of the arts curriculum document.
• Access to quality music education.

As an overall comment, the interviews were very consistent in terms of the issues identified that may create barriers to effective music education and the ways that an adequate model has been described. The participant viewpoints presented in this chapter are compatible with the thinking of other writers in the areas of teacher knowledge and confidence to teach
music, the value of music education, pedagogical approaches to teaching music, and curriculum criticism. This chapter places the participant viewpoints within a framework of other related research, drawing specifically on the literature that has been presented and discussed in Chapters 1 and 2.

Discussion about the issues that may create barriers produced some clear, consistent messages from all participants, and some particular ideas from individual participants. I have categorised these into areas where there seemed to be a common concern among the participants or where a participant has commented with particular strength or focus on a particular idea or issue, which may or may not be a majority viewpoint.

The Level of Musicianship Needed to Teach Music Effectively

The work of Buckton (1993), Drummond (1997), Elliott (1995, 1996), and Plummeridge (2001) has highlighted the essential role of the musically competent and confident teacher in creating an effective environment for music education. This teacher is able to engage children in practical music making, inducting them “into musical ways of life” (Elliott, 1996, p. 2).

Central to the success of the musical practicum is the music educator’s own commitment to being and becoming a musical mentor who inducts students into practices by example (Elliot, 1996, p. 5).

In each interview teacher knowledge was identified as a very significant issue for music education, and for most participants it was considered to be the most important issue.
I think most primary teachers find the syllabus, the curriculum, is beyond them to put it bluntly. I mean they can do a certain amount, all of them can do a little bit and some of them can do more but very few can do all of it. So that for me is the problem and it always has been the problem and will be the problem until somebody addresses it. **JD**

... we just know that you can't teach someone to sing if you can't sing yourself. That's not something you can look in a manual and figure out that way. **LL**

For one participant it was felt that the significance of this issue sometimes prevented discussion of other important issues in music education.

I think there are other issues that are important. I think the reason that maybe we focus on the one that we have [teacher knowledge] is that that one underpins everything now, and I guess maybe if that was addressed then we might focus more on other things. **LL**

As an overall concern, however, it was clear from the interviews that the participants perceive a lack of clarity for teachers about the level of musicianship that is required to teach music effectively. It was felt by all of the participants that the skills, knowledge and demonstrable musical ability needed to effectively stimulate, promote and monitor learning in music needs to be clarified and emphasised. Several participants commented on the need for the Ministry to identify and describe the level of knowledge and skill needed to provide adequate music education and many commented on the mismatch between the current level of skill of many generalist teachers and the expectations of the document (JD, MD, CG, LL, LW). One participant felt that it would be helpful if the level of skill and understanding needed to teach music effectively at each level of the curriculum was more commonly understood (LW). Further to this is the idea that the time required to reach an optimum level of understanding is also misunderstood, misrepresented or simply underestimated by teacher education providers and the ministry in terms of the provision of pre-service education and in-service support for teachers.
As a profession we’ve got to ask ourselves what is the level of musicianship that is required to teach music to children? Is there a level of musicianship required and if so what is that? And then how do we develop that and then how does that fit into the structure of the school? And I don’t think it should be a rigid thing that there has to be a music specialist. I think schools have to determine those things for themselves. But I think it’s just, to me, kind of empty headed to deny that musicianship is really a pretty important factor in it. LL

Because, you know, for me as a teacher of music, something that really keeps me in there is my belief in the area myself and my passion about that – I mean I take it pretty seriously and I think as a profession we’ve got to decide how serious is it. How important is it, you know, this musicianship side of things, or is it really something that just anyone can teach with the help of a few good resources. LL

The following participant felt that the expectations placed on the generalist teacher without a musical background were unreasonable and off-putting.

You wouldn’t require the generalist teacher to have certain level of knowledge because it seems to me that the more we drive them into expecting a high level of knowledge when they’re not adequately equipped when they start and not giving them enough time, actually what we do is knock their confidence even more. You know because we place an unreasonable demand upon them. Therefore they feel more inadequate at the end of the training than they did at the beginning. JD

One participant recommended that teachers be thought about in two groups, with appropriate expectations for each group as a solution to the differences between teachers in terms of their competence to teach music. This grouping would ensure that expectations matched the teachers’ abilities in the area of music education and that children would receive skill focused teaching from an appropriately qualified person.

I think it is about growing the expertise and to illustrate my thoughts on this I’ll talk about teacher groups A and B. First of all though, I think we have to be very clear about what the document demands. Technically / legally primary teachers / someone is supposed to teach music to every child to level four. I think we’re kidding ourselves given our current pre and post training structures that all generalist primary teachers do / will have the expertise to teach to level four, so I will now talk about the two teacher groups – A and B to suggest how this might be addressed. The group A teacher, is the generalist with little or no music skill background who will only ever be able to reach a basic level of confidence and competence with
their music teaching. I believe we have to determine clearly what the acceptable and attainable minimum level is for the generalist. And then the group B teacher is the specialist or the music leadership person who in some other way has gained skills to be able to work alongside the generalist but also take the specialist things that are not realistic for a generalist classroom teacher to take. So I think we need to determine what’s realistic and achievable for both A, the generalist, and B the specialist and how the two would compliment and work in with each other too. For example might it be only level one for the group A generalist teachers? We have had 125 years of “compulsory” music in NZ, and if you look back in New Zealand’s education history we’ve had numerous reports about the state of music education such as the Tait, Bryce, Ritchie, ERO, and Mansfield, who all conclude that specialists are required if we are going to be serious about achieving the objectives as prescribed by the various syllabus / curriculum documents over that time. But sadly this has never happened in a comprehensive or sustainable way. LW

Hennessy (2001) believes that what is needed is research into the skills, knowledge and teaching qualities needed for good music teaching, as well as a definition of ‘good teaching’ with regard to music teaching. The participants in this project were also concerned about the lack of clarity in this area, and felt that some assumptions prevail that are evidence of ignorance of the complexity of music as a discipline and of music teaching as a practice. Hennessy (2001) comments that:

My contention is that it is not difficult to make the case for music, or to argue for a curriculum which places practical, creative music making at its center. What is lacking is research which looks at the teaching and learning processes involved. What is needed is more knowledge and understanding of good music teaching. Maria Spychiger (1998) comments, ‘Good music teaching has been the strongest specification as regards the conclusivity of positive extra-musical outcomes from [extended] music education.’ From the well publicized research she was involved with in Switzerland in the early 1990s (Spychiger et al., 1993), she concludes that what is needed are well-educated music teachers, a high status for music in the curriculum and the evaluation of the quality and outcomes of music teaching (Hennessy, 2001, p. 242).
Teacher Confidence

*I believe the confidence of teachers and their ability to actually take the children on from the first level stages of the curriculum is another barrier because teachers will not dip their feet if they don't feel the confidence that they need to be able to take that next step.* NW

Participants talked about lack of teacher confidence as being a barrier, in that they felt that some teachers have skills that they don't acknowledge or lack the confidence to share in a public way. The fact that music making can be very individually exposing and the idea that one's mistakes may be obvious to others was seen to be potentially off-putting for teachers.

*... because music is an expressive art and involves performance, it's difficult because it's linked with self-confidence, it's so obvious when you get it wrong and you sing on your own or you play a bum note, it's very obvious whereas if you make a spelling mistake you just put a line through it and start again. If you get the number crunching wrong you just do it again and the error is not there for the whole world to see.* CG

While lack of music skill and knowledge were considered to be the major causes of inadequate music teaching, some participants also described occasions where teachers may have a negative self-perception of their musical ability based on stereotyped views of what it is to be musical (CG, RT, HW). For example, one participant commented that some teachers regard music literacy as narrowly describing the ability to read and write conventional notation, and that they do not value other aspects of musicianship, for example the ability to play an instrument and sing, as highly.

*I think there are a lot of teachers out there with strengths that they don't acknowledge themselves. They think it's a very easy option to say it's too hard, I can't do it, so I won't bother. I think there's some other issues too such as teachers who are very good singers or guitar players who don't actually give themselves credit for that, if they don't read music they think that they've got nothing to offer in music. So that self-esteem thing and confidence is a huge problem. I've come to the conclusion that those with an in-depth knowledge are going to run obviously a more in-depth programme but we have to be realistic and expect that other teachers can provide positive music experiences rather than in-depth programmes.* Sometimes I think teachers want to dive in the deep end and do all the really
challenging things which are too hard and that puts them off, whereas if they think of it in terms of providing experiences for children that are worthwhile and positive, that might be a better way in for them. RT

Young (2001) describes this sense of inadequacy as being, in some cases, more a feeling, shaped by negative music education experiences, than a reality. She links this to a situation where the recipients of inadequate music teaching at primary and secondary school then participate in inadequate teacher education only to become inadequate teachers of music themselves in a self-perpetuating cycle.

For primary school teachers, the problems (which seem to be perennial) are well documented, particularly in relation to the non-specialist. Here, it is the combined and compounding issues of teacher competence and confidence that are central. These feelings of inadequacy seem to spring from a conviction on the part of the trainees (and later, teachers in service) that they themselves are not musical. This perception is no doubt formed as a consequence of inadequate experiences of music as pupils (Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 1982); Mills, 1993). They then receive inadequate training—both initial and in-service. In school they encounter teachers who also feel inadequate and all parties proceed in turn to provide inadequate experiences for their pupils … (Young, 2001, p. 209).

**Pedagogical Content Knowledge Needed to Teach Music Effectively**

Jones and Moreland (2003) have reviewed studies that have investigated the relationship between effective teaching and pedagogical content knowledge. They have concluded that good subject knowledge is a vital component of pedagogical content knowledge which is in turn a key element of effective teaching.

Good teacher knowledge of subject content was found to have a positive effect on decision-making related to changing pedagogical strategies for creating better learning opportunities. In addition, sound content knowledge seems to have a positive effect on planning, assessment, implementation of curriculum and curriculum development. Harlen and James (1997) comment that teachers cannot provide experiences and activities that guide student
progress toward understanding of ideas if they themselves don’t know what the ideas are (Jones and Moreland, 2003, p. 78).

The participants identified particular aspects of teaching pedagogy where they felt that a musical background and a level of skill and knowledge were important. One participant in particular described the ways that a musical teacher uses her knowledge throughout a lesson in ways that are not accessible to a teacher without musical skill and understanding.

