MUSIC: NATURALLY INCLUSIVE, POTENTIALLY EXCLUSIVE?

Jennie Henley

ABSTRACT

This chapter explores the way teaching music lends itself to the inclusive pedagogical approach in action framework, focusing on four key areas: working outside of ability groups, using what learners can do as their starting point, engaging in learning at their own level whilst contributing to a collaborative outcome and developing the whole creative child rather than just a skillset.

Keywords: Musical domains; teaching; inclusive pedagogy; diversity

Key Learning Points

After reading this chapter, you should be able to:

- Consider different theoretical and philosophical understandings of musical knowledge and how they manifest in musical learning;
- Understand the way that teachers' conceptualisations of musical ability steer pedagogical decisions;

Inclusive Pedagogy Across the Curriculum
International Perspectives on Inclusive Education, Volume 7, 161–186

ISSN: 1479-3636/doi:10.1108/S1479-363620150000007015

- Describe what integrated activities are and understand how they enable learners to develop reflective learning;
- Identify areas of your music teaching that can be enhanced by the use of technology;
- Consider how different pedagogies can be interwoven in the classroom to enable children with different learning needs and experiences to engage in classroom music in a meaningful way.

MUSIC CURRICULA AND ACTIVE MUSIC MAKING

> Music is not a thing at all but an activity, something that people do. (Small, 1998, p. 2)

Music curricula can be exciting. A brief survey of international music curricula suggests that many children and young people engage in active music making through musical free play (Lee & Lin, 2013), musical movement (Sepp, Ruokonen, & Ruismäki, 2015), musical exploration (Vicente-Nicolás & Mac Ruairc, 2014) and utilising new media to create dynamic learning opportunities (Salavuo, 2008). Technology has opened up music curricula to be accessible to a wider range of learners (Byrne & Macdonald, 2002). Enterprise learning, defined as the development of 'the personal skills, behaviours and attributes that characterise entrepreneurs', and the application of these to a 'wide range of life experiences that an enterprising individual might encounter' (Garnett, 2013, p. 1), has brought a new dimension in that learners can engage in the creation and dissemination of music from a business perspective. In the best examples, music classrooms are alive with many different kinds of music, encouraging learners to cross-cultural boundaries and develop deep understandings of the relationship between music and context (Chen-Hafteck, 2007). These curriculum activities require learners to be active in their music making; exploring musical sounds and structures through different modes of learning and different modes of music making.

Philosophical understandings of music as an active and social subject have underpinned the development of music curricula beyond customary master–apprentice music instruction to an approach that aims to develop the whole child (Elliott, 1986). The view of music being both a *form* of knowledge and a *source* of knowledge has driven pedagogical change, moving away from notions of aesthetic education where music and *works of art* are treated as objects to be appreciated. Through actively making music, we can demonstrate our musicianship; we do not have to verbalise what we

can do, our music making shows what we can do. Moreover, the more we engage in music making, the more we can learn about our own musical selves and what we can do (Elliott, 1991). However, this view discounts the active aesthetic experiences that occur as a result of the relationship between artworks and people (Finney, 2002). Moreover, it could potentially narrow notions of what musicianship is – if action is solely translated as 'performing' music in a public sense. Listening can also be an active process and fundamental in interpreting, manipulating and responding to music; an equally valid aspect of musicianship as performance. The notion of a *work* of art is that the art is working with the person to generate a personal, aesthetic experience (Dewey, 2005). It is not about museum culture, but it is an active engagement in the artistic process; the art only exists in the lived aesthetic experience of the perceiver (Puolakka, 2013). Recognising music as an 'artistic-creative endeavour' is key in understanding the personal aesthetic experiences of learners, and the danger of taking away the aesthetic from musical learning and focussing purely on musical praxis (that of course can be more easily measured than aesthetic experience) is that you may impersonalise learning, taking it away from the child and placing values on music outside of the child's experiences (Finney, 2002).

Discussions and disagreements of what counts as musical knowledge are rife in musical scholarship, but dialogues between theorists have opened up different ways of thinking about musical learning; highlighting that musical knowledge is not one thing, but rather that multiple knowledges exist and interact in musical practices. Through considering these different knowledges, the teacher can challenge their own perceptions of what musical knowledge is, and draw on a combination of different perspectives to design learning to suit their learners. However, this can be made difficult by tensions between what policy documents validate as musical knowledge and what teachers believe learners should do in order to develop their musicianship (Stakelum, 2008). Teachers grapple with trying to design learning that they feel enhances musical development based on their understandings of musical knowledge, but are working within the confinements of curricula that may posit another type of knowledge such as a knowledge type that is more easily assessable (Fautley, 2010). This situation is further exacerbated by a mismatch between what learners might believe valid music making is, their own music making and what curricula dictate should happen in the classroom (Crawford, 2014). In some countries, this is being addressed by emphasising authenticity in musical learning (Karlsen, 2010), but there are problems with notions of authenticity in that it means different things in

different musical contexts and to different people. Authenticity is a contested concept. Authenticity can involve being true to a third party (the composer or even a 'style') and performing in a particular established stylistic manner. Authenticity can also involve being true to oneself and developing a unique style, different to anything that has gone before. In other countries, this is being addressed by curriculum change. However, this needs to be carefully managed and tensions arise when curricula undergo change but the shift to new ways of working is too quick for teachers (Herbst, De Wet, & Rijsdijk, 2005).

Swanwick (1989) argued that there could be a vast amount of differing practices between teachers in the classroom. These were related to a number of local issues in schools at that time, such as resources, space and an ability to draw on resources from outside of the school. But they were also related to differences in approach, attitudes towards, and expectations of, school music on the part of the teacher. This may be perceived as a problem by some; how can standards across music teaching be ensured if there is such a divergence of practice? There surely needs to be room for the teacher to respond to his or her environment, to tailor teaching to the particular needs of the learners, to draw on their own musicality and to manage a musical classroom that engages learners in the process of musical development. In devolved curricula where the teacher takes on the responsibility of curriculum design at a local level, teachers have been empowered 'to design their curricula to be more student and community centered, and more connected with students' real lives' (Thomas & Lien, 2005, p. 180). However, whether a curriculum is devolved to schools or designed at a national level, there is a challenge in providing a curriculum where all children and young people's musical abilities are catered for.

