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Abstract

There is a wealth of literature concerning how music listening should be fostered in the context of secondary education. However, little research has been undertaken on how music educators actually approach the teaching of listening in Australian schools. The present study seeks answers to the following question: How is listening being taught in senior secondary music courses in schools across New South Wales? The senior secondary music syllabuses—the Music 1 and Music 2 courses—set the expected outcomes for students, and list the topics for study from which teachers must select. This affords teachers a degree of freedom regarding the selection of resources and source material, and there exists a measure of open-endedness in relation to the HSC Aural written examination at the end of the course, given that there are no prescribed musical works for study. Fourteen teachers were interviewed regarding their approaches, techniques and the resources they used in their classroom, and how they understood and evaluated their students' listening skills. Responses were transcribed, coded and analysed. The interviews revealed that music educators utilised a range of strategies and techniques when teaching analytical listening in the senior secondary music courses. Data also indicated differences among the participants concerning the extent to which the HSC Aural written examination shaped the ways teachers devised and structured their listening-specific lessons. Based on the interview data, a ‘Systematic-Intuitive Continuum’ was devised as a means of representing each teacher’s position in relation to the two key influences on the teaching of music listening—the HSC Aural written
examination, and understandings of how best to develop student musicianship. Despite the diversity of teaching techniques and approaches, all teachers indicated that listening was a fundamental part of their music teaching and a key element in providing students with a worthwhile music education.
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Glossary

Commonly used terms and abbreviations

**ATAR:** Australian Tertiary Admissions Rank. This is calculated upon the completion of all HSC Course units. It is based on an aggregate of scaled marks in 10 units of ATAR courses, comprising the student’s best two units of English and the best eight units from the remaining units.

**BOSTES:** The Board of Studies, Teaching and Education Standards NSW. The BOSTES is the NSW state government department responsible for “school curriculum, assessment, and teaching and regulatory standards in NSW schools.” (Board of Studies, 2015a)

**HSC:** Higher School Certificate. This is the certification a student receives upon satisfactory completion of secondary schooling (Year 11 and Year 12) in NSW. “To gain an HSC, students must have completed a minimum of 12 units of Preliminary courses and 10 units of HSC courses. All courses in the HSC have a unit value. Most courses are 2 units” (Board of Studies, 2015c). Course completion is determined by a combination of 50% school-based assessments and 50% externally marked examinations.

**NSW:** New South Wales, an Australian state located on the eastern seaboard.

**NSW Curriculum Stages:** The various steps or levels within the NSW primary and secondary school curriculums. Kindergarten is the only year group in Early Stage 1; all other Stages encompass two year groups. For example, Stage 1 comprises Year 1 and 2 and so on up to through to Stage 6, which comprises Year 11 and 12.
**Preliminary and HSC years:** The Stage 6 subjects in NSW are divided into what is known as the Preliminary Course (Year 11) and the HSC Course (Year 12). Generally speaking, the Preliminary Courses are designed to underpin the HSC Courses, and can serve as either an introduction to the overall workload and subject material, or provide a knowledge foundation which is covered in more depth during the HSC Course.

**The concepts:** The six concepts of music, as outlined in the K-12 music curriculum. As set out in the various syllabuses, these are: pitch, duration, texture, tone colour, structure, and dynamics and expressive techniques.
CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Listening to music is an activity adolescents engage in, both recreationally and in educational contexts (Boal-Palheiros & Hargreaves, 2001). As a practice it is distinct from simply overhearing music in that it involves conscious engagement with music, by analysis, or elemental ‘recognition’, in order to deepen one’s personal understanding of the structural features of music. In music education contexts, listening, which can also be referred to as aural analysis or music appreciation, is a fundamental component of how music is taught and learned, for “music educators have guidelines about how to listen effectively, to get the most out of the music, and to focus attention for maximum musical impact” (Flowers, 2002, p. 1). The ability to listen to and understand structural features of music can be developed in isolation or in conjunction with other fundamental musical experiences, such as performing and composing. Its importance in the New South Wales (NSW) music curriculum means that the teaching approaches and techniques surrounding listening are key elements of music pedagogy.

Each year across New South Wales, almost 6000 students will undertake and complete a two year senior secondary Music course, and around 500 of those students will also undertake the Music Extension course in their HSC year (Board of Studies, 2015b). The number of students choosing to study Music for their Higher School Certificate (HSC) has increased from
just over 4000 students in 2001, to the 5767 students who completed Music 1 and Music 2 in 2014 (Board of Studies, 2015d). Given that students who choose Music have the potential to achieve an ATAR of up to 99.95 (NSW Vice-Chancellors’ Committee - Technical Committee on Scaling, 2015, p. 29), the effective teaching of senior secondary Music courses is of critical importance.

In the NSW Stage 6 Music syllabuses (Board of Studies, 2009f, 2009g) listening is subsumed under the category, ‘Aural’, and is considered a key “learning experience”—one of four, the others comprising performance, composition and musicology. As the Music 1 and Music 2 (and Music Extension) course syllabuses state: “Aural is an integral part of all activities associated with performance, composition and musicology” (Board of Studies, 2009f and 2009g, p. 21 and p. 22 respectively). This means that analytical listening is conceived of both as a stand-alone activity and as a skill that informs the other learning experiences. The Music 2 Course syllabus also states, “Using aural awareness as the basis, students should have experiences in singing, playing, composing, improvising, listening, recognising, memorising, reading, notating and moving in relation to all the concepts” (2009g, p. 15, emphasis added). This indicates an understanding that listening is foundational to all other musical experiences and that it should form part of every senior secondary music lesson.
With this syllabus providing a framework for program and lesson design, as well as the importance placed on the aural analysis of music in the HSC Music examinations, teachers ideally would not only need to regularly incorporate listening activities in their lessons, but ensure these activities are aimed at nurturing and developing their students’ listening skills as they progress through their senior secondary years. It should be noted that the purpose of this study is not to advocate teaching towards the HSC examination. However, throughout senior secondary music study, the HSC outcomes and exam requirements constitute a major part of the way in which students and teachers experience the Music 1 and Music 2 courses, therefore, the syllabus and the final exam must be acknowledged as key influences on the ways teachers approach senior secondary Music in NSW.

**Research questions**

While the syllabus defines the outcomes and expectations, it does not, of course, prescribe the means by which teachers are to achieve these. Interviews with educators in the field provide insight into how these outcomes are addressed, and what these practitioners consider to be the most effective approaches to use with their students. Hence this study seeks answers to three questions:

1. **What approaches and techniques do music educators in NSW use to teach listening to senior secondary students?**
2. **What resources and repertoire do music educators use to teach listening?**
3. What factors influence the way in which teachers approach the teaching of listening?

For this study, 14 senior secondary music teachers across New South Wales were interviewed about their approaches to teaching listening. They were asked to describe the resources they used, outline typical listening lesson structures and to reflect on the efficacy of their methods by discussing what they consider to be their most successful lessons. They were also asked how they evaluated the listening skills of the students they taught.