... what’s different about music I think is the role of the teacher as an active music-maker in the process of learning. That the quality of the child’s learning environment, I think, along with other things will be directly affected by the music-making ability of the teacher who’s not just instructing but she’s facilitating and responding. The music teacher has to be able to operate within that medium. I mean, I’ve sometimes talked about the music teacher as needing to be really highly skilled in improvising, not just improvising musically, but improvising in terms of teaching, because we’ve constantly got to adjust and change what we’re doing in terms of the musical response that we’re getting from the children. So you know, you plan a lesson and you’re thinking okay the children are going to be playing this little ostinato on the instruments, and the lesson is fabulous and it looks good and there’s absolutely no reason why it’s not going to work, and then you get in front of the students and you start doing it and you just realise that because you’ve got six children like this, and five children like this, that’s not the right ostinato, whereas if you just tweak it a little bit and do that, it’s going to work brilliantly. And that’s like talking about the minutiae of a music lesson but you could multiply that by 50 in terms of the musical decisions you might have to make during a good music lesson. LL

Recent research in New Zealand has also identified that the pedagogical practices of the teacher are central to optimising learning opportunities for diverse students. Alton-Lee (2003) has identified and described the characteristics of quality teaching. She has gathered evidence about practices that result in high achievement for diverse students and has concluded that the teacher is a key influence on student learning.

High achievement for diverse groups of learners is an outcome of the skilled and cumulative pedagogical actions of a teacher in creating and optimising an effective learning environment (Alton-Lee, 2003, p. 1).
The participants in this project all expressed concern and doubt as to the ability of the generalist teacher without a musical background to create an effective music learning environment. They agree that the teacher's level of musicianship needs to be such that he or she can provide a programme that has depth, is at the appropriate level for the children, and where the teacher has the knowledge needed to adjust their teaching to meet the needs of individuals and groups within the class. One participant commented that assessment for music is an area of particular challenge for teachers that lack the discipline knowledge needed to recognise learning need, establish criteria for success and articulate possible next learning steps (Clarke, 2001; Black and Wiliam, 2002).

_Quantitative research_ suggests that due to the unique nature and complexity of the music discipline, many generalist teachers are not equipped with the necessary content knowledge to provide responsive formative assessment for their students. That “Teachers and students engage constructively in goal-oriented
assessment” (Alton-Lee, 2003, p. x) has been identified as one of ten characteristics of quality teaching. The results of this project suggest that formative assessment is unlikely to be occurring if the teacher lacks the curriculum content knowledge needed to recognise and promote achievement in music. One participant also mentioned the ability to scaffold children’s learning as requiring a significant depth of music content knowledge as well as a great deal of skill and confidence as a teacher.

... a music class could be seen as a really good scaffolding situation – as the person at the centre of say the ensemble, I don’t mean centre as in a hierarchal sense, I’m sort of the structure underneath, so I’m providing a really strong scaffold initially, say by doing something on the piano – and then as the strength of the group grows, I withdraw and withdraw and they eventually are standing on their own. Well, I mean, a lot of the time we’re talking about quite elementary musical pieces, but even very elementary musical pieces need a lot of expertise sometimes to get them happening. LL

Alton-Lee (2003) has emphasised the critical roles of scaffolding as a key strategy for supporting and promoting students’ achievement.

... there is substantial evidence of the key role played by effective scaffolding in achieving higher outcomes for diverse students. Scaffolding is the process by which teachers challenge and enable students to move beyond what they can do independently by providing structured assistance (Alton-Lee, 2003, p. 77).

Integration was also seen by many of the participants as an aspect of teaching pedagogy that requires a depth of discipline knowledge to be meaningful and purposeful for children. An integrated approach was seen to be sometimes motivated by the need for efficient use of time rather than a desire to provide quality programmes in the arts.

And I think that another huge perception problem is that when music is subsumed into performing arts and integrated arts courses, we lose music in its own right and it is compromised as a discreet discipline and is fundamentally misunderstood in terms of how complex music really is. Allowing music to become just a servant of other subject areas, is hugely problematic. LW
Linda Webb went on to comment on the need for a planned and sequential music programme, which would give the children the skills and knowledge needed to express themselves musically within an integrated programme.

... in the research reading I'm doing at present about performing arts, and integrated arts issues, there is significant evidence that you must first create a strong understanding and skill level in music (or any one of the other arts disciplines) itself before you can do justice to an integrated approach. LW

The concern expressed by the participants about the superficial nature of some integrated approaches to teaching music is shared by Elliott (1999), Veblen (1999), and Manins (1998). Elliott, in particular, disagrees with the notion that the arts have much in common as disciplines or that learning in one arts discipline will necessarily promote learning in another arts discipline. Plummeridge (2001), and Eisner (2001) also doubt the idea of cross-fertilisation between learning areas and claim that the best way to promote learning in music is through musical pursuit, that is, through playing, creating and listening to music. However, Veblen (1997) has described conditions where an integrated approach can be fruitful and purposeful, without diminishing the integrity of music as a specific body of knowledge, or compromising children’s learning of specific music skills.

Integrating curriculum makes most sense to me as a music educator,
- if the integrity of the music is uncompromised;
- when students also participate in music making and learning in a regular sequenced curriculum;
- as appropriate for a given group of students;
- as appropriate to the subject are being studied, or as a full and richly contextual way to teach music;
- and, ideally, in collaboration among knowledgeable teachers (Veblen, 2000, p. 5).

Veblen’s viewpoint is compatible with the arts curriculum document which describes the benefits and considerations of an integrated approach between arts areas and between the arts and other essential learning areas, while acknowledging that the skills and knowledge specific to each discipline require planned teaching and careful monitoring within an
integrated teaching model (Ministry, 2000, p. 93). The advantages and disadvantages of integration have been discussed more fully in Chapter 2.

Valuing Musicianship and Music Education

*I don’t think people who aren’t involved in the world of music have the slightest idea how big music is.*  
CG

Underpinning the participants’ views on teacher knowledge was the frequently stated idea that music holds a unique place in the curriculum. Many commented that this uniqueness was not widely appreciated and that, in particular, the complexity of music as a body of knowledge is generally misunderstood and underestimated. Most participants felt that the complexity of music as a discipline was a major barrier for the generalist teacher without a music background and that effective music teaching depends on adequate teacher knowledge and skill. Many of the participants shared a concern that the concept of musicianship itself was misunderstood and underestimated and that a perception existed that enthusiasm without necessarily a depth of understanding may be sufficient for teaching music (JD, MD, CG, LL, HW, LW).

*... because music is such a complicated language and such a complicated medium with so many different dialects, I don’t think you can expect people to be able to teach it unless they’ve got a certain level of skill and ability and understanding of it.*  
JD

*...what’s different about music I think is the role of the teacher as an active music-maker in the process of learning...that the quality of the child’s learning environment, along with other things will be directly affected by the music making ability of the teacher.*  
LL

*There’s no other subject and we’ll still keep calling it a subject for now, like music. It’s something everybody has experience with at a very basic level, but what’s expected is so beyond what most people in this society can do themselves and if you can’t do it yourself you’re not going to approach it,*
you're not going to be able to unpack it for the kids and make it relevant for
the kids beyond basic low-level activities which might be fun but not
meaningful in terms of learning. Compliance, but not sound teaching and
learning necessarily. MD

... it seems to me to teach music in a primary school requires a very special
kind of training and skill development and this is especially true in
communities where you've got a really wide range of communities
represented in the school itself, a wide range of different cultures and so on.
It's interesting talking to people around the world where they've got twenty
different musical cultures in the classroom and seventeen languages and so
on. I would say it's far more difficult than teaching English or teaching
maths actually and there's only one language in maths as far as I know—
though I'm not an expert. Music's far more complicated. So I think you have
to train your music teachers specially. JD

One participant felt that she was sometimes put in the position of apologising for or
denying the importance of her musical skill and knowledge in order to help the generalist
teacher to feel better about their lack of competence in music.

... I think funny things happen when musical people get together with non—you
know, to use crude categories —non-musical people. There's almost an
apology. I feel what's happened at times is there's almost an apology for
your musicianship... LL

Pre-service teacher education can provide a really great experience for
students to develop their own musicality from wherever they are at — but
that's a completely different issue to equipping adults to go out and teach
children music. And so I often felt [when lecturing] incredibly compromised
and actually quite confused. Because for as a music teacher, what keeps me
going is my passion and I take my profession pretty seriously. We need to
decide how serious the issue of teacher musicianship is — or is music really
something you can just teach with the help of a few good resources. LL

All participants expressed concern that music programmes are often superficial,
reflecting a lack of status for music within the wider curriculum, lack of time in the school
day to provide an in-depth programme as well of lack of teacher understanding of the specific
goals of the music discipline.

... unfortunately areas like music or areas like the arts do not get focused on
as well because teachers seem to feel that they don't have the significance
within the curriculum that they really should have. And so the outcome of
that is that they get focused on in less detail and provided with a shorter
timeframe... NW
On one hand, (and I’m really talking primary and intermediate here, with mostly generalists but I think secondary can suffer from it too) primary music teaching fails to draw on those cognitive higher order aspects of learning through music because it’s done by generalists or it’s not done at all. Also, it can become marginalised for its dispensable kind of role as entertainment or any of the aesthetic aspects which are viewed as frills, and so in the hands of untrained people music can turn out to be quite superficial and simplistic, serving other ends than for music and it doesn’t really transcend into those artistic and aesthetic levels that it could, in the hands of a trained music educator.  

I think there is a community and school population perception still that the arts are less important. There’s an awful lot of powerful people who send messages that discourage teachers. Going around in the contract, we had a lot of very, very avid principals who were really keen to see that things happened and keen that we worked in the way that we were working, but there were an awful lot who simply didn’t opt to come in at all, and some who actively discouraged the people putting time into it because they said we’ve got to do literacy and numeracy... and we’ve got principals who are very very protective of their staff and don’t value the arts enough to put in the time and effort that it would require. So those I think are all barriers. Now that’s not to say there’s not a hang of a lot of schools where there’s really proactive wonderful stuff happening, but I think it’s more common to have discouragement. 

I think undoubtedly it’s the undervaluing of music. I don’t think we’ve educated people enough to really appreciate the value of what music can do. I think it’s totally marginalised and if people don’t see it as important nothing much is ever going to happen. It’s always going to be on the bottom of the heap. And that’s a really hard message to get through to people. And maybe that needs to be built into our professional development, some more research or NZ based research I think that’s coming up with this new contract isn’t it? But it’s never going to be a top priority and really from the management point of view, if you’ve got a principal in a school who’s really supportive of music, things are likely to happen, but of course if you don’t then its always going to be superficial. 