How a teacher conceptualises *ability* is central to understanding their perception of how musical development occurs, which in turn will steer the particular pedagogical choices that a teacher makes (Jaap & Patrick, 2014). In exploring the notion of musical ability and capability, the tensions between inclusivity and exclusivity that a teacher faces in the classroom become evident. Jaap and Patrick (2014) found that when teachers and tutors were asked to reflect on what they conceive musical ability to be, there was a difficulty in avoiding terminology that implied exclusivity – such as innate talent, gifted and more able. These terms lay uncomfortably with music programme leaders who viewed ability as a continuum, yet needed to describe what they are looking for in a learner for admission into specialised music programmes. Although terms like ability are difficult to

avoid, when asked to reflect on how musical ability is identified, there was a general agreement amongst music programme leaders that testing and measures are not effective, but that observation of musical behaviours is; they are not testing for ability, but are looking for signs of musicianship. These signs were numerous and included imagination, identifiable skills such as rhythm or pitch, attitudes toward music in terms of enthusiasm and commitment, and affective qualities such as empathy. This raises a challenge. If as one programme leader commented, 'we all have a gift, it's just a matter of finding where it lies' (Jaap & Patrick, 2014, p. 9), how do we conceptualise musical learning if each musical gift is individual to the child? To be musical is 'part of our human design' (Henriksson-Macaulay & Welch, 2015, p. 21) but there must be learning opportunities that align with the abilities (present state) and capability (musical potential) of the individual.

One way of understanding musical learning comes through viewing musical learning as the development of musical expertise (Hallam & Bautista, 2012). As a child becomes more embedded in their music making through scaffolded musical opportunities, their expertise will develop. Viewing musical learning in this way is helpful in that it moves away from concepts of ability and inability, towards an understanding that some children are likely to have had more opportunity to realise their musical potential than others. Also, this enables teachers to consider how children develop in different musical domains. A child who has had experience in one particular domain of musical learning will likely have developed more expertise in that domain than others. For example, a child who has received musical tuition outside of the school environment, on say the piano, will have more expertise in playing the piano than children who have not had that experience. However, that child may have had less experience in composition than another child. When a teacher views musical learning in this way, it is clear that classroom music can offer a child the opportunity to develop in different musical domains, utilising their particular expertise in new ways. Therefore, if music is an active and social subject as well as a cultural experience, and musical learning involves developing expertise through activity, the classroom teacher should provide a variety of activities that enable children and young people to engage in and develop different facets of musicality. Furthermore, the integration of these activities not only help to foster well-rounded, creative musicians (Forrester & Wong, 2008), but also provide a way for teachers to use inclusive pedagogy.

INTEGRATED ACTIVITIES

What do we mean by the integration of activities? Taking Fautley's (2005) model of group composition as an example, the compositional process is supported by a reflective cycle of exploration through improvisation, informal performance, discussion and evaluation, refinement and adjustment, informal performance, discussion and evaluation. This gives students the opportunity to draw on their individual resources whilst working together, switching between individual and group work, and to make collective decisions. It enables creativity to develop through reflection and problem solving and, as Fautley identifies, young people are likely to compose music that they themselves can play. Therefore, reflection and problem solving can occur through the learners' own actions, meaning that learning starts with what they can already do. The teacher's task is then to challenge the learner, taking them forward by building on and extending prior experience.

Strand (2009) points out that composition is rarely regarded by teachers as an end in itself. The way that composition can help to develop critical thinking skills has been explored through a number of research projects. Major and Cottle (2010) designed a project to investigate the ways that children used discussion and problem solving in their composing. The activity involved Primary school children composing a piece of music in response to a painting of the Great Fire of London. During the activity, the researchers recorded children's discussions and conversations, and analysed them using a framework derived from the taxonomy of educational objectives known as Bloom's taxonomy (Bloom & Krathwohl, 1956). Then, they created a problem by asking the children to remove an instrument and to develop their composition without that instrument. Once again they analysed the discussion and found that by introducing a problem, the children engaged in more critical discussion. This critical discussion was facilitated through a process of experimentation, performing, listening and evaluation of their own work. What was crucial in this was the way that the teachers scaffolded the learning through their questioning. In other words, the children were able to build their own understanding through responding to teacher questioning.

The scaffolding process in composition activities in Secondary schools has been documented by Fautley (2004). Through the analysis of teacher interventions, Fautley uncovered the strategies used by teachers in four different schools to support learning. The strategies ranged from the teacher giving no immediate intervention, but observing and 'storing' observations

for later discussion, to a frequent 'stop and question' approach. These strategies enabled the teachers to conduct good formative assessments of the students' work, although interestingly the teachers themselves had not purposefully set out to formatively assess. Fautley suggests that musical learning lends itself to good formative assessment, and this is the key to the successful integration of composing, performing and listening activities (Forrester & Wong, 2008).