The interviews were transcribed; then coded, and the data were compared and contrasted. Given the study's selective sample, the responses cannot provide a comprehensive sense of how music teachers approach the teaching of listening to senior secondary students. However, the recurring themes that emerge in relation to the use of resources, macro lesson structure and skill evaluation in the teaching of listening, for example, provide a useful base for a larger, future study. Ideally, the present study will generate some understanding of the teaching approaches and techniques educators are currently using, their ideas regarding how to best teach listening, and their sources of inspiration. Results from this study may also provide a basis for ideas concerning how to improve practice in relation to the teaching of listening and aural analysis.
Definitions

Throughout this thesis, the term ‘listening’ is used in different ways, according to context. Alternative or substitute terms are employed and defined in the Literature Review as a means of demonstrating the range of ways in which analytical listening is understood. However, two terms that occur most frequently throughout the relevant literature are ‘Aural’ and ‘Listening’. For the purposes of this study, these are defined as follows:

**Aural:** This is a term specific to the NSW Stage 6 syllabus. All prior syllabuses, from Early Stage 1 through to Stage 5 (Kindergarten through to Year 10) use the term ‘Listening’. According to the syllabus, “Aural refers to the ability to discriminate between sounds and to make judgements about their use in a wide range of musical styles, periods and genres” (Board of Studies, 2009f, p. 21). Aural is one of the four core Learning Experiences in Stage 6, along with Performance, Composition and Musicology. The participants of this study used ‘Aural’ and ‘Listening’ interchangeably; Aural is the syllabus term for all technical ‘listening’ related activities and assessments. For example, the final HSC listening exam is called the Aural Skills written exam (the Aural component is a core part of the overall assessment).

**Listening:** For the purposes of this study, the term ‘listening’ connotes *active* engagement with music, by way of analysis, or the recognition of music elements in order to deepen one’s personal understanding of music.
‘Listening’ was used as an umbrella term by the interviewer, in preference to the syllabus term ‘Aural’, in the hope that teachers would reflect on listening more broadly in their teaching, particularly to draw out whether (and if so, in what ways) they integrated listening with other activities. Further, the researcher used the term ‘listening’ during the interviews in order to encourage teachers to bring to the fore their own interpretation of the term, and not simply rely on the syllabus definition.
CHAPTER TWO

Literature Review

Introduction

This literature review centres on the idea of concentrated music listening, which in turn is predicated upon the ‘musical work’ concept. In particular, it focuses on the implications of listening for classroom music education, where, as has already been noted, listening, often coupled with analysis, is defined as a fundamental music learning experience, together with performance and composition.

This review provides a general view of the ways music listening is understood in the areas of music philosophy, psychology and musicology, as well as how music listening has been and can be approached in the music education classroom. The review considers the perspectives of the well-known composers Copland, Hindemith and Kodály, as well as listening theories developed by music philosophers and psychologists, including Reimer, Elliott, Hallam and Subotnik. It also examines a range of listening schemes that have been developed by music educators, and discusses results of research into the teaching of listening.

The literature review is followed by a critical analysis of the current New South Wales Stage 6 Music 1 and Music 2 syllabuses. The syllabuses form the foundation for senior secondary music teaching in NSW and hence are influential among teachers. As such, it is important that these documents
are understood within the context of the scholarly literature. The analysis of syllabuses also provides important contextual information relevant to understanding the study’s interview data. The Syllabus Analysis and Critique section contains a summary and description of the key syllabus elements, including the music Concepts, the Learning Experiences and the Topics for study. It also compares and contrasts components of the two syllabuses, including the language used, the hypothetical cohorts for each course, and the objectives and outcomes of each in relation to listening.

Broadly speaking, the literature indicates that music listening can be defined as an active and conscious engagement with musically organised sound. The literature review reveals that although a range of viable theories exists, and schemes for how music listening can be put into meaningful practice, there are few studies that address how music listening is actually being taught, particularly in Australian classrooms.

This should be of particular concern for teachers and students of senior secondary Music. The number of students who qualify for the New South Wales Higher School Certificate (NSW HSC) is increasing yearly. In 2014, 68,004 students completed the HSC and 5767 students (just under 10 percent, and the second highest Creative Arts candidature cohort after Visual Art) completed some form of senior secondary Music course (Board of Studies, 2015b). In 2013, students who completed any HSC Music units as a part of their overall course load were eligible to achieve an Australian Tertiary Admission Rank (ATAR) of up to and over 99.50, which could
provide them with access to almost any tertiary level course across Australia. Such statistics raise the question of why there is not more interest and scholarly research into how and what is being taught in the classroom?

This literature review then, forms the basis of the study into the teaching practices, approaches and techniques pertaining particularly to music listening. In the NSW Stage 6 Music 1 and Music 2 syllabuses (Board of Studies, 2009f & 2009g), music listening (termed ‘Aural’) is one of the four key Learning Experiences. The Aural written exam is a mandatory element of both Music courses, accounting for at least 30 per cent of a student’s final HSC mark. According to both syllabuses, it is also “an integral part of all activities associated with Performance, Composition and Musicology” (Board of Studies, 2009f p. 21; Board of Studies, 2009g, p. 22). This means that analytical music listening is an important part of Stage 6 Music teaching and learning and music educators should, ideally, be able to articulate how they design and implement music listening lessons for current senior secondary students.
The Development of ‘The Listener’

How did analytical listening become a cornerstone activity of music education? When did ‘the listener’ become an identifiable figure?

According to Scruton in *Understanding Music* (2009), listening is an activity which is at the heart of all musical cultures, but the act of listening “in motionless silence” is only a recent development, one related to the emergence of Western art music. Scruton explains that at a certain point in European social history, “organised listening” evolved, private and public art music concerts were established, and “the audience fell silent” (2009, p. 8). The focus of the audience began to centre on the musical work, and how a composer manipulates sounds in order to communicate directly with the audience. In this way, European art music culture created the listener, together with a unique and particular means of showing appreciation for and understanding music.

The advent of recorded sound meant that music became something that was accessible, and collectible, enabling the development of not only the ‘listener’ but a new kind of consumer. In *Beyond the Score* (2014), Cook details how the invention of the gramophone meant that music became a means of bringing public, social entertainment practices into the home. Music became not only something that you performed, or the subject of an outing, but something you could consume: “It made music something you could collect, and through collecting it, define who you were, even regulate your life” (Cook, 2014, p. 340). The gramophone became a means by which people could begin to use music for their own purposes and afforded “the
best opportunity to obtain a broad and comprehensive experience of the
great art treasure that lies beyond the possibilities of any individual
performer” (Stokowski, 1947, p. 13).

The portability of the gramophone meant that music became something
you could listen to, repeatedly, wherever and whenever you wanted to,
ideally in social contexts. As a consequence, the activity of music listening
left behind the elements of the live experience—audience, venue, physical
performance and visual stimuli—and instead directed attention towards
the sound of the music alone. The combination of the increasing
accessibility of music, as well as its use as a means of identity building led
to its importance in educational contexts. It gave rise to the Music
Appreciation movement in the United States and Great Britain, the main
aim of which was to educate and ‘improve’ students and the public
through guided listening to the major classical composers, which would
then, in turn, “fend off mass culture, and with it, popular music and jazz”
(Green, 2008, p. 79).