The participants all expressed concern about the marginal position of music in education, linked to a societal undervaluing of the importance of the arts in all aspects of children’s intellectual, social and cultural development. Similarly, Eisner (2001) believes that schooling has a powerful socialising affect, and that what is selected as curriculum content as well as the aspects of children’s learning that are formally measured for assessment purposes, give powerful messages to children about what adults value. He is concerned that the marginal position of the arts is evidenced in the lack of time, resources, and assessment
emphasis given to arts education, and that this has a significant influence on the way that children may view learning in the arts.

The position of the arts in the school curriculum symbolizes to the young what adults believe is important. The values the young internalize are seldom internalized by admonition; they permeate the environment and seep in slowly like water through sand. Values are conveyed through the forms of life in which they participate. For children these forms of life are made palpable by the value choices that the adults around them make. Among the most important of these choices is what schools should teach. The curriculum of the school shapes children's thinking. It is a mind-altering device; it symbolizes what adults believe is important for the young to know, what is important to be good at. It tells the young which human aptitudes are important to possess. It gives or denies children opportunities to learn how to think in certain ways (Eisner, 2001, p. 12).

Robinson (2000) has given reasons why he thinks the arts tend to be at the margins of educational practice rather than at the centre. He believes that the arts have suffered from a utilitarian focus in the western world on preparing a large percentage of the population for the workforce, and where only a small percentage of the population would be expected to have a career in the arts. He also believes that there is a widely held perception that the arts are not 'academic'.

The arts have been at the margins of education because they have not been seen as useful in getting jobs. This is partly because the practice of the arts does not conform to the dominant idea of academic intelligence (Robinson, 2000, p. 5).

All of the participants were very clear about the benefits of music education for children's learning as well as social and cultural well-being, and one participant placed music firmly in the centre of the curriculum. Robinson (2000) describes issues that would need to addressed if the arts were to take their place in the centre of the curriculum. He comments that an important way that schools need to show that the arts are valued is by employing teachers with the discipline and pedagogical content knowledge needed to teach the arts effectively.
The first [issue] is the curriculum. I know of no argument that can be sustained that mathematics is more important than music or that science is more important than the arts and humanities. These are equally important. But all of our systems perpetuate a hierarchy of ability in which the arts are at the bottom. The second is training of professional teachers and others. Teaching of the arts is an expert job. It is not easy. A great disservice has been done to the arts over the years with the general idea of free expression, that all we have to do with children to get them to benefit form the arts is let them loose. It isn’t true. To benefit from the arts children need to be immersed in the disciplines and practices of the arts. There’s a delicate balance between learning skills and having the freedom to innovate and speculate. Most of our teachers and most of our artists are not trained to do this [emphases in the original] (Robinson, 2000, p. 6).

Hallam (2001) believes that the way that music education is valued will determine the quality and quantity of time and resources allocated to music teaching. She describes a causal relationship between teacher, school and the wider community valuing of music education and children’s motivation about and achievement in music at school.

Crucial to engendering motivation to learn is the value placed on music by society, institutions within it, teachers, family and friends. If music is highly valued in a school both within the classroom and as an extra-curricula activity, then students will be more motivated to participate. If music is not valued, then the class music teacher and visiting teachers will have an uphill battle. The value placed on music is also reflected in the resources made available for its use (Hallam, 2001, p. 68).

The Structure and Content of the Arts Curriculum Document

*I think it’s intensely practical. It places a very pleasing emphasis on the doing, the making. At the same time it does give adequate weight to the contextual aspect of music making and equal importance to the creating side. So I think it’s a well balanced document really. I think there’s been a little bit of squeezing to accommodate it to the other curriculum areas...a little bit of contrivance in the common language. But once you get into the actual music-related parts that doesn’t affect it at all – I don’t think.*  

HW

Comments about the document were positive overall, however most participants identified aspects of the document that may present barriers to teachers (JD, MD, CG, LL,
One participant commented that any document can be a barrier because of the slippery nature of the written word.

Any document is a barrier because the written word can be taken as is, and deconstructing it is open to interpretation and to experience. So, when teachers don’t have that experience and don’t have the language or the understanding of from somewhere to somewhere, then it’s fraught because they need so much more. So the document is a barrier in that sense, and it can’t come alive until it’s interpreted for people – so we need interpreters who have a good knowledge and an innovative, inclusive, wide sense of what that can be, and I keep coming back to the kids – it’s not for the way we learned or for the way another country does it, it’s the way it is here in Aotearoa New Zealand for our kids. MD

One participant commented on the exciting possibilities for children’s learning if the aims of the document were able to be effectively realised in classrooms.

For me the actual strength of the document is that it is visionary and it has exciting potential if one could have appropriate people resources in place to take someone from the progression of level one to four because every child actually did have music as an integral part of their learning throughout all of their primary school years. Wow! Every curriculum document has aspects that you don’t particularly agree with, but looking at the potential growth and spiral development that could take place, I think that it’s exciting. To me the biggest challenge yet to be faced is matching the ideal of the document with the complexity of putting in place appropriate people resourcing. How we go about achieving this, is yet to be realised. LW

One participant emphasised the importance of teachers’ understanding the uniqueness of each discipline, as well as understanding the meaning of each of the curriculum strands in relation to each discipline, and appreciating the interlinked nature of the four strands.

It is critical that each discipline be understood for its uniqueness. I like the four strands and it’s important to see them linking rather than being separate entities. Each arts discipline has a slightly different interpretation of what these strands mean for that art form which can be a challenge for teachers. MD

The concerns that were expressed about the document were generally related to its implementation, rather than to its content or structure. However, one participant expressed
concern at the fact that the arts curriculum is an outcomes-based document and felt that this may result in a technicist or reductionist approach to teaching music rather than a more holistic approach.

Because it's an outcomes-based model (and that was a given) it has a problem with the choice of language. The explanations don't include words that acknowledge the expressive, subjective, creative side of learning music. The curriculum document is firmly in the camp which sees learning in school similar to a factory model. Each learning area defines a product and that presents some challenges. The first challenge is the levels that we inherited from the framework with that sort of assembly line thinking and the second problem is the SLOs or Specific Learning Outcomes. Teachers aren't very skilled at writing them so I think that's a problem, coz there's an expectation that they'll just do that. CG

The above comments about the outcomes-based conception and structure of the document and the sense of linear progression that may result from hierarchical levels are consistent with Cain (2001) who has highlighted problems with the linear nature of the British National Curriculum Statement. He is concerned that linear models may value progress up a predetermined ladder, to the detriment of musically rich, contextualised experiences that are relevant to the needs and interests of individuals at all levels. Similarly, Kushner (1994) has articulated concern that outcomes-based curricula, where a pre-determined sequenced set of behavioural outcomes are described, negate the possibility for other strategies for teaching and learning in music. In particular, an outcomes-based curriculum may not allow teachers to reflect on their practice and decide on strategies for music teaching that may be better in tune with the complex reality of their classroom and the diverse students within it.

Two participants critically discussed the notion of multiple literacies which is a concept that underpins the philosophy of the arts curriculum.

I think that there's another challenge about the idea of multiple literacies. I personally don't have a problem with that idea of growing music literacy, I think it's great but I don't think it's been well understood. And I don't think that the numeracy/literacy strategies help... the literacy strategy should
have been all inclusive. Learning is a process and we should be using literacy as a global kind of term so that music and dance and drama and visual arts are recognised as other ways we communicate and interpret meaning in our lives. If only teachers could understand that, they’d get their heads around multiple literacies better. They would actually improve the literacy/numeracy training programmes if the trainers could see the bigger picture. CG

I think the whole question of multiple disciplines and single disciplines within the arts is a very difficult one. It’s very easy to package the arts together because they have certain things in common but the danger with doing that is that you don’t actually notice the differences. They are unique ways of knowing, if that’s the phrase we can use; they have certain things in common and the knowledge we gain from experiences in music and theatre and visual arts and so on have something in common. But they’re not actually the same—for instance the languages are quite different—and I think there’s a danger that in putting them together one doesn’t recognise the differences. JD

Two participants commented on transition points, between documents (from Te Whariki to level one of the arts curriculum) and between the levels within the current document, as sometimes describing too big a leap (RT, HW).

In summary, commonly expressed ideas among the participants about the strengths of the documents were: that it is internationally well regarded; it is comparable with the other curriculum documents; it is not prescriptive or limiting in its scope; it is broad and balanced, flowing well from strands to objectives to learning examples, with clear pathways for teacher’s to follow; it describes a clear sense of progression; it is inclusive of all musics, and acknowledges the uniqueness of music as a body of knowledge.

I believe that teachers can work with this document and build in their own planning and programmes of work from a fairly good steer. I think that the pathways are clear and straightforward with the strands and the objectives and the learning examples that just flow through to help teachers drill down. I believe it’s easy to follow especially with its focus on the action reflection cycle which is in keeping with the current emphasis on the teacher as a reflective practitioner and it was good to see that written into the document. I think it lines up very well with the other six on the framework so that there is some familiarity for busy teachers jumping from one to the other. The seven documents have evolved, with each one becoming a much cleaner document than the one before. I still think that it’s clear that they
belong on the same national curriculum framework. And I think that another strength is that it does acknowledge the uniqueness of music. It didn't get trapped into a model that promoted the performing arts or the integrated curriculum. It could have been very tempting for the writers of the arts curriculum to come up with more of what I call a "fruit salad document" but it has come out very clearly that there are four separate disciplines, that music is one of those. They're all unique. Although they often use the same terms, those terms mean something different for each art form and so on, so I think this curriculum has not sold music short. CG

One participant saw it as a strength that the current document is not a radical departure from the previous syllabus, building on what has previously worked well (JD). One participant felt that the Understanding music in context strand is a particular strength, as this had been a neglected aspect of the previous syllabus (MD).

**Pre-Service and In-Service Teacher Education**

*To teach music in a primary school requires a very special kind of training and skill development.* JD

All of the participants expressed concern about the nature of pre-service teacher education and the lack of time given to music education in pre-service programmes, and considered this to be a significant barrier to quality music education. Many described the minimal hours given to music education as being inadequate to support the development of students with or without prior knowledge of music as a discipline. Some participants felt that improvement in the standard of music education in our primary schools would be impossible unless there is a radical change to the way teachers are educated in this area.

*... we've kind of shot ourselves in the foot. Because we've probably got a better curriculum for music than we had, but we have actually less skilled teachers because within the colleges, trainees are getting less time and the professional development is not on an ongoing continuing basis in quite the
same way that it was. And I think therefore we've actually made the situation worse not better. JD

Many of the participants expressed concern that student teachers were not seeing good music teaching practice being modelled in schools and were reliant on short pre-service curriculum courses to meet their development needs. The fact that there is no prior music knowledge requirement for selection into a teacher education qualification was also highlighted as a problem for music education.