What is important in the two research studies reported above is the development of personal ownership by the students in their own work. In both composition activities, the students were performing composers. In other words, they were given tasks that involved composing a piece of music that they would perform. Not only was the work their own composition, but it was also their own performance. They rehearsed and directed their own performances. Lewis (2012) acknowledges the need for ownership in school music activities, and questions the role of the teacher in composition. One of the challenges with composition that Lewis raises lies in continuity across lessons. Teaching learners who do not read traditional staff notation and who struggle to remember and interpret their graphic notations from one lesson to the next provides teachers with challenges in planning for progression across a sequence of lessons. However, Lewis found a solution in mobile technology. Introducing mobile technology in the form of the learners' own mobile phones and iPods had a transformative effect on their work. Learners were encouraged to record themselves, go away and listen to the recordings, reflect upon those recordings and use them to refine their work. This also gave them the opportunity to develop their unique voice and own their music. The learners in this research used a similar reflective cycle as those in Major and Cottle's (2010) and Fautley's (2004) research, but it was mediated not solely by the teacher, but by technology. This highlights two key areas in the development of music pedagogy over recent years, the use of technology in the classroom and the introduction of informal pedagogies.

TECHNOLOGY

The use of technology in aiding formative assessment is a key area for developing inclusive pedagogy. A simple digital recording device can facilitate engagement in a complex process of self-assessment and reflection, leading to both musical development and the development of independent

thinking and sense of individual agency (Henley, in press). As the learner becomes more embedded in their own reflective cycle, they are more able to steer their own learning. Appropriate use of technology can enable teachers to design learning that places the learner at the centre (Way & Webb, 2007). However, the affordances that technology holds for inclusive pedagogy go beyond individual reflection. Cain (2004) argues that the introduction of technology into music classrooms has caused a significant shift in pedagogy where teachers have moved away from whole class teaching to incorporating more group work and pair work. Moreover, technology can question sequential theories of musical development, such as that developed by Swanwick and Tillman (1986). No longer do learners need to spend time developing instrumental technique to produce musical sounds. Rather, they interact with the music in a different way. This gives the teacher the opportunity to design learning for mixed ability groups, taking the emphasis of notions of *ability* away from instrumental technique. The teacher is enabled to combine *different* abilities in groups, rather than consider learners who can play an instrument or sing particularly well as higher ability and those who cannot as lower ability.

Although technology in various guises has been utilised throughout time to support and develop performance (Himonides, 2012), it is only recently that modern technology has been used in music making in ways other than those related to performance practice (King, 2012). With the advent of 'YouTube' culture changing the way that we access, share, create and perceive music (Cayari, 2011), new understandings of the way technology is used in music making and creativity are feeding into music pedagogy (Wise, Greenwood, & Davis, 2011). Indeed, technological developments have thus called into question what we mean by the terms 'composing', 'performing' and 'audience-listening' (Cain, 2004, p. 217).

As previously discussed, the boundaries of composing, performing and audience listening have been blurred through the incorporation of integrated activities and the use of formative assessment. What the blurring of these boundaries can do is develop the learner's capacity to think as a musician and develop their own creativity. Research into creativity in song-writing has suggested that the ability to zoom in and out of your work, looking at it from both micro and macro perspectives and switching between the roles of composer, performer and listener, significantly increases your level of engagement in the creative process (Gooderson & Henley, in press). Aspin (1990) also points to this faculty of a musician. He argues that arts are both subjective and objective in nature as the creator has to take on different roles during creative acts, switching between creator and spectator.

Gooderson and Henley found that the technology used in song-writing provided the creator with a means to do this. Moreover, technology enables learners to interact with composition in a more immediate way and explore layering, arranging, reformulating, sampling and manipulating sounds, and sequencing to a far greater extent than pencil and paper might (Green, 2000). Learners are able to problem solve and think creativity utilising their musical and technological skillsets as a means to an end rather than as an end in itself.

Technology then can provide opportunities for teachers to develop learning that focuses on the whole creative child, but there are challenges in this. Three contentious issues in music education related to musical learning concern what valid musical knowledge is, authenticity of learning experiences and a recognition that learning is multidimensional and non-linear (Crawford, 2014). Paramount to designing learning that seeks to move away from thinking about music in terms of a specific skillset is acknowledging the ways that children, young people and adults engage in music. Criticisms of using technology in the music classroom have pointed to the challenges that notation software and music software and instruments containing pre-set samples pose for assessment (Cain, 2004). Once again, these criticisms call into question what valid musical knowledge is, and raise the tensions between what learners believe is valid knowledge and what is validated as knowledge by curricula. If an authentic learning perspective is adopted, in other words, if learning reflects real-life interaction with music, teachers can look beyond the development of a skillset and draw on the relationship between learner and music. However, again there are difficulties in the term authenticity; what is authentic learning? The holistic perspective of learning put forward by Crawford (2014) demonstrates how technology facilitates the interactions between notions of valid knowledge, notions of authentic learning and multidimensional learning, in turn supporting creative development through integrated activities that place composition at the centre. Furthermore, incorporating informal learning pedagogies into classroom music teaching can provide a means to bringing this holistic perspective into teaching.

INFORMAL PEDAGOGIES

Since the launch of A New Classroom Pedagogy in 2008 (Green, 2009) informal pedagogies have received much attention in both research and

practice. Informal pedagogies have been developed in response to new understandings of the way different people learn, and the routes that musicians take in order to develop their expertise. In its most basic form, formal learning has been defined as learning that takes place in the presence of a teacher, and informal learning as learning that takes place where there is no teacher present (Lebler, 2008). Folkestad (2006) clarifies that teacher presence is a defining factor of a formal teaching situation, but that teacher may be another musician; teacher presence means that someone is leading the musical activity. Informal learning situations on the other hand are where 'the activity steers the way of working/playing/composing and the process proceeds by the interaction of the participants in the activity also described as self chosen and voluntary' (p. 141). In short, formal learning situations are teacher-led, informal situations are activity-led. Other definitions of formal/informal learning focus on the physical environment. Jaffurs (2004) questions whether musicality is the same in both formal and informal settings. However, positioning formal and informal settings against each other in this way is problematic, and leads to a simplification of a complex web of interactions between learners, their environment and the learning that occurs within that environment. Folkestad (2006) argues that informal–formal learning is not a dichotomy, but rather a continuum that is predicated by not only the setting, but also styles of learning, ownership of learning and intentionality of the learning. However, this too is problematic. When applied to the inclusive pedagogical approach in action (IPAA) framework, learning might be considered towards the informal end of the continuum in terms of ownership, learning styles and intentionality, but the setting is formal. So how can learning be both formal and informal at the same time?