Listening to music became a more accessible and practical element of
music education with the addition of gramophones in the classroom in the
early twentieth century (Plummeridge, n.d.). The possibility of focused
listening activities led to teacher-created materials and resources for the
gramophone (Clark, 1920), and perpetuated the close structural analysis
of musical works. Over the years, music listening technology has evolved
considerably, and music education has endeavoured to embrace such
developments. The use of the gramophone and the wireless radio evolved into the tape deck, eventually leading to the CD player and, currently, to the mp3 player, the computer and the Internet for streaming.

The availability of and access to musical resources has exploded since the advent of the Internet, with a broad—and in terms of quality, variable—range of teacher-produced material made freely available, the educational ramifications of which have not yet been evaluated (Finnäs, 2001). This has even led to the development of “clip culture”; the music being heard can be placed in a visual context (as distinct from a live performance) and thus possibly generate deeper awareness of the music and the role the body plays in listening (Webb, 2010). The widespread usage of headphones, originally designed for military use (Howeth, 1963), also means that listening as a collective social activity is now in decline since music can be listened to anywhere, in more or less total isolation.

Informally, the music you listen to can come to define who you are, especially the music that you choose for your ears only. Headphone music listening can be a means of isolating, or differentiating, yourself from the rest of world; in the words of Blunty3000, “I’ve got headphones on, don’t bother me, don’t talk to me… consider them a cloak of invisibility” (Nyre, 2008, p. 38). Formally however, particularly in the music classroom, music listening retains its social qualities, in that it is undertaken in the presence of an audience, however the purpose is not necessarily for enjoyment but rather analysis and knowledge acquisition. The teaching of listening in
silence, or in “mute surrender” (Schafer, 1969) has now been in place for a century. So stands the modern listener.
Music Listening Theories: Philosophy and Psychology

With the theories of listening discussed below, the writers focus on particular factors that contribute to effective and meaningful listening. Overall, these factors are: knowledge of the technical aspects of the music; the individual affective response - how the music makes people feel, or the meaning people derive from it; and the psychological response—how the brain perceives, orders and translates sound. A key underlying tenet seems to be that musical knowledge—technical, contextual, social, historical—directly affects the listener's affective and psychological response, hence the more sophisticated knowledge, the better the listener. As listening theories have developed throughout the twentieth century, it appears that the affective response and personal connection to the music being listened to became a more important element of listening theory. It is as if listening has come to be acknowledged as a three dimensional experience, with knowledge, personal experience and the amount of experience (time) contributing to the depth of understanding as a whole.

Composers on Listening

The following section focuses on the perceptions of three established composers of the purpose of the listener, as well as what they believe to be the important features of music.
One of the earliest and well known works on listening is *What to Listen for in Music* (Copland, 1939). Copland’s book concentrated on listening from the composer’s point of view and was aimed at the amateur music listener who wanted to know how to listen to art music more deeply. For Copland, there were three overall purposes, or planes, for listening: for enjoyment (the sensuous plane), for expressive analysis (the expressive plane) and for technical analysis (the sheerly musical plane) (Copland, 1939, p. 7).

**Sensuous plane:** This is the absolute basic mode of listening, “listening without thinking” (p. 7). Copland gives the example of turning on the radio and “bathing” in the sound, just letting music fill the space. For most non-musicians, this would be their default mode of listening to music.

**Expressive plane:** Listening to music and acknowledging the expressive qualities we attribute to it, or the meaning we derive from it. This expressive meaning can fluctuate; it can be different from person to person, and even different (however slightly) each time a person listens to a particular piece of music.

**Sheerly musical plane:** Being able to listen to music and focus on the notes themselves and their manipulation. For the lay listener, this would be of the least concern and of which they would have the least knowledge (Copland, 1939, pp. 7-15).

Copland goes on to describe what he considers to be the four essential elements of music—rhythm, melody, harmony and tone colour—and how these are manipulated by the composer in order to create particular
sounds. His overall purpose was to encourage the reader to think more deeply about what they hear, and to learn more about the music that they listen to, because “knowledge enhances enjoyment” (Copland, 1939, p. xxiii). Deep, meaningful listening is not simply about identifying the particular elements of a piece of music; it is also involves understanding their musical relationships, their purpose, as well as how composers, performers and listeners all contribute to the musical experience.

In *Music and Imagination* (1952), Copland focuses less on musical elements and more on what defines an ideal listener, which he summarises as being a combination of “the preparation of the trained professional with the innocence of the intuitive amateur” (p. 19). Copland outlines two key requirements for talented listening: “First, the ability to open oneself up to musical experience; and secondly, the ability to evaluate critically that experience. Neither of these is possible without a certain native gift” (p. 18). Talented listeners are not necessarily able to enjoy music more but are capable of understanding what they can hear. They can perceive emotional nuances and, in the context of extended musical works, balance and combine the key elements of the music in order to assemble the structural framework of a piece, forming a conception of it in the mind’s ear. And it is in this mind’s ear that “these exercise-like patterns of sound take on meaning [and] they become music” (p.22).
In Copland’s understanding of music listening, it is what is contained within the music itself that is of most importance for the educated listener. In contrast, for Sessions (1950), the key element to understanding listening was in examining how the ears hear and how the brain processes sound. According to Sessions, when listening to a piece of music, the “musical ear” discriminates specific elements, such as the melody, or an underlying rhythm (pp. 31-32). The brain then relates these elements to particular, personal impressions—it makes connections to the person’s prior musical knowledge by associating and co-ordinating musical impressions (p. 32). The brain then orders these connections hierarchically. This theory of listening implies that a listener’s initial response to music is technical (identifying elements) however they go on to make emotional and (or) cognitive connections in order to produce a response. The highest level of understanding would produce a “critical” response from a listener who has learnt to perceive, appreciate and articulate differences within musical works (Sessions, 1950, p. 100).

Hindemith was not as explicit as Copland in his description of listener types, but he made reference to three main types of listening behaviour in his book *A Composer’s World* (1953). Depending on the listener’s musical knowledge and musical experience, she may be able to perceive the music (but not understand or connect with it), or she may be able to connect with certain musical elements that correspond with prior experience, or even go so far as to identify and understand the musical choices the composer has made. Experience, knowledge and individual listening
technique are all important facets of creating a skilled listener, with the level of skill determined by the listener themselves.

Hindemith writes that the listener, that is, the musical consumer, is the person who determines whether or not the sound they are hearing is music. "Music, whatever sound and structure it may assume, remains meaningless noise unless it touches a receiving mind" (p. 14). Any amateur listener is capable of developing their music listening skills, and anyone who wants to listen will create their own listening technique, based on their musical experiences. However, this in turn will mean that simple listeners will seek out simple music, which corresponds with their basic understanding and comprehension of musical structures. It also means that if the music being heard in no way corresponds with the listener's previous experience and they can make no connections with any element, then it ceases to be music and “disappears in chaos” (Hindemith, 1953, p. 21). Hindemith believes that a wide experience in music listening is the most important factor for any listener of any musical skill level.

**Philosophies of Listening**

The following selection of theories represents key research and ideas regarding music listening, the listener and the musical experience. As stated in Chapter 1, there are certain elements that appear to be fundamental across all theories: knowledge, experience and the individual response. What varies among the theories is the focus of the theorist,
whether on the listener, or on the music, which then determines the way in which each theorist perceives what is important about listening and how it should be effectively put into practice.