Well, I think that there are three or four problems, big problems in the pre-service training. I think that teacher training is currently not adequate for both secondary and primary teachers because the curriculum requires children Years 1-8 to have music training up to Level 3 or 4. Generalists teaching to Level 3, becoming a bit more specialised by Level 4. Now the current training certainly is not adequate to help trainees gain that knowledge. I think most of them are operating at about Level 1 themselves. There's no guarantee that trainees in any intake have had any music learning. There are no pre-requisites for music and the time has been cut from music right across all the Colleges of Education, the range of compulsory hours across BEd training – and Linda will reinforce this – ranges from something like eight hours to 48 hours and this has declined significantly from 1990. The Colleges have just slashed and burned the hours, and the other part of the problem is that when trainees go out on their practicum they don't even see adequate teacher modelling for music. It is a cyclic situation. If you're not training them they're not coming out adequately trained to teach music then they're not going to be able to model music teaching and learning for the next cohort and so on.

T Exactly. They might in fact never see somebody teach music in their entire three years. Nor might they teach it themselves and get any feedback.

C That's right. And for many of them, their most recent music learning experience may well have been somewhere back in their own primary school days. CG

Obviously pre-service education in music is pathetic. It's not enough and one of the problems that we have at our college is that they do it in their first year and then it's three years down the track before they're in a classroom and of course in the meantime they go out on practicum and they don't see lessons modelled, they don't see music being taught. . . So it's a whole cycle... they're not seeing it modelled. I've even had a student offer to take children for singing. This is a music pathway student and the teacher told him 'no we don't have time for things like that.' So it's an uphill battle all the way for students who are quite committed when they start. They see the value of it but I think that gets pushed aside as the three years pass and they haven't seen it in action. And other priorities come in. RT
One participant commented on the fact that teacher education institutions award teaching qualifications to people who demonstrably lack the skill and knowledge to teach music effectively.

J It's funny isn't it because normally if you train people in skills, whether its to become a plumber or an electrician or a pianist, you don't say 'O.K. well you spent three years learning that and then you can go away and do it'. You say 'you learn this till you can do it properly and when you can do it properly then you can go away and do it.'

T Right.

J You know the apprentice system is that you're apprenticed to somebody and when he reckons that you can make a cupboard without the doors falling off he says 'O.K. now you can make the cupboards- you're like me now' that's fine. And if somebody comes to learn the piano, they learn the piano until they can't learn anymore from the teacher or they've got to a certain point and the teacher says 'O.K. you go out there and give a concert.' You know or 'you're on your own now you've learnt the skills.' In teacher training we don't do it that way. We say 'we'll get everybody together in a big building for three years and at the end of that we'll call them teachers'. Now the chances that everybody's got all the skills required with that system seems to me to be pretty slim. The only way you could make sure that everybody who comes out as a teacher has the right kinds of skills right across the curriculum is to make sure that they have enough skills before they start. Again the NZSME and I have written countless letters to colleges saying 'why don't you have a music requirement for people who go to college because you have a cat in hells chance of really getting people through to an adequate level if they don't have any prior experience. JD

One participant commented that the structuring of the arts as one of the seven essential learning areas is a disadvantage for music education, particularly within the context of teacher education.

I'm increasingly aware that the whole decision in the first place to make the Arts one of the seven curriculum learning areas has been a real disadvantage for music, because of the squeezing of the subjects. Making music an equal part with dance, drama and visual arts, I don't think has been helpful at all. People say to me 'how can we possibly have reached the stage where there is so little time given in teacher training – how have we got to this stage?' And I say 'well I think it goes back to that decision. HW
Helen Willberg went on to describe her experience of the reduction of time music education courses, as result of music forming one quarter of the arts curriculum.

... we were down to ten and a half hours of specific music time...which I believe does nothing for the person who's got no music. It does nothing for the person who's got lots of music... doubling the hours when the hours are so few would make very little difference. And I mean my colleague and I both bravely said 'oh yes, cut it down to such and such, yes alright we'll pare it down again, we'll work out what's essential, we'll do it' you know...But when it was finally reduced we both looked at each other and we said 'we've been kidding ourselves that we've been able to do it on what we've got now, but this is just plain ridiculous. HW

Drummond (1997), in particular, has noted the lack of opportunity existing for generalist teachers to become musical mentors, due to a nation-wide lack of pre-service time dedicated to music education and decreasing in-service support hours allocated to advisory services for music. He has investigated the declining number of hours for music in pre-service and in-service teacher education, commenting on the mismatch between the growing importance of and interest in music participation in schools and the wider community and the undervaluing of music in teacher education.

The evidence is unequivocal. The number of hours training in music received by primary teacher trainees in New Zealand is declining. So is the number of hours of in-service support provided to music teachers at the primary and secondary levels. At the same time, the demand from teachers to be upskilled in music remains constant, the curriculum requirement of music teaching in the schools are as demanding as they have ever been, the opportunities for students to learn music have never been greater, and the numbers of students wanting to become involved in music within school is steadily increasing. In a world where education is supposed to be market-driven, and where providers are therefore supposed to be responding to the needs of clients, this situation would appear to be absurd (Drummond, 1997, p. 22).

The description of pre-service teacher education as being lacking in time allocation is consistent with the concerns expressed by Barnes (2001) about the quality of teacher education in Britain and the lack of opportunity for students to either study music education or see music teaching modelled in school.
The Royal Society of Arts (RSA, 1999) records that in 1998, 30 per cent of primary teacher training students from two universities did not teach music in their second teaching practice and 40 per cent failed to teach it in their third and final practice. Some 63 per cent of the same students considered that they had not learned how to teach music in their second practice from their mentor or class teacher, and 81 per cent said the same of their final practice. In a separate study of third year students from another university, the RSA found that 82 per cent were only ‘slightly’ confident about teaching music as a result of their college training. In my own institution up to half of the first and second year trainees returning from teaching practice during 1999 and 2000, considered they had neither seen nor been asked to teach any music during their block school experience. Almost 30 per cent of teacher training institutions now do not offer specialist courses in music to primary teacher trainees (RSA, 1999: 24) (Barnes, 2001, p. 93).

Hennessy (2001) comments that professional development models need to be evaluated in term of benefits for children's learning.

It is difficult not to be persuaded of the value of all teachers being involved in music teaching, but more research is needed to develop the practice and evaluation of different patterns of initial training as well as professional development. Independent research is needed to evaluate the efficacy of professional development for serving teachers in music. The more important question is ‘do children receive a better education in music as a result?’, ‘better’ meaning more engaging, exciting, relevant, imaginative, demanding...more musical (Hennessy, 2001, p. 244).

Other Barriers

Other potential barriers mentioned briefly in one interview in particular, but also alluded to by other participants were; the status and affordability of extra-curricular music education (MD, CG, HW), student and teacher self belief (CG, RT), perceptions of school music as ‘uncool’ or irrelevant (CG), lack of teacher confidence to use music technologies (CG, RT), manageability within a crowded curriculum (LW, NW), lack of space and instrument resources (NW), and the unique issue for music of the impact of private providers, including a concern that students who don’t learn privately and who are trying to achieve in music purely...
through participation in the school programme cannot compete at the higher levels, with those who do learn privately (CG, HW). Two participants expressed concern about the possibility that those children most likely to succeed at school music in terms of examination results are those children who have been provided with private tuition in music (CG, HW).

There's an extremely high standard at the top end of the school system (for level 8 / NCEA levels 1, 2, 3). The standard is excellent. This has been brought about because of our private music studios that provide a number of music students with that extra pathway that students in a school just plodding through a music course don't get. And it raises the bar really high. So that in some ways, the private system that we've got disadvantages the music learners in our schools because they're denied access through time, money, opportunity, remoteness etc. Some students give up quite quickly trying to take music at school because they realise their marks are just going to come out so low at the end, for no matter how hard they've tried (and they're possibly an 'A' student in everything else,) they come out with a 'C' or a 'D' in music, simply because of the structure of the qualifications at that level. And that there are so few parallels with music. Maybe with gymnastics where kids take private tuition for many many years which extends and enriches their work in schools. But I don't think we've quite got it right with music. For senior students the standard is extremely high, and is quite depressing for those who have just gone through a conventional school music programme and can only achieve a moderate or low grade. CG

One particular principle that I think that I would like to see espoused, and that is that the principle of equality so that children may go out to private providers but they don't have to. That the foundational music studies are all done at school. A child can do their music entirely through a school programme and reach the standard required at levels 5, 6, 7 and 8. So that to mind is what we should be aiming at. I would of course see a daily music programme in the classroom as essential. I would also like to see it adequately resourced from the point of view of instruments and the looking after of instruments and all of those kinds of things. HW

A further barrier mentioned by several participants is the notion of musical talent and the idea that some people are biologically pre-disposed to be successful at music learning and some are not (MD, CG, LL, RT, LW).

Others who are keen observers of children's musical behaviour have claimed that 'all children, to a greater or lesser degree, are musical' (Campbell, 1998). What is inherent in these views, however, is that musicality is not expressed in the same way by all people, a view that has,
unfortunately, led to the erroneous popular notion that one either has musical ‘gifts’ or one doesn’t (Upitis, 2001, p. 52).

Nutthal (2001) has investigated the rituals of classroom practice that he believes have become culturally embedded ideas about what effective teaching looks like. He has concluded that the construct of academic ability has lead to the idea that teaching is not the most significant part of the teaching and learning equation. Within this construct, teachers enact teaching rituals that are underpinned by an assumption that the students will learn if they have the ability to do so.

I also came to understand that there is a web of supporting beliefs or myths that justify the way these rituals are played out, possibly the most significant of these is the concept of academic ability. When the teacher manages the classroom so that all the students are, as far as the teacher can see, busily engaged in appropriate activities, what can explain consistent differences in what the students produce. The teacher is doing everything right, so why do some students fail to respond? The concept of inherent ability or intelligence appropriately transfers responsibility away from the teacher’s management of classroom activities. Learning is said to be function of ability. Our data, however, show that differences in what the students learn, and differences in how they engage with classroom and testing activities. In both cases, these are a function of their motivation and the extent to which they share the purpose and culture of the teacher or tester (Nutthal, 2001, April) (Nutthal, 2001, p. 21).

Some participants expressed concern that notions of musical talent, in terms of music education, may lead to a belief that the effort or expense of providing quality music education is wasted on children who have not been identified as musically talented (MD, CG, HW). One participant provided an argument against the idea that having a specialist teacher may add to public perceptions that music is an elitist subject for the talented few.