The basic principles of informal learning pedagogies are that learners are able to exercise choice in their learning. In music, notation is not always the starting point for musical learning, and there is an emphasis on 'holistic' learning rather than compartmentalising technique, musical elements (Green, 2002). Jaffurs (2004, p. 192) claims that, 'informal music learning exists in any community where there is music.' So surely that also includes school and classroom communities and, therefore, informal pedagogies can transcend the immediate physical environment. Research into adults who learn music within ensembles such as wind bands and orchestras found that within a structured rehearsal, there is a spectrum of different ways of learning from across what has become known as formal and informal learning perspectives. Learners are able to participate in learning, and move between different ways of learning, by the way that the learning community is set

up, the rules that allow the learning community to function, and how the labour is divided within that community (Henley, 2009). In other words, rather than pedagogy dictating one way of learning and attempting to work in a cross-context way, pedagogy and social context are integrated in a way that allows learners and teachers to interact in different ways.

Through the evolution of informal pedagogies, teachers have been encouraged to try new ways of organising learning so that the learner is placed at the centre. Therefore it might be assumed that informal pedagogies are naturally inclusive. However, revering just one pedagogical approach above others could potentially cause exclusivity, no matter how inclusive the pedagogy might seem. Cain (2013) points out that since the introduction of informal learning into classrooms, some teachers have abandoned formal pedagogies altogether in favour of a curriculum being realised entirely through informal pedagogies. Yet, formal pedagogies have affordances that informal pedagogies do not, and vice versa. The irony is that whilst one pedagogical approach (informal) aimed to bring in more ways for learners to engage in music, there is a potential to exclude all those for whom more formal pedagogies were suited. Therefore, Cain urges us to move beyond thinking in terms of formal and informal pedagogies, but develop our understanding of musical learning as dynamic and multidimensional, designing pedagogy that enables learners to interact with music in a myriad of different ways. This is where the IPAA framework is of most use to music teachers.

MUSIC AND THE IPAA FRAMEWORK

Mapping learning using the IPAA framework enables teachers to move beyond the confines of particular pedagogies and choose learning activities based on the needs of the learners; it allows for an 'inside out' approach rather than an 'outside in' approach. There are four key areas of the IPAA framework that are embedded in musical learning processes across Primary and Secondary music education. Music curricula that integrate composition and improvisation with performance and listening and evaluation afford opportunities for teachers to design and develop teaching that is learner-centred, whilst also open to enrichment and extension through the expertise of an adult. Technology enables the teacher to design learning that reduces notions of ability groupings. Informal pedagogies can empower learners through a process of building on what they can already do. All three of

these facilitate the development of the creative child. The following case studies taken from small-scale in-school research projects highlight these areas in more detail.

CASE STUDY 1 – WORKING OUTSIDE OF ABILITY GROUPS AND INDIVIDUALS CONTRIBUTING TO A COLLABORATIVE OUTCOME

Body Percussion: What Learning Processes Take Place When Children Compose in Groups?

(Gemma Williams, Primary Student Teacher, 2013/2014)

Underpinned by the idea that creativity and music making are fundamentally and necessarily social, and are explicitly collaborative endeavours (Miell, Littleton, & Rojas-Drummond, 2008), this project used Fautley's (2005) model of group composition to design a sequence of lessons that would utilise the affordances that groups offered in terms of building children's competencies through the distribution of compositional tasks:

> Group composing is useful as a stage in the development of autonomous skills, as it allows distribution of the composing task among multiple individuals, and enables scaffolding of learning to take place (Wood, Bruner, & Ross, 1979 – check ref) as individuals become increasingly competent. (Fautley, 2005, p. 54)

Taking on board Miell and MacDonald's (2000) view that musical collaboration is effective within friendship groups, groupings were made on the basis of friendship rather than ability. This enabled mixed-ability groups to be formed.

Sequence of lessons:

1. Whole class: Call and response clapping rhythms. In small groups: experiment with producing different sounds using parts of the body. Whole class: share through performance. Learning outcome: To experiment with producing different sounds using parts of the body.
2. Whole class: Call and response body percussion rhythms. Teacher starts and then children take turns to lead. In small groups:

compose a repeating rhythm using different parts of the body. Learning outcome: To compose repeating rhythmic patterns using body percussion. To practice keeping a steady pulse.

3. Whole class: Select two rhythms. Divide class in two. One child leads each large group. Perform rhythms together, record performance. In small groups: Practice composed repeating rhythm. Join with another group and layer the two rhythms and record performance. Learning outcome: To layer rhythms and perform with a steady pulse.
4. Whole class: Watch video recordings from previous lesson and evaluate. In groups: Practice layered repeating rhythm. Whole class: Join with another group so that four rhythms are layered. Perform to rest of class, record performance. Learning outcomes: To create rhythmic complexity by layering four rhythms. To perform with a steady pulse. To evaluate own work.

Children were filmed during the activities, and this was used for reflection and self-evaluation. The recordings were also used to reflect on the lessons by the teacher and to inform and modify subsequent lessons. The recordings were then analysed using Fautley's (2005) model of group composition.

Although this project was conducted in a Primary school with a class of 9- and 10-year olds, and Fautley's model is based on composing in Secondary schools (children aged 11 upward), there was evidence of the children engaging in the different stages of group composition as outlined by Fautley. As expected, the generation of ideas phase took the greatest amount of time.

The project found that children who lacked confidence in their own musical ability demonstrated significant progress within group composing. The project also found that children were able to collaborate within friendship groups, and that more experienced children were able to lead and utilise their expertise within the group environment.