For Dunn (2006) and Hallam (2006), the many influences in the life of the individual are what make each music listening experience unique. Dunn includes factors such as the social and (or) cultural context of the music, the previous experience of the listener and knowledge about the music itself—its genre, style, performing media, underlying emotional impetus. But Dunn also believes it is important to consider factors that are separate from the music, such as the time of day, the sequence of events that occur before and after the listening experience, the motivation of the individual to listen to music (internal or external), and even the level of attention paid by the listener at the time. All of these factors, Dunn explains, contribute to the depth of understanding and the quality of the personal connection made with the music (Dunn, 2006, p. 35).

Dunn isolates five key responses that can then occur (2006, p. 35). The extramusical or emotional response occurs when the individual makes a personal, non-musical connection with the music being listened to (for example, this was the final song at my high school graduation). The imaginative and cognitive responses occur when acknowledging particular elements of the music, either conjuring images that the music may suggest, or being able to connect with particular technical elements, such as the melody or harmonic accompaniment. The affective response is the
individual’s emotional response to the music at that time—as distinct from making an emotional connection with a previous experience, as in the extramusical response—and the physical response is the individual’s kinaesthetic reaction to the music. An individual could have one or all of these responses over the course of a listening period, as well as a simultaneous combination of responses.

Personal experiences and individual musical preferences are also key factors for the way Hallam (2006) describes how listeners process musical information. Where other theorists may perceive ‘hearing’ as almost the opposite of listening, where hearing is passive and listening is active, Hallam sees hearing as the beginning of the developmental process of becoming a music listener. Hearing, particularly repetitive and/or unconscious hearing, such as hearing pop music in a clothing store, or an inverted triad played to signal the end of intermission, can be a means of enculturation (p. 57). Prior musical experience and initial exposure to particular tonal schemes can affect our ability to process musical information while listening.

Hallam’s description of responses to music is similar to that of Dunn’s: they can include physiological, motor, intellectual, aesthetic and emotional responses. However, Hallam also sees personal preference as being an important factor in determining the way in which a person responds to music. Gender, maturity, socio-economic and cultural status, personality and prior musical training can all shape a person’s musical preferences,
which can then determine the kind of music listening choices they can make.

Music appreciation and the importance of music ‘praxis’, or practical embodiment and engagement with music, is the primary focus of Regelski’s theory (2006). Regelski is critical of the idea of music appreciation, that music is something to be considered and understood; instead, he believes music needs to be viewed praxially, as something that should be actively used to bridge the gap between school music and music in real life. Understanding music should mean being able to participate, successfully, in the act of musicking. “Appreciation, then, is not something you ‘know’ (although knowledge and skill are involved); it is something you do” (p. 298). Regelski believes that a more active, practical approach to music appreciation leads to tangible and immediate learning, and motivates students to cultivate every day music making, and appreciating habits.

Serafine considers the “principal transaction” in musical interaction is between the person (composer, performer, listener) and a piece of music, that is, it is not shared amongst musical parties (1987, p. 6). Up to the publication of her book *Music as Cognition* (1987), Serafine believed that formal investigations of music had focused on the technical parts of the whole (chords, scales, notes) and ignored the generic cognitive processes that construct music. It is the cognitive processes that should be of greater importance, because if the listener cannot perceive the patterns and
relationships in, and organisation of the music, then they do not exist.

Listening, she believes, is a phase (with performing and composing) in the human cognitive construction of music, which means that music as an artwork is not fixed, but rather is fluid and abstract, and exists in many forms depending on how it has been experienced.

Serafine proposes that there are both temporal and nontemporal processes in music listening. They are relevant to both composers and listeners and, though generic in design, apply particularly to art music, jazz and folk music.

**Temporal Processes.** These processes refer to the listener's ability to understand music broadly, to identify and connect with overall musical structures.

- **Succession:** The mental process of grouping small events or units of sound, which, over time, form new, longer units.
- **Simultaneity:** Combining and synthesising musical events, “construing the texture or areas of activity that occur in the piece” (1987, p. 78). This means the listener is making immediate connections with what is being heard, and then cognitively constructing and identifying texture (pp. 74-79).

**Nontemporal Processes.** These processes are more indicative of the listener's ability to identify and distinguish certain elements of the music they are hearing.
Closure: Identifying certain musical features that indicate 'finish', for example a decrescendo, or a V-I cadence.

Abstraction: Identifying how composers utilise patterns in order to unify larger works, for example, using a melodic fragment as the basis for another theme.

Transformation: Identifying the augmentation of the aforementioned initial melody.

Hierarchic structuring: The way in which a listener primes herself to seek out important elements of the music; the organisation of music in the mind (Serafine, 1987, pp. 79 – 88).

Categorising these processes is applicable in understanding the musical development of children, with a specific focus on the factors that can influence this development. Serafine believes it is important to determine whether music is a matter of perception or cognition, that is, whether we understand music innately or whether it is a product of our experience. This could be determined by assessing the musical knowledge of children, compared with adults, a difficulty being whether the results (pertaining to children particularly) are hampered by a limited vocabulary, lack of focus and so forth, or whether they are a true reflection of internal cognition. This can then be used to reveal exactly how it is we listen to, connect with and understand music.
A review of approaches to listening by Reimer and Wright examines the importance of musical experience and how education and classroom listening can help expose listeners to various kinds of music (Reimer & Wright, 1992). These authors state, “If a listener has no experience in a given musical style, a meaningful musical experience of any work in that style is unlikely” (Reimer and Wright, 1992, p. 239). Their overall argument is that listening is not, and should not be, passive, that is, the listener should be engaging with the music on some level.

Complementarily, good music should demand the attention and involvement of the listener. Ideal music listening practice means being objective and subjective at the same time. This involves listening to music and perceiving its technical elements, while generating an affective, personal response.

Elliott’s three degrees of “audition” – hearing, listening to, and listening for - share similarities with Copland’s listening planes (Elliott, 1995, pp. 80, 126 - 128), particularly the first degree. However, Elliott says that as the activity moves from just hearing to actively listening for something, there is an increasing level of both knowledge and personal involvement with the music. It is like a three dimensional process that involves listening to and identifying musical units and then drawing on these identifications over time as the music unfolds. It involves a process of deciding whether a pattern is consistent or inconsistent, identifying timbres, listening for thematic development and so forth.
Elliott also comments on other aspects of music and how they relate, or contribute to, the listening process. He argues that the creation of music is, in part, related to the way it is listened to. The listening experience is dependent on both the physically made sounds and human consciousness. Cognition plays an important role; artistic and cultural knowledge is key in determining the exact musical qualities of what the listener is hearing. This point is interesting in that while previously mentioned theorists have emphasised the importance of technical knowledge about music in general, Elliott contends that more specific, contextual musical knowledge is essential to deep listening. Cultural musical knowledge is particularly important in relation to pitch. Different cultures determine the concept of what is tonal in different ways, which would mean they would yield a different tonal character (key or mode) that would serve as a reference point. The listener's cognitive development is also related to the innate complexity of the music being listened to. “If one’s musicianship continues to improve, this development of personal competency propels the self to higher levels of complexity” (Elliott, 1995, p. 123).