_T_ Do you think that by having music specialist teacher in a school, you might give children the idea that music is somehow elitist or too hard for some people? You know, that music is special, and you need a special room and a special teacher?

_L_ I think music is special... children have to know that when you invest a lot of energy in something there is a reward for that and I think the much stronger messages to students will come through the experiences they have
in the music room. And I think if they came into the music room and there was a huge favouring of children who could do something musically then obviously that would get that message. But that’s completely the opposite of what I operate from in a music room. I’ve got enough instruments for every child to be on an instrument whenever I need that to happen. So everyone’s playing all the time, there’s no one ever sitting out. It’s not a question of the good kids playing and the others watching. So I think they have a great experience of being a music-maker. And that’s what I think is really central for young children. The experience I want to give children in primary school is that they learn to position themselves as a music-maker at whatever level and at whatever level they’re able to do that, and I think they’re pretty non-judgemental, they don’t have the same sets of hierarchies as we have, so they can really appreciate someone playing, you know, in all sorts of different ways. We don’t need to worry that there’s a great hierarchy of those that play an instrument really well and those that don’t. I don’t think they think like that. And the sorts of experiences they’re having don’t make them think like that, because we’re sort of operating as a group, we’re playing together. LL

The participants were in agreement that music education is beneficial for all children if well taught and that provision of quality music education should not be dependent on parental educational background or values, nor parental ability to pay for tuition. Similarly, Elliott (1995) argues for quality music education for all children.

Musicianship is not something given by nature to some children and not to others. Musicianship is a form of thinking and knowing that is educable and applicable to all. Accordingly, all music students ought to be taught in the same essential way; as reflective musical practitioners, or musical apprentices. Put another way, the best music curriculum for the best music students is the best curriculum for all music students; a music curriculum based on artistic musicing and listening through performing and improvising in particular, and composing, and arranging, and conducting wherever these are possible and relevant (Elliott, 1995, p. 260).
Chapter Five

An Adequate Model

Introduction

This chapter focuses on the participants' suggestions for removing the barriers and creating an adequate model of music education. Each participant shared a view of how music education could be better organised and delivered, showing awareness of the issues and specific challenges for schools and the possibilities for resolving these issues in realistic, practical, but also visionary ways.

An adequate model of music education described and discussed in this chapter includes three important components

• collaboration between specialist and generalists teachers
• a specialist pathway within pre-service teacher education
• an ongoing and responsive model of in-service support
• effective and supportive school leadership

An Adequate Model

McPhee and Stollery (2002) have attempted to define an adequate model of music education. They use the terms 'crystallising' and 'paralysing' to describe life experiences that
might either allow or prevent the development of musical intelligence. The crystallising experiences include; parental encouragement and support, motivation through praise and reinforcement and inspiration from a gifted teacher or role model. Paralysing experiences included; poor or inadequate teaching, negative attitudes from teachers, peers and family, lack of opportunity, and the demands of musical development (McPhee and Stollery, pp. 93-94).

First, access and opportunity for musical encounter and experience need to be ‘crystallizing’ rather than ‘paralyzing’ in nature. Second, there needs to be a curriculum which develops a wide variety of metacognitive skills such as experimentation, improvisation, assimilation with the real world, and which fosters motivation. Third, the teaching relationship should be based upon positive reinforcement of achievement rather than the employment of a deficient model. Ability should be nurtured and, through this, exploited at an early stage through the provision of opportunities within and outside the curriculum. Fourth we need a longitudinal view of musical development that encompasses all the agencies responsible for it: primary and secondary schools; parents and the home environment; private tutors and music centres; and ensemble groups. By means of this holistic approach, a situation is created where there are no barriers to development and where there is a real possibility that development will take place (McPhee and Stollery, 2002, p. 95).

One of the hoped-for outcomes of this project was to describe a model of practice in music education that might better meet the musical needs and interests of New Zealand primary school children, by addressing or removing some of the perceived barriers. My assumption was that the research participants, based on their many years of experience in music education would be able to inform this description with carefully considered, theory- and practice-based ideas about what makes a quality music programme and how this might best be provided. The interviews were very rewarding in this way, in that all of the participants were very clear about what they believed is needed in schools to improve the current situation. Most interestingly, the adequate model of music education described by each participant was consistent across the interviews and was well supported by the literature in this area. The participants all had strong messages for the Ministry of Education about its role in improving the quality of music education in schools, and many had suggestions for
some important steps along the way to achieving an adequate model. One participant talked about the way that ideals and vision need to work in combination with a sense of practical reality.

... you're trying to make sure that the ideals of music education are being met, that everybody should have access to it, that the best possible music education should be provided. I've always felt it important, especially since my involvement in ISME that music of all kinds should be included in music education. So there are sets of ideals and principles that one's trying to encourage. But there are also the practicalities of it because it's no good having the ideals there if people aren't paying attention to how you can get towards those ideals so I've always been very forthright in terms of what I think is needed in terms of resourcing – particularly teacher training. Supporting teachers in the classroom all the professional development things that we need because its all very well to have a curriculum and a syllabus and a set of nice principles, but unless somebody's doing something about it at the chalk face or in the setting, or in the classroom then you get nowhere. So I've always tried to advocate both of those and to argue the case for both of those. And also I mean I'm a sort of person whose always interested in new ways of doing things so I've tended to encourage people to think of new ways of doing things. To accept the solutions that were around when I was a kid aren't necessarily going to be the right solutions for kids nowadays. JD

All of the participants stated that the knowledge and skill requirement for effectively meeting the demands of the music component of the curriculum, particularly beyond level 2, is beyond many teachers without a musical background. Therefore, each advocated that music education would be best served by specialist teachers working in a variety of roles in primary schools.

Specialist/Generalist Collaboration

We've got to go back to the idea of specialisation, to support generalists, there's no two ways about it. MD
All of the participants felt that there is a clear need for specialist music teachers in primary schools. Most commonly, the participants advocated a collaborative relationship between specialist and generalist teachers. One participant pointed out some arguments in favour of generalist teachers, while acknowledging that she was now convinced that specialist teacher were needed.

Well I have always supported that idea that it is ideal for the generalist teacher to teach music, because I believe that if the teacher doesn't ... and hands over the music and perhaps the visual art and perhaps the drama and perhaps PE and whatnot to other people, then I think that teacher misses out on an enormous amount of that child's development. And I think it misses out on the balance in the class of seeing children who have strengths in particular areas and allowing those strengths and encouraging those strengths to flow over into other areas and so on. That to my mind has been the strongest argument for the generalist teacher and the perspective of the whole child and the joy of the whole thing. The creativity and the imagination. What you're left with if you take out those things may still delight some teachers' hearts absolutely but I think for a lot of teachers there is joy in the breadth that we have in our curriculum.

If the teacher is not a confident musical person, will they be able to do that joyful teaching and finding out about the whole child.

Probably not.

No.

No. I must admit in the current situation, I have become more and more convinced that we need specialists.

One suggested model was that the specialist teacher teach the aspects of the curriculum that were too specialized for the generalist teacher – for example instrumental and choral ensembles, and provided a mentoring relationship for the generalist teacher to ensure that some accessible aspect of the music programme were being successfully taught, to the best of that teacher's ability.

I think that the generalists can make the links across the curriculum if the specialist is going to have some skills input. I think the generalist can also set up the situation where they can learn from the specialist - use them as a mentor, as a model, and they can start to build their capacity by being available if it's possible time-wise to work alongside the specialist.
the role of the specialist should be to do what the generalist can't do. For instance the specialist can teach kids how to play an instrument or read and record music. In simple terms, the generalist could focus on learning through and about music and the specialist can focus on learning in music. You've got a reasonable balance then instead of children either not having music taught at all or having music taught pretty poorly. CG

One participant discussed the advantages and disadvantages of specialist/ generalist working relationships.

T  Can you see a role for a specialist teacher in schools for music?

R  Absolutely. And I've got mixed views. I think if every school had access to a specialist, providing that person is a good person, because there are specialists that are not great teachers that don't do marvellous things to be honest, and sometimes classroom teachers do a better job in terms of motivating children. But I would expect a specialist to use the skills they have and do the things the classroom teacher finds the most challenging. Like the real skill building and concept building. Of course there is a danger when you have a specialist that music's removed from the classroom and that's a concern. And that the teacher doesn't have to take any responsibility at all for any sort of music experiences and just offloads it. And I appreciate where teachers are coming from. They have enough to worry about, but I'd love to see a balance where you have specialists providing say instrumental, you know programmes where there are lots of instruments being used well and lots of in-depth stuff plus the classroom teacher doing some worthwhile music activities, some listening after lunch and some singing when they can—using music with language, maths, so it becomes an integrated part of the programme. RT

The role of the specialist as collaborative, that is, working supportively with the generalists, was favoured by all participants. One of the participants, who is a specialist in a primary school, and takes all of the music in the school, sees this as very beneficial for the children and the school as a community. She values conversations with other teachers in the school about the children’s progress in music.

I think links are really important and you've got to be flexible. I try to have a pretty open conversation with the teachers about the various students. I think one of the really good things is that teachers are very interested to hear who is shining in music. They're always amazed at the children who are just absolutely wonderful in music who struggle in other areas of the programme. LL
The notion of a shared position – working part-time across a small cluster of schools was favoured by all participants, except for one, who expressed concern that the specialist was at least permanent part-time in one school, so that he or she would have a sense of belonging and commitment from that school community and greater job security.

T  So, with some of the others I’ve talked to, we’ve talked about the idea of some schools clustering together and sharing somebody – sharing a specialist. Can you picture that working?

L  I think that there, one of the issues involved in the, from a different perspective, is protecting that status of the music teacher and one of the reasons this is working for me is that I have a status of a teacher who, I don’t know how many years I’ve taught, say twenty-two years or something. I mean there’s nothing compromised, I’m in a permanent position, I get all the conditions are as a classroom teacher and I have no anxiety about where I’m going to be next year. Whereas there is an expectation sometimes that teachers will work here, work there, and if the funds run out at the end of the year then too bad. So I think if there was really good cooperation between two schools, and I think the conditions of the job have to be looked at really carefully – I think that can be a solution.

T  Yeah, but it could possibly be a bit exploitive or insecure for that person?

L  And also I there’s something about, you know, something that happens when you’re part of a ... I mean I’m being very fussy, but when you’re part of a school community, you know, you have a kind of a loyalty and involvement with the school community. When you’re working between two schools that would change the nature of your relationship to the schools. And I think in a way it kind of sets the teacher up more as like the itinerant specialist. I would rather favour a teacher who was prepared to do three days music and two days of something else within one school. I see that as a better solution.