Thought for the teacher: How are more experienced children challenged in mixed-ability groups?

CASE STUDY 2 – USE WHAT THEY CAN DO AS THEIR STARTING POINT AND DEVELOPING THE WHOLE CREATIVE CHILD

Storytelling in Children's Improvised Songs

(Helen Pope, Primary student teacher, 2013/2014)

Using Glover and Ward's (1998) suggestion that young children arrive at school having already experienced making music with their voices, and that voice play is '*a ready made starting point for making music with voices on which to build*' (p. 110), this project was designed to investigate narratives in young children's singing. The project challenged Davies' (1992) suggestion that young children's vocal improvisations are rudimentary, and a sequence of lessons was designed that started from the children's own vocal starting points and aimed to develop children's improvised singing through the introduction of known narratives.

According to Faulkner (2003), using the children's own ideas will make the music experience meaningful and motivating. The lessons took place in a 'free-flow' environment. A 'free-flow' classroom comprises teacher-led activities that are followed up by activities that the children can freely choose and move between. Therefore the children are able to develop their understanding at their own level through engaging in the free-flow activities at their own pace.

Sequence of lessons:

1. Whole class: Focus on nursery rhyme 'Humpty Dumpty'. Children create sounds for each line using pictures and props to support them. Free-flow: Humpty Dumpty props at a table. Children can choose to visit the table and improvise sounds using the props. Learning outcome: to explore making non-speech sounds with voices. To connect symbols (props) with sounds.
2. Whole class: Call and response sounds from the previous lesson. Focus on nursery rhyme, 'Hey Diddle Diddle'. Children create sounds for each line using pictures and props to support them. Free-flow: Hey Diddle Diddle props at a table. Children can choose to visit the table and improvise songs using the props. Learning outcome: To recall sounds and symbols from previous

lesson. To build on sounds and increase confidence in creating new sounds.

3. Whole class: Read the first part of 'The Three Little Pigs'. Children volunteer to improvise songs as the different characters – 'what might the wolf sing here?' 'what might the first pig sing here?' Free-flow: Set up a table of straw (to represent the house of straw from the story) and masks and microphones (microphones are a signal to sing). Children improvise songs as different characters. Learning outcome: For children to begin to perform their improvised songs.
4. Whole class: Children improvise songs at three points in the story. Other children vocalise background sounds to set the scene. Free-flow: Set up a table of straw (to represent the house of straw from the story) and masks and microphones. Children improvise songs as different characters. Children record and perform their songs to one another during free-flow. Learning outcome: For children to volunteer songs while other children provide a soundscape accompaniment. To develop understanding of characterisation.
5. Whole class: Read 'Hansel and Gretal' to the children. Choose children to be different characters and perform an improvised song at different points in the story. Free-flow: Set up a cage and masks on the carpet, along with microphones. Children perform and record their improvised songs to one another. Learning outcome: For children to apply knowledge, skills and understanding to a new narrative.

Children were video recorded during whole class time and free-flow time. The project found that the four- and five-year olds engaged in the learning and were able to develop their own narratives. It was felt that all children were given a voice, and that children were able to build on their own understandings of both the narratives used and of what they could already do with their voices. Moreover, the project found that the lessons also gave children a musical voice. When analysing the improvised songs, they were found to be more than rudimentary chants.

Thought for the teacher: How can children collaborate more in this type of activity?

These two case studies represent typical musical activities that can be seen in schools from early years through to lower Secondary age. The following lesson plans take these ideas further, demonstrating how learning can be planned in both Primary and Secondary phases that reflect the IPAA framework.

CREATING MUSICAL NARRATIVE – PRIMARY-AGED CHILDREN

Lesson	Creating Musical Narrative	Year Group	Year 4
Objectives	To understand how music can be created by layering repeating patterns; To develop sense of communal pulse in an ensemble; To consider how music can create narrative and the ways in which music can be interpreted through narrative.		

Activities	IPAA Framework
Individual Quick Task: Learners are asked to explore their classroom environment. What sounds can they make using the different materials in the classroom? How can they manipulate the sounds to create new sounds? What happens when they change the way they make the sound? Once learners have found a sound that they like, ask them to create a pattern with that sound that can be repeated.	Finding opportunities for learners to choose the level with which they engage in lessons. Activities that include all children.
Whole Class: invite some learners to share their sound patterns with the class. One learner shares their sound pattern. Ask children if they can give you a good adjective to describe the sound. Add the adjectives to a 'word bank'. Ask learners if anyone has a sound that could be described by adjectives that are opposite to the first sound. Continue until the class has shared a number of different sounds and there is a variety of adjectives in your word bank. No sound is right or wrong. All sounds are valid and all sounds have different properties.	Use of language which expresses the value of all children.

(*Continued*)

Activities	IPAA Framework
Whole Class: Explain to children that you are going to put all the sounds together. Explain that you will conduct and agree signals for children to start making their sound and to stop making their sound. You might decide to gradually bring in all the sounds and gradually take them away again, or you might start and stop particular sounds. Record the performance.	Focus teaching and learning on what children can do rather than what they cannot. Activities that include all children.
Whole Class: Play back the recording. Ask learners to reflect on their work. How did the sounds work together to make a piece of music? How did they work together as an ensemble? Learners might identify that they used non-verbal communication and that they listened and watched others during the music making. What might have happened if any of the sounds were missing? Would the piece of music still be the same? Learners should identify that every sound contributes to the whole piece.	Interdependence between teachers and learners to create new knowledge, which in turn links into notions of participation. Use of formative assessment. Use of language which expresses the value of all children.
In small groups: Play the recording again and ask learners to think 'if I was standing in a place and those were the sounds that I could hear, where would I be?' Ask learners to share their ideas of where they would be. Depending on the outcome of the improvised performance, they might say a factory, a toy shop, a jungle, etc. Ask them to explain to each why they thought that and what it was in the music that helped to create that image. Then ask learners to improvise a story – what is happening in that image? To help learners, you might ask them to think about who is in the image; what are they doing, how did they get there, where are they going?	Finding opportunities for learners to co-construct knowledge.
Small group task: Ask learners to use a similar method to compose a short piece of music. During this time they should record their own work, listen back to it and refine it.	Rejection of ability grouping as main or sole organisation of learning groups.