The importance Elliott places on cultural and contextual knowledge contrasts markedly with the views advanced by Subotnik in *Deconstructive Variations: Music and Reason in Western Society* (1995). Subotnik’s theory is a variant on theories developed by Schoenberg, Adorno and Stravinsky about “structural listening” (p. 150). Structural listening is based on the assumption that each musical work is autonomous, valuable and meaningful. It requires discipline and intellectual rigour, but does not
require culturally specific knowledge. Indeed no knowledge of the music being played is required, which keeps the listening ‘pure’. The piece being listened to should exist for and of itself.

Being unaware of what it should sound like, based on knowing the composer, or era, or intended style, makes for a more legitimate listening experience. That is, the music should be heard for what it is rather than what a previously informed listener believes it should be. “The listener follows and comprehends the unfolding realisation, with all of its detailed inner relationships of a generating musical conception” (Subotnik, 1995, p. 150). Whether this practice is possible or not would presumably come down to the aspect of discipline, in being able to disconnect oneself from prior listening experiences so as to experience music, constantly, for the first time.

For Reimer, in *A Philosophy of Music Education: Advancing the Vision* (2003), listening is a creative act that is not the specific domain of musicians; rather it is brought to life by the experience and knowledge of an individual. The idea that people who are not musically trained have the ability to creatively interpret the music they hear is an inclusive approach to listening. According to Reimer, creativity in listening is derived from the “meaning making” process - that is, how a listener makes sense of music she hears (pp. 116 – 118). By creative, Reimer means imaginative, original or inventive, in relation to the individual’s perception of the music and how they ascribe meaning to it. All music listening demands creativity but
the individual may halt the process due to a lack of understanding, or a lack of motivation. An educator’s role therefore is to provide music and create an environment that is intellectually and creatively stimulating – one that will encourage engagement, but not over extend the listener.

Conclusion

With the listening theories discussed, it can be seen that the main component that directly affects the efficacy and depth of listening is knowledge. For some theorists, this specifically means technical musical knowledge – of the structure and elements of music, as well as a firm grasp of the related terminology. For others (excluding Subotnik), essential knowledge is broadened to cultural and artistic contexts, where it is important not simply to know what the music is, but how and where it has been created. As music listening theories have developed, consideration of the scope of knowledge and experience of the individual has also become a key element of effective listening processes. The more experience a listener has with a broad range of musical contexts, the deeper their connection with the music will be, technically and emotionally.

It could be said that some of these theories, particularly those of the composers discussed, are based on the structures and processes inherent in Western art music, and might therefore be difficult to apply to music that does not adhere to the ‘composed musical work’ format, or music that may be difficult to describe in formal musical terms. Other theories, such
as those of Reimer and Wright, Hallam, and Regelski could be more widely applied to music listening due to their focus on the broadening of the listening experience. The genre of music that is studied is not necessarily important; what is more important is the experience, the praxis, the exposure to a wide variety of sounds in order to make a personal, contextual connection with the music in question. How this knowledge and experience can be structured, taught, and learned, is discussed in the following sections.
Developments in Musicology

Musicology is “the scholarly study of music” (Duckles & Pasler, n.d.). Broadly speaking, it is the investigative aspect of music, where music researchers study and scrutinise music as a physical, psychological, aesthetic and cultural phenomenon. As a discipline, modern musicology emerged in Europe during the Enlightenment. It was primarily a product of Western European societal and cultural perspectives, and shares many core elements with the investigative practices of the social sciences, philology and philosophy. With regard to the NSW Stage 6 Music syllabuses, ‘Musicology’ is the music learning experience most closely associated with ‘Aural’, in that the way in which musicology is most commonly taught and learned in NSW is via listening to, discussing and analysing music (see, for example, Board of Studies, 2009g, pp. 21-22 and compare the terminology used to describe both Musicology and Listening). It is therefore worth briefly outlining what, according to the relevant literature, musicology comprises, and to examine how musicology has changed as a practice, particularly in recent decades.

Until the 19th century, the practice of musicology was confined to the analysis, definition and understanding of the physical and scientific properties of musical sound, including acoustics, the physics of sound and the psychology of hearing. Towards the end of the 19th century, a pioneering paper by Adler entitled “Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft” (“The Scope, Method, and Aim of Musicology,” 1885)
in his newly founded journal *Vierteljahresschrift für Musikwissenschaft* (*Musicology Quarterly*) was the first of its kind to attempt to clearly define the practice of musicology according to two distinct study forms: the historical form, which is the study of what occurs around the music and how we describe it; and systematic form, which is the study of the music sound as well as the philosophical considerations it raises. Adler’s article was notable in that it advocated that musicology be grounded in empirical study, as well as acknowledging the importance of “the sociological aspect of the discipline” (Carner & Eder, n.d.; Mugglestone & Adler, 1981). This definition of musicology formed the foundation for the study of Western art music which developed over the following century.

The discipline of musicology began to experience a shift in focus around the 1980s, when musical scholars began to question the limitations of the ways music had been studied up until that point. Music began to be viewed more as a process instead of only as a product, and this led to a broadening of scholarly perspectives on music, leading to the emergence of what was termed ‘New’ musicology. This ‘New’ practice meant the study of music became open to broader historical, cultural, social, global and gender based perspectives and analysis of the ways these factors shape musical meaning. Music previously excluded by scholars—that is, almost anything that was not Western or European art music—began to be formally considered, as well as the ways in which music could be used in the construction of social identities, spaces and communities. The study of
music moved away from relying on musical scores as the foundation of musical validity, and towards the ways musical performance and the role of the listener shape musical meaning and experience.

Such changes within the discipline of musicology have meant that it has become more aligned with its sister discipline, ethnomusicology. Traditionally, ethnomusicology was the study of music other than Western art music, using anthropological and ethnographical research methods, however a more contemporary definition encompasses the music of all peoples and subcultures, and acknowledges musicality as being fundamental to what it means to be human (Rice, 2014). Ethnomusicologists undertake field work to study the intellectual, physical, cultural and social elements of “music making by groups of people” (Rice, 2014, p. 4) and are concerned with “the act of interpretation and with the values inherent in it” (Cook, 2008, p. 49).

The scholarly analysis of popular music, and the ways in which it differs from Western art music, has also been a part of the development of musicology since the 1980s. Popular music analysis and research encompasses not only the historical, social and cultural value and use of popular music in contemporary society, but also its innate elemental and theoretical structure, that is, the rules that govern its musical creation and performance. According to Moore (2001), the key to the analysis of rock, and pop, music, is that one must refer to what he terms “the primary
text”—the recorded performance of a song, which is its equivalent to a score. The key distinction between art music and rock music is how each is transmitted, that is, whether through notation or by way of recorded performances, respectively.