LL

One participant described three levels of specialist/ generalist collaboration needed for successful music education.

I believe that using a cluster system where there’s a specialist available to every school, needs to involve three levels of music to be really successful. First level is the classroom music that happens which I call “incidental music” used for example at transition points, where you might use a rhyme or a rhythm or you sing a topical or favourite well known song or use music as a roll call greeting etc. And then level two is “integrated music” which is planned for and used within the classroom programme across curriculum, e.g. within the performing arts, or as part of a theme or integrated unit –
and it is purposefully there, and not something that happens incidentally. And then there’s level three “specifically planned separate music sessions.” And then on top of that there’s actually a fourth thing, the specialist group / event which might be choirs, orchestras, musicals, concerts, etc that often happen outside of normal class time. This might also involve using experts e.g. cultural group leaders, people who have particular talents, and there might be itinerant instrument teachers who come in. I believe that the music specialist needs to take overall responsibility for over seeing that all of the levels / types of music activity within each school connect with each other.

LW

Linda Webb went on to describe the way that the specialist and generalist need to work together.

But I think one of the worst things I see happening in schools and feedback also from student teachers is when they go into the school and they say ‘oh yeah, someone came in and did music, but I never saw it’. You know, somebody comes in and does it in a void, as a separate thing. I totally oppose that model, as I believe what needs to happen is that the specialist needs to also be responsible for whole staff professional development (or they may bring in other people). Essentially they make sure that this happens. That they also talk with teachers in smaller groups as in syndicates or levels about what they can do across the curriculum and how it can fit into their whole programme. So I think the incidental music is one thing as whole staff and then I think within syndicates you’d be responsible for helping with planning and looking e.g. at cross-curricular possibilities. I think there’s a definite place for saying ‘well, if I’m going to take your class for the specialist music and also take the specialist groups, you need to understand and monitor these activities so that you can support / reinforce these achievements with what you do musically within your own classroom. I see that there is a feasible way to link all those things and everybody feel part of the “music” team.

LW

One participant described the possibilities for the development of centres of excellence as a result of specialist/ generalist collaborations. According to this participant, such centres could become known for the quality of their provision of music education.

I’m a great believer in centres of excellence and centres of learning. And it could be that a teacher is established in a particular school and other schools would come to that teacher, rather than that teacher itinerates, so there’s that option as well. And so there are possibilities, a range of possibilities that could be trialled to see which was most effective. Probably the most economical is the itinerant teacher process, but I still feel there is an avenue for having a specialist area set up and established that class groups can visit. So that’s another centre of teaching excellence.

NW
A Specialist Pathway Within Pre-Service Teacher Education

Many participants suggested ways that teacher education providers could improve practice and programme structures in the interests of music education.

I think a possible model for teacher education would be for students to indicate their interest in music and then be put together as a professional studies group with one of the music staff. So there can be the practice, the link between the theory and the practice across wider issues and those people would go through as a cohort for the three years being able to support each other so that you build the experts within the group, and then even that concept carrying on in schools so that those people would then be familiar with working and sharing in a group, that they could then be a music specialist or leader in the school that supports other staff. If every College did that, even if it was a trial and that if somebody did a little longitudinal study on that to see what happens to those people and the impact that they might have when they get through. MD

One participant emphasised the importance of generalist primary teaching experience for specialist music teachers in order to ensure that they had pedagogical skills and understandings as well as subject and curriculum knowledge.

I guess what I think is, I think it’s really essential that teachers, music teachers of primary children should be primary teachers. I think a generalist training for a music teacher is really important, because I think firstly I’m a teacher of children – so all the pedagogical awareness and all the learning about other aspects of the curriculum is essential, so I think that a music teacher needs to have some time in a generalist classroom. LL

One participant felt that changes to teacher education required a shift in thinking that included acceptance of the idea that specialist teachers are needed to teach music in primary schools and that programme structures within teacher education setting need to reflect this idea.

Well I think, we have to diffuse the tension that exists as a result of the very idea that everyone will teach music equally well. We have to talk about and resolve what we think is realistic for the generalist to achieve versus the specialist. And we have to offer programmes that train specialist primary music teachers alongside generalists. I think that we have to make sure that the people who are making the decisions about programme pathways in pre-
service (whether in Colleges or Universities) understand this as well as school BOTs, principals, and communities. This requires appropriate funding and support from government who need to also be saying let’s be realistic about this by ensuring that providers have appropriate pathways in place to actually make this achievable. LW

One participant described the need for specialist and generalist pathways in teacher education.

I mean, I think, yes, there should definitely be part in the College course for development of the musicianship of all teachers, because that’s an important part of their education, and they’re going to be participating in musical events and musical learning in a primary school, but then I think there needs to be, you know, there needs to be a career path, a very clearly identified career path for those people who have strengths in music and who wish to pursue it, and then I think there has to be realistic positions out in the schools for those people to go to. I think the problem with it was, but then on the other hand when you are getting people who are strong, I kind of believe the positions will develop. LL

I know from having set up the B Mus Ed degree programme in Auckland that we had schools right across New Zealand requesting the graduates – we simply could not meet the demand. I mean, the difference and benefit in those people doing music education alongside their teacher training was so obvious to everyone who had them in their schools as trainees. Instead of doing just the three year course, they did four years with the teacher training stretched out over a four year period with the music happening alongside – it was parallel development – not an end-on model. As you have just mentioned, individual skill development in music happens only over a long period of time. LW

I actually firmly believe that the combination of a university school of music and a college of education working together to achieve a four year specialist music education qualification for primary is an extremely beneficial way to go. LW

One participant described the potential for disruption of the cycle of inadequacy that could happen as a result of specialist pathways in teacher education.

I mean, I think, yes, there should definitely be part in the College course for development of the musicianship of all teachers, because that’s an important part of their education, and they’re going to be participating in musical events and musical learning in a primary school, but then I think there needs to be a career path, a very clearly identified career path for those people who have strengths in music and who wish to pursue it, and then I think there has to be realistic positions out in the schools for those
people to go to. When you are getting people who are strong, I kind of believe the positions will develop. **LL**

**J** I think if we did introduce specialist training for music then that would probably mean we could re-think how we do the music training for the generalists.

**T** Yes.

**J** So we might actually be able to give them a rather better more useful kind of training, because their task would not be to try and do the whole curriculum for music but it would be to support somebody who can. **JD**

One participant suggested a variety of approaches to the method of training a potential specialist might receive, for example, providing sabbatical leave for classroom teachers so that they could participate in a short specialist music education course provided by a university or college of education (HW). Another suggestion was to provide courses for community musicians so that they could acquire the curriculum and pedagogical content knowledge needed to fill a specialist music position (HW). Most participants considered it to be important that the music specialist was generalist trained and able to therefore make appropriate links to other aspects of the curriculum (JD, MD, CG, RT, HW, LW).

We do need specialists working alongside generalists in all our primary schools. I think that they need a different training pathway to be a specialist. I would like to see specialists attached to clusters of primary schools, say at least three specialists in intermediate schools so that you’re covering choral, instrumental and kapa haka or something. For small schools and schools that are isolated, it’s not that easy but I think there must be better ways of using the community resources. I think there must be ways of opening up the LATTs the Limited Authority to Teach Teachers so that they can be acknowledged and paid properly in schools and I think we could beef up the training for private providers who are keen to teach whole classes because there are some of them out there. But I think as a way for specialists to work in a school, they would need to be included as a member of the staff so that valuing their input should never be a problem and I think that the critical person in this equation is the principal. They need to demonstrate considerable leadership in including specialists in primary schools in the planning and reflection sessions. And then what would happen would be that the generalist teacher could teach what they’re best at and teach just what they have a passion for ... I think that the generalists can make the links across the curriculum if the specialist is going to have some input it’s the generalists who can make the links. I think that the generalists can also set up the situation where they can learn from the
Specialist teaching of music is supported by Drummond (1997), Elliott (1995) and Plummeridge (2001). Upitis (2001) has commented on the goal of preservation of musical heritage and believes that this requires specialist discipline knowledge. He also stresses the importance of innovative teaching practice in music education and the role of personal musicianship in innovative teaching.

Music specialists must continue to exist in the 21st century for preservation and innovation in music education. The notion that every teacher can teach every subject in elementary schools, at least, is simply not born out in practice. Further it is not only music that suffers from lack of specialised teachers; other disciplines suffer as well. Earlier I spoke of the importance of preserving parts of our music heritage, and made the case that this could only be done through some form of specialised instruction. But it is also the case that innovation in music education is likely to come from those who are musicians themselves—composers, performers, listeners, experimenters, creators (Upitis, 2001, p. 53).

However, in a similar way to the participants in this project, he comments on the potential richness to be gained from specialist and generalist collaborations.

Having said this, innovation in music education is not a task that rests on the shoulders of specialists alone. Music in our elementary and secondary schools should be taught by classroom teachers, specialists and artists. My colleague, Katharine Smithrim, has pointed out that to say that music can only be taught by specialists also implies that music is in some way different from other subjects, and can only be ‘accessed’ by special people, something that is in direct contradiction to the notion that music is for everyone. Rather, it is a blend of true partnerships between generalist teachers, specialists teachers and artists that is most likely to yield the richest music education, both in terms of preservation and innovation (Upitis, 2001, p. 53).
Effective and Supportive School Leadership

Many of the participants commented on the importance of school leadership in establishing and nurturing good practice in music education. The way that the Board of Trustees and school principal demonstrate their valuing of music education through support for professional development, and the funding of quality resources was considered to be critical.

We need music to be taught as part of the curriculum and taught well. And for me the person who’s going to ensure that is the principal. A principal who wants music to happen will recognise that it has value for their schools for their students. They will find qualified teachers to take the lead. I believe they’ll seek them out and if they find someone with promise they’ll put money into PD for them. I think the principals need to allocate a sufficient budget to enable a programme to take place with the right equipment and to ensure, not block, that there are performance opportunities so that people, the Board of Trustees, the parents, the community in general can see a music programme in action. And see the light in the eyes and the smile on the faces and the difference it’s making in self-esteem to children who they encounter in other settings. CG

Linda Locke spoke of her principal’s support for her position as a music specialist within a mainstream school and the benefits for children’s learning that have resulted.