(*Continued*)

Activities	IPAA Framework
Whole Class: Each group performs their composition and it is recorded. Invite learners to give feedback on each other's work.	Use of formative assessment.
Plenary: Lead a discussion about the lesson. How was the music created? Encourage learners to think about the way the music was layered as well as the ways in which they improvised and performed. Ask learners to think of what they might do next with the music. Learners write these ideas down on pieces of paper that they can stick to the wall. Ask learners to look at each other's ideas and make a note of some ideas that they like. Use these as the basis for the following lesson.	Respect the dignity of learners as full members of the community of the classroom. Differentiation achieved through choice of activities for everyone.

Further activities	Depending on learner's ideas, following lessons might include: Listening to recordings of small group compositions. Developing small group compositions by adding more sounds, uploading the recording into software and layering different sounds over the top, adding vocalisations, etc. Putting small group compositions together to create a whole class composition. Using the recordings to inspire some animation, creating the animation and inserting the music. Developing dance/movement/drama that explores the narratives within the recordings. Learners could be encouraged to use vocabulary in the word bank in their writing.

EXPLORING CONTRAST – LESSON PLAN FOR SECONDARY-AGED CHILDREN

(by Jo Saunders, UCL Institute of Education)

Lesson	Exploring Contrast	Year Group	Year 7
Objectives	To understand how music can be created by layering and extending simple patterns; To understand and utilise the different elements of music; To develop collaborative composition skills; To develop ensemble and rehearsal skills.		

Activities	IPAA Framework
Starter Task: Individual working.	Finding opportunities for learners to choose the level with which they engage in lessons. Activities that include all children.
Each pupil is given a small section of a poem, a photocopy of their own creative writing, or a fragment of song lyrics. This should include no more than a dozen words, including a relatively broad range of language. Each pupil should identify one word from their extract that appeals to them. With this word, they should experiment with the rhythm of the word (through syllables). Possibilities also include clapping the rhythm of the word as they speak it and explore different body percussion versions of the same rhythm. Selection of pupils to demonstrate their 'word.'	Differentiation achieved through choice of activities for everyone.
Whole class: Pupils are divided into small groups according to their chosen method of performance (chanting/singing, clapping, body percussion) to form parts of a larger ensemble. Teacher initially models (as conductor) to explore the ways in which the individual response can create different layers and patterns. Pupils take on conducting role and alongside peers within the ensemble, decide how to indicate when to perform, rest, increase volume or pace.	Rejection of ability grouping as main or sole organisation of learning groups. Finding opportunities for learners to co-construct knowledge.

(*Continued*)

Activities	IPAA Framework
Whole class: Pupils are asked to walk around the classroom performing their word (as chant, sung motif, clapped pattern or body percussion as decided by the individual). As they meet another pupil, they experiment with how their word patterns fit together. What makes some patterns fit and others not? If they like the 'fit' they join that pupil and begin to form a group. If not, they move on. Pupils continue to create groups until all pupils are included.	Rejection of ability grouping as main or sole organisation of learning groups. Finding opportunities for learners to co-construct knowledge.
In small groups: Facilitated discussion; why did you choose this group of patterns/pupils? What is it about the patterns that work? What makes it interesting? How does it feel? How would you describe that? How can you talk about the musical decisions that you were making? Leaners should identify those specific features of the patterns that made stronger combinations.	Use of language which expresses the values of all children. Use of formative assessment. Interdependence between teachers and learners to create new knowledge, which in turn links into notions of participation.
Whole class: Facilitated discussion; What can you do next? How can you extend your patterns? How can you create contrast? Peer modelling of patterns and suggestions from the class as to how to extend their work.	Focus teaching and learning on what children can do rather than what they cannot. Activities that include all children.
In small groups: In their working groups, the pupils will explore contrast in their patterns through repetition, changing the duration (making some syllables longer or shorter), changing the pitch, changing the timbre of their voices, introducing body percussion, playing the same pattern on a chosen instrument (each pupil offers their word and then works alongside their peers in their small group to extend and manipulate their sound in a manner that suits them best).	Use of formative peer assessment. Differentiation achieved through choice of activities for everyone. Activities that include all children.
Whole class: Revisiting of conducting/ ensemble task. Pupils are divided into sections of the ensemble according to their chosen method of performance (chanting/ singing, clapping, body percussion) to form	Use of language which expresses the value of all children. Respect the dignity of learners as full members of the community of the classroom.

(*Continued*)

Activities	IPAA Framework
parts of a large ensemble. How can the piece be extended? What changes do we hear this time? Make recording of at least two performances (with different pupil conductors).	
Plenary: Some pupils will have developed their patterns beyond the initial stimulus whilst others will explore variants that are closely related. Why is it useful to have this variety in the patterns? What are we able to do with them? How does it strengthen the composition?	Differentiation achieved through choice of activities for everyone.
What does the composition still need? How can we strengthen the work? Pupil responses to this can be used as stimulus work for further lessons.	
Further activities	Exploring links with other musical genres that exploit repeating patterns in combination; Exploring other compositional techniques that stem from non-musical sources; Exploring means of notating the composition through graphic score; Exploring how the use of technology facilitates the manipulation of simple patterns.