As musicology has developed as a discipline, so too have the implications for the teaching and learning of music. A number of scholars have recommended the incorporation of such new musicological perspectives in curriculum and classroom contexts, arguing for the need to incorporate approaches arising from the discoveries about music from the fields of ethnomusicology and popular music studies for example, as well as the cultural aspects of New musicology and performance studies. Of particular interest is how listeners to music construct meanings from what they hear, and attempt to understand the extent to which such meanings are inherent in the sounds themselves. Even perceptive music critics such as Alex Ross have engaged in the search for continuities of meaning across musical history. Ross’s volume, Listen to This, includes an essay impressive for its historical and geographic-cultural scope, in which he explains that while “there are no globally consistent signifiers of emotion”, nonetheless “the lament topos”—a melodic motif that descends over the interval of a fourth—“occurs often enough in various traditions that it has become a durable point of reference” (Ross, 2010, p. 27).
In *Music: A Very Short Introduction* (2000), Cook states that what we say about music impacts what it can become: “Language constructs reality rather than merely reflecting it... How we think about music also affects the way we make music” (p.14). Cook also likens the activities of composing, performing and listening to the commercial means of production, distribution and consumption of an economy based on the manufacture of goods and the capability to stockpile a surplus. This perception of the key processes of music makes composers the generators of the core product, leaving listeners the passive consumers. Cook says these terms and definitions are a product of our historical Western culture and are not necessarily a true reflection of where and what music is now and, more importantly, we need to see them as such and start questioning their current validity.

The analytical framework that is used particularly in the New South Wales and Australian music curriculums is that of the concepts of the music. Students are expected to be able to use the concepts of music, that is, pitch, duration, timbre, tone colour, structure and dynamics and expressive techniques, as a means of analysing, understanding and investigating the “distinctly abstract nature” of music (Board of Studies, 2009g, p. 15). However, according to Rose and Countryman (2013), this model of musical analysis is considerably outdated, having been proposed in the 1950s, and forming only one example of how Western art music could be analysed, and which, they argue, “devalues diversity, limits access and
denies individuality” (p. 48). Elemental learning leads to set definitions and the learning of precise discriminations, knowledge that is more easily examined through written tests. This makes music appear to be static and exact, which conflicts with how students informally understand music, that is, as personal, complex and diverse. It leads to the perception that there are two musics: a distinct ‘school’ version of music, that effectively fits with elemental analysis, and ‘other’ or ‘real world’ music, knowledge of which is not perceived to be as legitimate. According to Rose and Countryman, this situation bypasses the discussion and investigation of meaning in music, and leaves teachers with a one-size-fits-all approach.

In his book *Rock: The Primary Text* (2001), Moore proposes an alternative analytical model that is particularly relevant and useful for the analysis of rock, and popular, music. Instead of analysing rock music via its elements, he proposes rock and pop music can be structurally analysed according to a four layer model based on the music’s instrumentation:

1. Rhythm
2. Bass/low register
3. Melody/high register

From there, deeper analysis of the music would involve the consideration of certain features of the music, such as the specific instrumentation; the
timbre and the ensemble roles, repetition (what is repeated and how is it used), as well as how these features contribute to the perceived identity of the song.

Understanding and analysing music in and through performance has become an important method of ethnomusicological study. In *Teaching Music Globally* (2004), Campbell states, “The doing of music, informed by listening, is what brings musical learning and what brings home the conceptual understanding and skill-building that students require” (p. 9). This means that student participation, oral and aural learning techniques and immersive learning practices are vital for the study of music of different cultures. With regard to teaching strategies that pertain to cultural and world music, Campbell lists five action items. The most pertinent is the fifth of these, “Honour the pedagogical system in which the music is embedded” (p. 14). In other words, the cultural and social significance of the music and musical practices should be considered and even employed in classroom pedagogy as best as possible, in order to best understand the context and meaning of the music for study.

Green (2003) advocates immersive musical practices, but also acknowledges that, particularly in relation to pop music, “if the learning methods of the relevant musicians are ignored, a peculiar, classroom version of the music is likely to emerge... bearing little resemblance to its existence in the world outside” (p. 269). Green reminds us that it is
important to consider that much music, particularly that which is not Western art music, is created by non-institutionalised musicians. This has implications for its analysis and potential recreation within a classroom context: to ignore the methods by which the music was originally created means that a true rendering of it in an educational context is impossible.

Conclusion
As a discipline, musicology has undergone considerable change, diversification and broadening of conceptual scope since it was officially established in the late 19th century. The majority of these changes have occurred in the last 20-30 years, reflecting broader changes in social, cultural, musical and cognitive boundaries. These changes are not, however, being effectively incorporated into music curriculums, particularly those that remain fully committed to the elements-fits-all approach, despite the more inclusive range of music accepted for formal study. Research suggests that, to complement the broader range of musical styles and genres now acceptable for formal study, the way in which we analyse this music should also be broadened, in order to encourage a better understanding of the meanings of music.
Music Listening: Pedagogies and Schemes

There are a number of examples in the music education literature of educationists and researchers who have devised particular schemes regarding how analytical listening should be undertaken in primary and secondary education (Campbell, 2004; Green, 2008; Walby, 2011). These schemes could be intended for broad implementation, such as within a curriculum or syllabus (Loane, 1984), or designed for specific means, such as a particular learning stage (Peterson, 2006), musical style (Starr, 1977) or socio-cultural context (Silverman, 2013). They may be based on the understandings of music education at the time (Hartshorn, 1958), or present new ways to approach old material (Gracyk, 2007). Overall, the key factor in each of these schemes is that active or engaged listening is the ultimate outcome, but each example contains different purposes or contexts. Haack (1969) says that complex music listening skills need to be actively and systematically taught. Undirected listening is not likely to result in the development of specific and complex musical concepts. It is how educators teach and utilise directed listening that differs from theorist to theorist.

Listening in the broader Music curriculum

Hungarian composer Kodály was an educational theorist and he advocated listening as the foundation of music education (Houlahan & Tacka, 2008, p. 26). The book Kodaly Today (Houlahan & Tacka, 2008) provides examples of lesson plans, music and ways to create a music curriculum based on the
ideas of Kodály, with a focus on primary age students. Kodály aimed to
introduce the great masterpieces of music to anyone and everyone by way
of listening.

For Kodály, the purpose of listening in the classroom was to develop the
ear, in order to clarify the rhythmic and melodic elements of music. He
believed students should be taught to identify the various elements of the
music they listen to and that they should be constantly taught how to
listen, throughout any and all musical activities, especially when singing.
For Kodály, listening is very much connected to performing. For example,
students should intently listen to songs that they will eventually learn how
to sing and perform. Kodály wrote, "Individual singing plus listening to
music (by means of active and passive well-arranged experiences)
develops the ear to such an extent that one understands music one has
heard with as much clarity as though one were looking at a score"
(Houlahan & Tacka, 2008, p. 26).

According to Hartshorn, (1958), listening to music was a “rapidly
expanding cultural activity” (p. 261) at the time of his writing in the 1950s,
which meant that educators should place more consideration on how it
was taught in the classroom. For Hartshorn, learning via listening was
more about recognising patterns and making connections in time, focusing
on musical relationships, with the tone of the music being its most
distinguishing characteristic. “Form”, Hartshorn believed, was the key to
understanding what is heard as it “engages the mind” (p. 263), rather than the senses as with all of the other elements. Form results from the relationships between the elements in a composition, and brings organic unity and contrast to the music.

According to Hartshorn, students should listen to works both holistically and elementally. The examples of Hartshorn’s listening activities share some similarities with Kodaly’s methods. Good listening activities include listening with singing, listening with rhythm and rhythmic performance or dance, listening to instrumental tone colour and performance, listening with notation and music reading (where the eye assists the ear), listening and developing theoretical, or technical, understanding. The works that Hartshorn use as examples are all classical pieces, with no mention of any other musical style. According to Hartshorn, the enjoyment of the listener should also be considered and should go alongside discipline, effort and intellectual achievement, although there is a difference between enjoyment being an outcome of a listening activity rather than a purpose.