It’s interesting that at the school that I’m at, the principal himself is not musical. But he decided at a certain point that there were just too many teachers that couldn’t teach music – the children weren’t getting a fair deal and he had someone very musical on the staff. He’s a very good manager of funds, so he manipulated things a bit and put in place a music specialist and the results have really pleased him, pleased the community. Whenever people walk past the music room there’s always some singing or some musical playing happening or something. There’s always musical sounds coming from that, there’s always music being made here. So I mean, I think he’s kind of gratified all the time cause he hears the music being made all the time. LL

But then you see the school principal has to be persuaded to fund that within the funding allocation. So you have to say ‘so how are we going to do that, I mean are we going to lose another generalist, I mean lose a classroom teacher, where are you going to find the money for it to make that happen.’ Therefore somebody has to say, ‘O.K. let’s get these five schools together and see if each of them could put in a fifth of a salary.’ But who’s
One participant spoke of possible solutions to the practical and funding realities of providing a specialist teacher for music.

The other area is now that schools have more options in the way they expend their operation grant, may be for schools to be encouraged to see how a programme of specialist support could work, a trial process where you can get a number of schools willing to trial for a start, and show how effective it is, is a way of dealing with specialisation. Whereas schools might identify, say, .2 of their funding to go towards a cluster specialist that could be used in that manner — a bit like the itinerant process. But you’re going to need at least five or six schools to be happy to come on board a programme of that nature to enable it to work for a person who is willing to itinerate. NW

An Ongoing and Responsive Model of Professional Development for Teachers

Nigel Wilson spoke about the potential relationship between the employment of a specialist teacher and the provision of professional development. The following is a response to questions about the problem of teachers lacking subject knowledge in music.

I think there are two solutions. I think what we’ve got to do is look closely at how that can be best managed within the school environment. And the two aspects — one is that the classroom teacher still needs to be able to include some aspects of the music curriculum within their own programme so that they, continue to have an understanding of where it fits and where it’s related to especially within the other aspects of the curriculum, but also in aspects of children’s lives and how it really permeates that, but at the same time there is room also I think for specialisation whereby schools can look at either cluster grouping processes or bringing in specialists that may be employed across five or six schools. I actually feel the process used at secondary schools is a good one with the itinerant teachers of music, who itinerate especially around instrumental instruction and across a number of schools is an effective process of encouraging, a. schools to take that next step and, b. the teachers to see how to take the next step and, c. to have that
specialist support. And at times that specialist support will assist the classroom teacher and the pupils will be able to bring understandings from what they're learning from the specialist teacher back to the classroom. I believe there is room and a need to look more extensively at this process.

T So can you see a relationship between that visiting specialist and the classroom teacher in terms of ongoing professional development for the classroom teacher?

N Yes, that could be married into the professional development process. I believe ... one of the problems we've faced with is that there is often good blocks of good professional development training, but it's not ongoing. And it's the ongoing that is needed. Now there are ways around that, through that specialisation teacher process where teachers can learn from the specialist teacher and continue to build on what is being developed by the specialist teacher, a, for themselves and, b, for the children that are working with them. So you've got two avenues being covered there – you've got the children being able to be taken on by a teacher who is very aware of the curriculum, and, b, you’ve got all the processes which support teachers within the school happening at the same time. NW

Nigel Wilson also spoke of the need for an ongoing model of professional development, as opposed to the current provision of short-term packages.

One of the big things that really does concern me is that PD process whereby we don't have the ongoing follow up and I think that's an area that needs exploring. One of the difficulties that we confront, I think, in Otago is the limited access to support services. And that's an unfortunate situation that's arisen that we need to keep coming back to. I know my staff love it when people come out and support them, and give them the support to develop further their skills because they're enthusiastic and on they go.

T So you would like there to be essentially a music adviser?

N Well, there is the two options. There's either you establish a music advisor or you move towards the specialist teacher process where those people are available to itinerate in and out of schools when they get called on. And it may be that there is a block PD process, but there's always a follow up of having a specialist teacher there or access to that sort of avenue. So that teachers see it not as just PD, but as part and parcel of ongoing development within their own personal level and also in the classroom.

T Possibly you need both, don't you? You might need the specialist teacher who's very hands-on in the school with children, and then a floating advisory person that's monitoring and offering advice and keeping an eye on how things are going.
N Yes, that would work too. One of the things you’ll find is that through the contracts schools cover at the particular time all staff are supported, but then there’s always new teachers coming in and there’s always new needs arise and that’s where we miss out. NW

One participant spoke of the depth of professional development needed and the difficulty of addressing this need with short-term approaches to teacher support.

You know I think the professional development work that’s been done for the new curriculum is great. From all the reports, you know people are getting excited, feeling more comfortable about it, but it is not addressing some of the fundamental problems. I mean if somebody has difficulty in doing something you can help them out with a little bit of what they’re doing and they may feel a little bit better, but the problems I think for most teachers are far more fundamental.

T Yes. It would be like discovering that all of the people teaching maths can’t actually add.

J That’s right. That’s right.

T It is as basic as that.

J It is rather. And I mean you can go along and you can give them some professional development because we’ve decided to introduce division now. So give them some professional development on division but if they can’t add they will still get stuck. JD

One participant commented on the need for flexibility in the delivery of teacher support for music. She highlighted the need to tailor the support to reflect the nature of the discipline.

The only point I probably want to make is that I don’t think that a model which is appropriate for say maths, or numeracy or literacy, is necessarily appropriate for another discipline like music. They are not the same and they should never be aligned to other successful, (if they are), professional development models. I think the leaders have to establish what the issues are, what are the successful pathways that people have found for teaching, in a particular art form, and run with that as closely as you can. For instance, I think that for music or any of the performing arts, working in a group is important, the group experience, the sharing and being able to not feel utterly exposed in a one to one situation is significant. I would have liked to see groups, little clusters of small, groups of eight to ten, cooperative clusters where teachers can learn about teaching music, by experiencing the modelling as learners, but with the focus being a lot tighter – say in specific levels. ... That approach is not the same as taking the whole school staff. There would be better modelling and mentoring. CG
Hawk, Hill and Taylor (2001) have identified some key characteristics of effective professional development. Their research has provided evidence that professional development will only be successful if it takes place in an environment that is conducive to learning. This environment must include a principal who is enthusiastic about learning alongside his or her teaching staff.

The principal plays a pivotal role in modelling learning, building a culture of collaboration, and identifying potential in and facilitating the learning of others (p. 3).

The key characteristics identified by Hawk, Hill and Taylor (2001) are summarised as follows;

1. Learning is for everyone (p. 3)
   Professional development will be successful in a school where principal and teaching staff have a commitment to their ongoing development.

2. We learn by taking risks and trying something new (p. 3).
   Within a supportive community of learners teachers will feel able to improve their practice by taking risks, trying out new approaches, and reflecting honestly on the effectiveness of their practice (p. 3).

3. We need to ‘own’ the process (p. 4)
   Professional development will be successful if teachers feel committed to the process and feel motivated about the particular innovations advocated in the teacher development programme.

4. The learning needs to be relevant (p. 4)
The professional development needs to meet teachers’ needs and be located in their ‘real world’ (p. 4).

It should have what they call, ‘coherence – consistency with their goals, addressing real and daily concerns and building on earlier experiences and learning (Hawk, Hill and Taylor, 2001, p. 4).

We need to focus on deep rather than shallow learning (p. 4)

According to Hawk, Hill and Taylor’s research findings, one-off courses are insufficient and ineffective. This is because they do not provide the opportunity for teachers’ to make the real links between theory and practice that will have long-term impact on their development of pedagogical content knowledge. Teacher development needs to be individualised, allowing for cycles of action and reflection to take place.

Professional development needs to be much more than going on a course and picking up a useful strategy. The focus needs to be on deep learning that provides the experiences and understanding that not only modify practice but also enable teachers to examine the values and beliefs that underpin that practice (p. 4).

We’re working on this together (p. 5).

Teachers need to receive feedback about their practice within a safe and supportive community of learners.

What difference is this making for our students? (p. 5)

Implementation of initiatives needs to be monitored in terms of the impact on children’s learning.

Professional development should make a difference to the delivery of the teaching and learning programme and ensure that both opportunities and outcomes for students are improved (p. 5).
These characteristics of effective professional development would seem to fit with the concerns raised by the participants about the need for ongoing, responsive and flexible provision of teacher development. This also links to the suggested changes to the nature of pre-service teacher education highlighted by all of the participants, where a specialist training pathway has been identified as a significant need. The potential for specialist support of generalist teachers in schools has been an important idea discussed by all participants. Hawk, Hill and Taylor (2001) acknowledge that professional development courses offered outside of school have value (p. 15), but believe that professional development is most likely to be successful if it happens in the context of the school setting within a supportive, collegial environment. This fits with the model suggested by participant Nigel Wilson, and echoed by other participants, in which mentoring of generalist teachers, collaborative teaching, as well as specialised teaching could be provided by a specialist music teacher, possibly working within a cluster of schools.
Chapter 6
Conclusions

In the end, however, an excellent curriculum is an excellent teacher interacting with students in educationally sound ways (Elliott, 1995, p. 258).

The aim of the present study was to talk to some key informants about music education in primary schools, and ask them to identify barriers to the effective implementation of the music component of the Arts Curriculum (Ministry, 2000). The key informants were also asked to explore possibilities for an adequate model of music education.

The motivation for the project stemmed from personal experience and professional concern about the quality of music education in New Zealand primary schools. In particular, this concern has arisen from my work in pre-service and in-service teacher education. My personal and professional experience have shaped my construction of music as a complex discipline and my belief in the benefits for all children to be gained from learning music from a person with a depth of subject knowledge linked with pedagogical knowledge relevant to this discipline.

Music as a curriculum area has remained an accepted, if reduced part of the curriculum through changing eras in education as education policy has swung between traditional and progressive ideas about curriculum, the role of schooling and changing constructions of the teacher and the child. Traditional thinking about music education constructs music as a body of knowledge to be transmitted as it is defined in classical Western terms, with an emphasis on preservation of a particular musical heritage and appreciation of ‘great works’. Music learning from a traditional perspective is perceived to be good for the masses in terms of
creating a more cultured public, and good for children with an innate talent who are destined to achieve musically. Progressive educators place greater emphasis on the child as a creative being needing music as a vehicle for self expression and the development of the imagination, and on ways to enhance non-musical aspects of the curriculum, learning and behaviour (Plummeridge, 2001). Both of these ways of thinking about the nature of music education can be identified as related threads within the eclectic theoretical underpinning of the current arts document, along with a significant focus on appreciating the diversity of musical expression within socio-cultural contexts. This project has suggested a theoretical framework for considering the aims of music education as they have evolved over time, with a particular focus on the goals, philosophy and structure of the current arts document. This framework is derived, in particular, from the work of Plummeridge (2001), and Foley, Hong and Thwaites (1999).