IPAA FRAMEWORK AND MUSICAL LEARNING

This chapter has explored the ways that music curricula are founded on philosophical ideas relating to music as an activity rather than music as a product. The lesson plans and case studies show how active music making can provide a catalyst for inclusive pedagogy. Within active music making, the emphasis of learning is firmly on developing expertise through participation. The way that a teacher conceptualises musical ability will steer the

pedagogical decisions that they make. Research has demonstrated that every child is musical and has the capacity to engage in and respond to music. Therefore by adopting the idea that the more musical activity a child participates in, the more they are able to develop their own musical understanding, teachers can conceptualise musical learning that is accessible to all. Moreover, by providing a range of different musical activities, teachers can empower children to explore diverse ways of making music and find their own musical pathway.

Applying the IPAA framework to musical learning enables teachers to question and reflect on the naturally inclusive nature of music and develop their practice so as to ensure that traditional views of inherent musical ability do not exclude children from participating in musical learning. Moreover, by integrating musical activities, incorporating technology into musical learning and drawing on a variety of different pedagogical approaches that put the child at the centre of the learning, teachers can develop practice that responds to the multidimensional and diverse nature of musical engagement.

A final point to consider is the concept of developing expertise applies as equally to adults as it does to children. The more musical teaching a teacher participates in, the more they are able to develop their own musical teaching and in turn develop their own musicality. The reflective questions below will help teachers to engage in the development of their practice through thinking through the issues presented in this chapter and applying them to classroom practice. Ultimately, through using the IPAA framework, teachers can develop good musical teaching practice that is firmly embedded within inclusive music making and places the musical child at the heart of learning.

REFLECTIVE QUESTIONS

- What are the benefits to the teacher of considering different theories on the nature of musical knowledge? How can you draw on these to design inclusive pedagogy?
- In what ways do notions of musical ability inhibit inclusive teaching?
- Why should musical learning be based on active music making?
- What opportunities are there for your pedagogy to support a reflective composing, performing and listening cycle?

- What technologies are available to you and how do they support musical learning?
- In what ways can you draw from informal pedagogies?
- Reflecting on your own musical experiences, can you provide a musical learning example for each evidence point in the IPAA framework? In turn, can you develop these examples into classroom activities/practice?

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Dr Jo Saunders, Lecturer in Music Education at the UCL Institute of Education, kindly supplied the *Exploring Contrast* lesson plan for Secondary-aged children.

REFERENCES

Aspin, D. (1990). The problem of aesthetic education. In K. Swanwick (Ed.), *The arts and education*. National Association for Education in the Arts, London.

Bloom, B., & Krathwohl, D. (1956). *Taxonomy of educational objectives: The classification of educational goals. Handbook I: Cognitive domain*. New York, NY: Longmans.

Byrne, C., & Macdonald, R. A. R. (2002). The use of information and communication technology (IandCT) in the Scottish music curriculum: A focus group investigation of themes and issues. *Music Education Research*, *4*(2), 263–273. doi:10.1080/1461380022000011957

Cain, T. (2004). Theory, technology and the music curriculum. *British Journal of Music Education*, *21*(2), 215–221. doi:10.1017/S0265051704005650

Cain, T. (2013). "Passing it on": Beyond formal or informal pedagogies. *Music Education Research*, *15*(1), 74–91. doi:10.1080/14613808.2012.752803

Cayari, C. (2011). The YouTube effect: How YouTube has provided new ways to consume, create, and share music. *International Journal of Education and the Arts*, *12*(6), 1–28.

Chen-Hafteck, L. (2007). Contextual analyses of children's responses to an integrated Chinese music and culture experience. *Music Education Research*, *9*(3), 337–353. doi:10.1080/14613800701587688

Crawford, R. (2014). A multidimensional/non-linear teaching and learning model: Teaching and learning music in an authentic and holistic context. *Music Education Research*, *16*(1), 50–69. doi:10.1080/14613808.2013.812627

Davies, C. (1992). Listen to my song: A study of songs invented by children aged 5 to 7 years. *British Journal of Music Education*, *9*(1), 19–48. doi:10.1017/S0265051700008676

Dewey, J. (2005). *Art as experience*. New York, NY: Perigee Books.

Elliott, D. (1991). Music as knowledge. In E. R. Jorgensen (Ed.), *Philosopher, teacher, musician* (pp. 21–40). Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Elliott, D. J. (1986). Finding a place for music in the curriculum. *British Journal of Music Education*, *3*(2), 135–151. doi:10.1017/S0265051700005283
Faulkner, R. (2003). Group composing: Pupil perceptions from a social psychological study. *Music Education Research*, *5*(2), 101–124. doi:10.1080/1461380032000085504
Fautley, M. (2004). Teacher intervention strategies in the composing processes of lower secondary school students. *International Journal of Music Education*, *22*(3), 201–218.
Fautley, M. (2005). A new model of the group composing process of lower secondary school students. *Music Education Research*, *7*(1), 39–57.
Fautley, M. (2010). *Assessment in music education*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Finney, J. (2002). Music education as aesthetic education: A rethink. *British Journal of Music Education*, *19*(2), 119–134. doi:10.1017/S0265051702000219
Folkestad, G. (2006). Formal and informal learning situations or practices vs formal and informal ways of learning. *British Journal of Music Education*, *23*(2), 135–145.
Forrester, V., & Wong, M. (2008). Curriculum reform in the Hong Kong primary classroom: What gives? *Music Education Research*, *10*(2), 271–284 .doi:10.1080/14613800802079122
Garnett, J. (2013). Enterprise pedagogy in music: An exploration of multiple pedagogies. *Music Education Research*, *15*(1), 1–18. doi:10.1080/14613808.2012.703175
Glover, J., & Ward, S. (1998). *Teaching music in the primary school* (2nd ed.). AandC Black.
Gooderson, M. C., & Henley, J. (in press). Professional song-writing: Creativity, collaboration, and tensions between higher education song-writing and industry practice. In G. Dylan-Smith, M. Brennan, P. Kirkman, Z. Moir, & S. Rambarran (Eds.), *Ashgate research companion to popular music education*. Farnham: Ashgate.
Green, L. (2000). On the evaluation and assessment of music as a media art. In R. Sinker, & U. Sefton-Green (Eds.), *Evaluation Issues in Media Arts Production* (pp. 89–106). London: Routledge.
Green, L. (2002). *How popular musicians learn (Ebk) a way ahead for music education*. Farnham: Ashgate.
Green, L. (2009). *Music, informal learning and the school: A new classroom pedagogy*. Farnham: Ashgate.
Hallam, S., & Bautista, A. (2012). Processes of instrumental learning: The development of musical expertise. In G. E. McPherson & G. F. Welch (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of music education* (Vol. 1, pp. 658–676). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Henley, J. (in press). Young offenders. In A. King & E. Himonides (Eds.), *Ashgate research companion to music, technology and education*. Farnham: Ashgate.
Henley, J. (2009). The learning ensemble; musical learning through participation. Unpublished PhD thesis, Birmingham City University.
Herbst, A., De Wet, J., & Rijsdijk, S. (2005). A survey of music education in the primary schools of South Africa's Cape peninsula. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, *53*(3), 260–283.
Henriksson-Macaulay, L., & Welch, G. F. (2015). The musical key to babies' cognitive and social development. *International Journal of Birth and Parent Education*, *2*(2), 21–25.
Himonides, E. (2012). The misunderstanding of music-technology-education; a meta-perspective. In G. E. McPherson & G. F. Welch (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of music education* (Vol. 2, pp. 433–456). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jaap, A., & Patrick, F. (2014). Teachers' concepts of musical talent and nurturing musical ability: Music learning as exclusive or as opportunity for all? *Music Education Research*, *17*(3), 262–277. doi:10.1080/14613808.2014.950559