To Hartshorn, listening is the most important of all musical activities, followed by singing, playing, reading and writing, with listening being a part of every other activity. For him, good listening engages both the body and the mind, thinking and feeling, developing an open, thoughtful mind. In his article “On Listening in Music Education” (1984), Loane wrote that listening should be seen to be the whole of music education and devised a
remodel of musical activity categorisation whereby all musical activities become a practical form of listening, depicted as follows:

(A) *Musical activity itself (listening)*

(i) *Modes of listening with a concretely embodied component*

(a) composition-listening

(b) performance-listening

(c) movement-listening and so on

(ii) *Audience-listening*

(B) *Explicit reflection on musical activity (analysis-of-listening)* (Loane, 1984, p. 35).

Moreover, Loane suggests that listening should be considered from various perspectives, depending on what role the listener is playing in relation to the music. The forms of listening in combination with other activities, such as performing, composing, or participating as an audience member, should be thought of as “musical thinking” (p. 28). The act of music (performing, composing, listening) should be the aim of musical education, not the finished product (a performance, composition, description of what is heard). ‘Analysis-of-listening’ (1984, pp. 33-34) is more a reflection on the musical activity than an actual musical activity *per se.*
Loane’s ideas share similarities with those of Elliott. In music education, core knowledge is shown by thinking musically in the actions of ‘musicing’ and listening. According to Elliott (1995), listening is thinking-in-action (p. 80). It is important to listen critically, with an understanding of appropriate emotional-musical decisions, and an element of metacognition, that is, thinking about why you are thinking about the music in this way. Elliott believes that verbal conceptualisation should not be a goal in learning. Rather, the focus should be on how the student internally conceptualises what they hear. Listening should be intertwined with performance, including actively listening to one’s own performance and music making, and appreciating music as a performance art. Elliott proposes assessing a student’s performance ability as a marker of her listening ability. Instead of asking students to verbally express what they can hear, using appropriate musical terminology, students could instead be assessed on how accurately they can musically express what they can hear.

Like Campbell (2004), whose ideas were discussed in the previous section, Elliott believes verbal knowledge needs to be connected with the actual processes of listening and performing. Music curriculums should reflect the inclusion and utilisation of all musical creative processes as part of music learning as a whole. This would mean, for example, not just listening to African music, but creating and performing the rhythms and songs of the culture. Each experiential element should not exist in a vacuum but rather be connected to a particular learning experience. Every Music
curriculum should be multicultural, that is, it should expose students to a wide range of cultural practices and beliefs, and provide students with opportunities to immerse themselves within the cultures via listening, performing and composing. "Musical listening spirals upward in relation to the cognitive challenges inherent in the musical works of a given practise" (p. 123), Elliott writes.

In summary, Elliott believes music listening is a multi-faceted procedure, with constant and direct connections with composing and performing. Artistic and cultural knowledge play a key role in an individual's ability to progress from hearing to listening, as well as being one of the most important elements in the development of well rounded, creative musicians. Elliott believes the process of active listening involves several levels of cognition, decision making and identification, making connections with prior knowledge while developing new knowledge. These choices are governed by musical and cultural knowledge, which should be developed in practice.

While these music listening schemes may be effective in teaching students how to listen to classical-art music, they do not take into consideration contemporary art music and its place in the music curriculum. Starr (1977) discusses the difficulty of teaching such music. At the time Starr was writing, teachers were unsure of how to teach contemporary art music due to its deviation from established tonal norms. Starr describes ways teachers could approach this music, aiming at students with a high
level of conceptual understanding. The approach includes the analysis of student performances, and involves discussion of form, style and history in order to develop contextual understanding, as well as relevant examples.

**Teacher centred or student centred?**

Espeland (2011) and Dunn (2006) give differing opinions on how listening should be approached in the music classroom. In her brief history of classroom listening, Espeland sees the teacher as the focal point of the classroom, the person who can ensure that the students are able to identify what is important about the music. “Educational music listening is defined as different ways of educating young people to recognize, understand and appreciate central aspects of the sounding essences of particular pieces of music and their respective contexts” (Espeland, 2011, p. 146). As already outlined, Dunn's (2006) focus in educational music listening falls squarely on the student, that is, on what the students experience, how they listen and how they respond. Dunn believes that school-based listening experiences are limited by being teacher created and directed, and that they should align more with the kind of listening students engage in outside of school. The learning needs of the students should be considered more in the teaching and lesson development process.

Espeland (2011) outlines the development of a typical lesson. The teacher selects a piece of music, then plans when the listening happens and
decides what is the most important element that needs to be heard. The kind of teacher and (or) class demographic will shape how it is taught. Active listening is an ideal listening methodology, where nothing can be learnt or internalised unless the individual makes an active personal engagement and connection with the music. It is then also the teacher's role to devise activities that allow students the opportunity to make these personal connections with the music they are listening to.

Dunn (2006) on the other hand makes eight recommendations for a more meaningful approach to teaching intuitive listening (2006, pp. 34-35). Dunn’s intuitive listening is similar to Espeland’s (2011) active listening, to the extent that it involves making personal connections with music. However, Dunn claims that this cannot be taught, but rather it is something that students must experience for themselves. It is the responsibility of the teacher to curate an open and creative music listening environment. Dunn’s recommendations include:

- Offering students more time to listen.
- Identifying the difference between hearing and listening.
- Recognition of student understanding and knowledge of music as being an important element of the listening and learning experience.
- Using the music as the ultimate authority, not the teacher, and accepting that each person will have a unique listening experience depending on their own personal knowledge and understanding.
• Using creative ways, other than just writing, for students to represent what they hear, such as drawings or graphs.
• Connecting with music listened to outside of school; using music from the student’s library for study.
• Listening to and reflecting on student performance (2006, pp. 36-37).

In Espeland’s (2011) classroom, with the teacher as the expert, the class benefits from the teacher’s knowledge of music. Listening activities would be more concise and focused on gaining elemental understanding of the music. The importance of the teacher in establishing the learning environment and the significance of teacher choices is also positively emphasised in Carlisle (2008), as well as in a study of the choices of secondary school music teachers in New Zealand by McPhail (2013).

In Dunn’s classroom, the teacher becomes part guide, part observer to the student experience. Listening activities are as much about what the students can bring to the music as what the music offers the students. The students’ own understanding and personal experience with music is also of high importance, a factor acknowledged in other studies such as Boal-Palheiros et al (2001) and Green’s (2008) comprehensive, multi-school study on informal music learning practices in the classroom.
**Context specific schemes**

Other music educators have, like Dunn, proposed specific outlines for comprehensive listening practice in the classroom. These include Campbell (2005), Priest (2002), Peterson (2006), McAnally (2007), Lowe (2012) and Johnson (2011). Each scheme has best listening practice as a core outcome, but each is part of a different context or purpose, with consideration of age group, prior knowledge and (or) particular educational circumstance (such as the Music Appreciation classroom).