This project has explored ideas about the meaning and value of music, in particular focusing on two interlinked ideas, that music may have intrinsic and/ or extrinsic benefits. These benefits are often used to justify music education as a worthwhile pursuit for children, and to affirm the inclusion of music in the school curriculum (Cox, 2001; Plummeridge, 2001). Research that has been reviewed indicates that music education has value for its own sake as well as having wider social, cultural and intellectual benefits. As Robinson (2000) suggests:

The arts don’t do one thing; they do many. They promote a broad range of intellectual development. They are among a suite of ways of promoting creative thought and action. They promote an engagement in cultural understanding. They encourage social communication; they offer a language of feeling. And they provide modes of aesthetic engagement (Robinson, 2000, p. 32).

While acknowledging and celebrating the many intrinsic and extrinsic benefits of music learning, a clear message from the literature in this area is that music has a unique place in the
curriculum, because of the unique nature of music itself. According to Elliott (1995), appreciation of the unique nature of music and music learning is pivotal to the development of quality music education.

... the most important differences between, for example, science education, mathematics education, and music education lie not in what education makes of them but in the differences among and between science, mathematics, and music. In other words, without a prior sense of the nature and significance of music it is impossible to justify the place of music teaching and learning in any educational scheme, let alone explain how the values of music should be realized (Elliott, 1995, p. 13).

Issues to do with access to music education have been discussed along with problems associated with a curriculum area that can be viewed as a middle class activity, available to children whose parents value the western classical tradition of learning and measuring musical achievement and are in a position to pay for lessons outside of school. Ideas about musical talent or giftedness have also been discussed, with consideration of an ecological view of musicianship including the idea that musical intelligence can be learned, and that musicianship is a 'multidimensional form of knowledge' (Elliott, 1995, p. 224) that can be acquired through teaching and learning.

The relevance of school music has been considered along with the need for school music programmes to acknowledge and connect with the out-of-school musical lives of children. Literature in this area suggests that while many children are happily involved in music making in contexts other than school, school music should be a vital and equitable opportunity for all children to discover their musical selves and have their musical potential nurtured (Shehan-Campbell, 1993; Stålhammer, 2003).
The need for carefully differentiated teaching that acknowledges the diversity of children’s individual strengths, needs and musical interests has been highlighted by many writers in this field. Pitts (2000), for example, suggests that:

To expect music in the curriculum to do the same thing for all children is a false premise: what pupils encounter in their school music lessons impacts upon different ability levels, different experiences, different perceptions of school and music. Music offers the opportunity for every child to move on from where they are, in skills, understanding and imagination. The use they make of their school music experience is beyond the teacher’s control, and rightly so, given that the immediate and long-term effects of music are greatest when the child is fully involved and learning independently. The function of music in the curriculum is a facilitative one, where lessons are a source of learning and experience that form only part of the child’s musical world and identity. Teachers should present their own musical beliefs and experiences with integrity, and the rest will follow: children will find their own sense of purpose if teachers are committed to theirs (Pitts, 2000, p. 41).

This project has investigated concerns expressed by some that the place of music in the curriculum has been marginalised by its position as only one quarter of the Arts. This concern is linked to debate over the political ideology underpinning the Curriculum Framework (Ministry of Education, 1993) and the perceived greater value to society as needing to feed the growth of the knowledge economy (Mansfield, 2003; Sullivan, 2001).

The context for teaching and learning has been an important thread in this project, including consideration of the impact of appraisal and professional development pressures on teachers’ work (Hawk, Hill and Taylor, 2001; Young, 2001). According to the literature in this area, the expectation that the generalist teacher can become competent to teach music through the current provision of pre-service courses or in-service teacher development reflects a lack of understanding of the complexity of music as a discipline, its cultural significance in people’s lives, and the depth of understanding and demonstrable musicianship needed to teach effectively (Eisner, 2001; Elliot, 1995; Hallam, 2001). This lack of understanding is evidenced in the marginal position of music within the Framework, and the inadequacy of courses offered to students in teacher education programmes (Drummond, 1997).
Barriers to the Effective Implementation of the Music Component of the Arts Curriculum Document

This project has found that it is the opinion of the research participants, supported by evaluation reports over time and other research and advocacy work, that children in New Zealand primary schools are not being well served by the current generalist model of music education. This inadequacy is seen to be linked to inadequate teacher education for music as well as a model of in-service teacher support that lacks the depth and time to make a real difference to teachers' confidence or competence to teach music. In the interviews the key informants identified many barriers to effective music education, but the most significant of these were: teachers' lack of content knowledge; the lack of time and resourcing in pre-service and in-service teacher education programmes; and the way that education in the arts is viewed and valued by schools and the wider community. Participants also highlighted the need for clarity among the education community about the level of musicianship required to teach music effectively, as well as considering problems associated with teachers' self-perception of their musical talent and the impact of many teachers' lack of confidence to teach music, that may or may not be a realistic self-appraisal of their ability. Many expressed concern about the inequitable nature of access to quality music education, and the advantage for many children of learning from private providers.

The issue of teacher knowledge, and in particular, the idea that teachers need a depth of pedagogical content knowledge to teach music effectively has been a key area for investigation. The development of pedagogical content knowledge is considered to be vital for effective teaching and involves the interlinking of teachers' subject content knowledge, their understanding of the goals and philosophy of the curriculum, as well as their pedagogical knowledge, for example, of formative assessment, or scaffolding strategies (Alton-Lee, 2003;
Hallam, 2001). There is a considerable body of literature that describes music education as an area requiring specialist subject knowledge, and which rejects the notion that the generalist teacher can teach anything given the right attitude.

The notion that every teacher can teach every subject in elementary schools, at least, is simply not borne out in practice. Further, it is not only music that suffers from lack of specialized teachers; other disciplines suffer as well. Earlier I spoke of the importance of preserving parts of our music heritage, and made the case that this could only be done through some form of specialized instruction. But it is also the case that innovation in music education is likely to come from those who are musicians themselves—composers, performers, listeners, experimenters, creators (Upitis, 2001, p. 53).

In summary, it seems clear from historical reporting and the results of the present project that the inadequacy of music education as it is presently practiced in primary school, is not the result of inadequate or poorly conceived curriculum documents past or present. Instead, this inadequacy lies in the implementation of the curriculum by teachers who are not qualified to teach music, that is, who lack the uniquely musical skills, knowledge and understandings needed to teach effectively. This lack of knowledge is not being addressed by the current model of pre-service or in-service teacher education, despite the conscientious work of music advisors. This local perception conforms with a considerable body of international literature in this area (Plummeridge, 2001; Elliott, 1995; Eisner, 2001). It is certainly not a new problem and has been clearly stated in music education reports over time (ERO, 1995, Renwick, 1978; Tait, 1970).
Solutions

Music is an important part of the curriculum, with a role as indefinable as the place that music holds in so many lives. We need to be modest about the place of school music in the overall musical development of the child, and yet be ambitious about its provision, resourcing and variety, if all children are to have the opportunity to discover its potential for themselves (Pitts, 2000, p. 41).

The need for specialist teachers of music in primary education is supported by research and advocacy work done in New Zealand and overseas over a significant period of time (Buckton, 1993; Drummond, 1997). The need for specialist teachers to work either independent of or collaboratively with generalist teachers was emphasised by all of the participants in the present study. The need for teacher education pathways for potential music specialists was identified as an essential component of the evolution of an adequate model of music education in the participant comments on implementing music education in schools. A range of possible structures for this was suggested, including the ideas that community musicians could work as specialist teachers if given an appropriate course in curriculum and pedagogy, or the specialist could be generalist trained with a specialist aspect to their course, possibly within a fourth year of study. The idea of schools working in small clusters to employ a specialist music teacher was well supported by the participants. The possible role for the specialist was described as including: providing ongoing mentoring and teacher development for generalist staff; teaching choral and instrumental groups; teaching classes working at level 3 of the curriculum and beyond, providing modelling, shared teaching, and planning support for the general classroom music programmes. Collaboration at school and community level was advocated by all participants. As Upitis points out, “innovation in music education is not a task that rests on the shoulders of specialists alone” (2001, p. 53).

Collaboration is vital, between teachers, between schools, and with the wider community. It may be that quality music education requires experiences and collaborative approaches to
teaching and learning that are wider than the classroom, in order that children can get the
group performance, and community music experiences that are such an important part of
music making and responding. Adams (2001) comments on the benefits of community music-
making experiences.

... the extended curriculum has provided opportunities for participation in
choirs, bands, orchestra and preparation for public performance within and
beyond the school. Collegiality, loyalty to the group and social interaction
are all developed within such corporate activity. Satisfaction in performance
arises both from how well the individual contributes to the whole, from their
knowledge of the pleasure gained from the audience. It follows that
musicians, as individual performers, also become aware of their role within
the wider community (Adams, 2001, p. 183).

It is interesting to note here that as a result of the Curriculum Stocktake (2002) report to
the minister, the Curriculum Project is currently underway. This project has an aim to address
school’s concerns that teachers have too much to teach and too much to assess. As a result of
the changes recommended in the report and being developed in the Project, schools will have
greater flexibility to develop programmes that they feel will better reflect the needs of their
school community, with a focus on depth rather than compliant coverage of curriculum
achievement objectives. Curriculum achievement objectives will be reduced in number, as
will the essential skills currently described in the Framework. A draft of the revised document
is expected in 2006. The potential benefits for music education are as yet unclear, but perhaps
within this context of greater flexibility for schools, schools may be able to consider ways to
provide specialist support for their music programmes.

The importance and value of music education for all children has been well-argued, as
has the idea that music making and learning is a natural and joyful socio-cultural behaviour
and intellectual pursuit that is a vital part of the curriculum. Barnes (2001) makes a plea for
quality music education for primary school aged children.
If music creates meaning in our lives, forms an essential part of our humanity, helps us think more deeply and effectively and enhances our emotional literacy, then it seems highly negligent to give it such a lowly place in the curricula of our schools. The lack of music-making opportunities is particularly serious for primary education since it now looks probable that attitudes to many key aspects of life are set in most of us by the time we are 12. If we have not won children’s hearts for music by the end of the primary school, there is little chance of changing them in secondary school (Barnes, 2001, p. 99).

With acknowledgement of the unique nature and specialist knowledge requirements of music teaching it is possible for school communities, teacher educators, school advisors, researchers and policy makers to work together to create not just an adequate, but an excellent model of music education for all children. For change to occur, the specialist teaching requirements of music education will have to be understood and articulated at policy level, in a way that will support changes to practice in teacher education and in ways that will help schools to think about and plan for the provision of quality of music education. The vital component in either an adequate or an excellent model, is the excellent teacher, who understands and is committed to music, music education, and children’s learning.
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