Jaffurs, S. E. (2004). The impact of informal music learning practices in the classroom, or how I learned how to teach from a garage band. *International Journal of Music Education*, *22*(3), 189–200.

Karlsen, S. (2010). Boomtown music education and the need for authenticity–informal learning put into practice in Swedish post-compulsory music education. *British Journal of Music Education*, *27*(1), 35–46.

King, A. (2012). The student prince: Music making with technology. In G. E. McPherson & G. F. Welch (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of music education* (Vol. 2, pp. 476–491). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lebler, D. (2008). Popular music pedagogy: Peer learning in practice. *Music Education Research*, *10*(2), 193–213.

Lee, P.-N., & Lin, S.-H. (2013). Music teaching for young children at a developmentally appropriate practice classroom in Taiwan. *Music Education Research*, *15*(1), 107–122. doi:10.1080/14613808.2012.759549

Lewis, R. (2012). Composing the curriculum: Teacher identity. *British Journal of Music Education*, *29*(2), 153–161. doi:10.1017/S0265051712000198

Major, A. E., & Cottle, M. (2010). Learning and teaching through talk: Music composing in the classroom with children aged six to seven years. *British Journal of Music Education*, *23*(3), 289–304.

Miell, D., Littleton, K., & Rojas-Drummond, S. (2008). Editorial introduction. *International Journal of Educational Research*, *47*(1), 1–2. doi:10.1016/j.ijer.2007.11.002

Miell, D., & MacDonald, R. (2000). Children's creative collaborations: The importance of friendship when working together on a musical composition. *Social Development*, *9*(3), 348–369.

Puolakka, K. (2013). Dewey and everyday aesthetics – A new look. *Contemporary Aesthetics*, *12*. Retrieved from http://contempaesthetics.org/newvolume/pages/article.php?articleID=699

Salavuo, M. (2008). Social media as an opportunity for pedagogical change in music education. *Journal of Music, Technology and Education*, *1*(2–3), 2–3.

Saunders, J., & Welch, G. F. (2012). *Communities of music education: A pilot study*. iMerc. London: Institute of Education.

Sepp, A., Ruokonen, I., & Ruismäki, H. (2015). Musical practices and methods in music lessons: A comparative study of Estonian and Finnish general music education. *Music Education Research*, *17*(3), 340–358. doi:10.1080/14613808.2014.902433

Small, C. (1998). *Musicking: The meanings of performing and listening*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

Stakelum, M. (2008). Creating a musical world in the classroom: Application of a Bourdieuan approach towards understanding teacher practice. *British Journal of Music Education*, *25*(1), 91–102. doi:10.1017/S0265051707007747

Strand, K. D. (2009). A narrative analysis of action research on teaching composition. *Music Education Research*, *11*(3), 349–363. doi:10.1080/14613800903144288

Swanwick, K. (1989). Music in schools: A study of context and curriculum practice. *British Journal of Music Education*, *6*(2), 155–171. doi:10.1017/S0265051700007026

Swanwick, K., & Tillman, J. (1986). The sequence of musical development: A study of children's composition. *British Journal of Music Education*, *3*(3), 305–339.

Thomas, R., & Lien, L. (2005). Alternative curriculum perspectives: Implications for teachers' curriculum development in Taiwan. *Journal of Educational Research and Development*, *1*(2), 177–203.

Vicente-Nicolás, G., & Mac Ruairc, G. (2014). Music activities in primary school: Students' preferences in the Spanish region of Murcia. *Music Education Research* *16*(3), 290–306. doi:10.1080/14613808.2014.912261

Way, J., & Webb, C. (2007). A framework for analysing ICT adoption in Australian primary schools. *Australasian Journal of Educational Technology*, *23*(4), 559–582. Retrieved from http://ascilite.org.au/ajet/submission/index.php/AJET/article/view/1252

Wise, S., Greenwood, J., & Davis, N. (2011). Teachers' use of digital technology in secondary music education: Illustrations of changing classrooms. *British Journal of Music Education*, *28*(2), 117–134.

Wood, D., Bruner, J., & Ross, G. (1979). The role of tutoring in problem solving. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, *17*, 89–100.