Campbell includes three phases in her pedagogy of listening; Attentive Listening, Engaged Listening and Enactive Listening (2005, pp. 31-32). These phases serve as a framework for developing aural skills, with the eventual outcome of enhanced and accurate performance. Ideally, the students would listen attentively to a piece of music, with their awareness drawn to certain aspects, such as a particular beat or tune by way of some visual aid or guide such as a basic graphic score. They are encouraged to become engaged with the music, by clapping an ostinato, or playing and singing parts of the music, often along with a recording. This would lead to enacting or performing the music in a manner that resembles the original piece as closely as possible. In this way, students are able to demonstrate the depth of their listening not by writing down what they hear but performing it, which concurs with Elliott’s (1995) proposal of assessing the listening ability of students via performance, rather than description.
Priest’s model for creative listening (2002), which built on a previous article (Priest, 1993) is similar to Campbell’s, in that he advocates strongly for listening activities to focus on listening to music, individual internalisation of what is heard, and developing psychomotor skills as a means of expression, rather than notation skills. At the time of his writing, the focus of music education in Britain, particularly at General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) level, was on linking aural analysis with “musical literacy” (p. 106), that is, the reading and writing of music in Western Art Music notation. The listening experience lacked creativity and was conducted with the purpose of producing a correct, predetermined outcome: the correct rhythm pattern for example, the correct notes on the stave, or the correct chord progression and so on. Priest designed his approach to maximise the inclusion of student musicians, rather than excluding or ignoring the musicianship of students who are unable to read and write music.

In typical classroom listening activities, greater emphasis tends to be placed on the accuracy of interpretation than on flexibility in understanding. Peterson (2006) understands the listening process as one of creative construction that is unique to each individual, and outlines a creative listening scheme that involves a five stage process of immersion, incubation, insight, synthesis and explication (p. 18). The different stages of the process can be fluid; while listening to a piece of music for example, students may be generating insight and synthesising ideas about a
previous section, while at the same time connecting these ideas with what they are hearing in subsequent sections. This scheme accepts that the individual’s experience and knowledge of music affects how they first perceive what they hear and how they go on to learn new material, making connections with other elements within the music that is new or at a higher level, usually with the assistance of a teacher or more experienced listener. By the end of the process, the listener is able to describe what they have heard and have gained deeper knowledge and understanding. This scheme is complex and more suitable for higher level students of music, engaging in focused listening lessons, and able to effectively analyse and discuss their own metacognitive processes.

In “Meaningful Listening for Middle and High School Students” (2007), McAnally provides ideas on how to incorporate effective listening practice in the music appreciation classroom. Some tips include:

- Start each class with listening.
- Consider the purpose of the listening: choose the music carefully, considering such aspects as style, length of the piece and whether or not it is music different to your own, and your students’, experience with music.
- Allow students to respond to the music in their own way (2007, p. 24).
McAnally believes that effective listening experiences have three parts: preparation, listening and follow up. Prior to listening, it is important to “build bridges between the students and the music” (p. 25): giving contextual information about the composer, or the piece, or a historical context. Teachers should provide information about themes in the music, or instruments; sing prominent themes, or a folk tune on which the piece is based; and keep students focused during the listening by getting them to concentrate on listening maps, or asking them to listen for specific elements and to keep track of these by writing down or raising their hand when they hear them. This approach to music listening is appropriate for teachers and classes that are accustomed to the ‘chalk and talk’—listening to and discussing music, with lessons carefully planned and led by the teacher. There is also a focus on constant student engagement, which can positively affect student achievement (Newmann, 1998).

Lowe's chapter in *The Music History Classroom* (2012) resembles McAnally’s approach to the extent that she advocates a high degree of preparation and organisation (preparing the music, preparing the technology, communicating listening engagement intentions, and so on) as a factor key to success in active listening (pp. 47-48). Lowe's ideas for effective listening lesson design are also in keeping with connecting listening exclusively with musicology - learning about the historical, cultural and social context of the music – and in the belief that the most effective mode of listening involves writing and undertaking specific tasks while listening (pp. 48-60). All exercises are based on writing and (or)
notating, with occasional clapping exercises to emphasise rhythm. Some activities are very complex, and would require a significant degree of prior knowledge in order to be successful. The lessons Lowe describes have a strong intellectual basis, with activities centred on writing and discussion.

Johnson’s article from 2011 focuses on ensemble rehearsals and how participating students can take a more active role. He describes the ensemble situations as though these could be adapted for the general music classroom. Johnson designs these to be student-directed and collaborative, as opposed to teacher-directed and lecture focused. Johnson divides potential rehearsal activities into three types of practice groups: collaborations between two people, between members of an ensemble instrument section, or among the entire ensemble (pp. 51-52). Those practicing the part or section would then primarily use their listening skills to enhance the performance of the particular part being practised. Peer interaction is, overall, the main focus of the article. By redesigning rehearsals and putting the emphasis on the students’ abilities and knowledge, it in turn encourages a higher level of learning and interpersonal development. This could potentially be applied to practical classroom lessons by switching the focus from performing to listening. A further example of positive peer interaction in the music education classroom can be found in Silverman (2013), where the author describes how teaching music democratically provides students with the opportunity to converse and work together, and to learn from each other.
As is evident from the examples provided thus far, most music listening schemes have elements in common, such as an overall determination to bring listening to the forefront of the music classroom, making listening meaningful and developing students’ listening skills and abilities. However, these schemes are dependent upon the context, knowledge and experience of the learners, and assume a range of teacher roles. For example, Campbell's approach (2005) demands a practical, interactive environment in teaching music to younger children. Walby (2011) advocates a sit-and-listen, dialectical approach, where misconceptions and challenged correct ideas are reinforced. This is in line with United States syllabuses that require students to be able to describe, discuss and analyse music, and is designed for younger students with a rudimentary understanding of music and related terminology. Lessons focus on vocabulary acquisition and retention, with the outcomes being higher level reading, writing and musical language complexity.

These two schemes are examples of the difficulty that music educators currently face - when teaching music listening, what should the focus be? Perhaps music listening would be more meaningful with a practical approach, such as Campbell (2005) recommends, or perhaps a focus on writing and vocabulary acquisition is required, as Walby (2011) proposes. Perhaps it is more important for students to acquire knowledge intuitively (Dunn, 2006) or instead, should the teacher be seen as the expert, guiding students in search of important elements (McAnally, 2007)? And, what are
the important elements of music? Should the focus be on form (Hartshorn, 1958), melodies and folk tunes (Houlahan & Tacka, 2008), or rhythm (Dalby, 2005)? Or some other musical features, perhaps?

**Conclusion**

The schemes presented in this section are of merit, however they need to be presented in an appropriate context, in relation to the students, classroom environment and teacher. Music educators must be able to connect their pedagogical expertise with the requisite knowledge and the learning styles of their students in order to pursue effective and meaningful music teaching (Button, 2010). Certain schemes would therefore not work with students at certain ages, or with varying levels of language competence and behavioural development, or with no prior knowledge of the music they are studying.

Some schemes may only work for particular styles of music. For example, many of the schemes (and, indeed, theories of listening) discussed throughout the chapter assume that classical or art music will be taught (Copland, 1939; Hartshorn, 1958; Starr, 1977), while other schemes are more suitable for pop or folk music (Green, 2008; Houlahan & Tacka, 2008). Gracyk argues that certain kinds of pop music are not actually suitable for analytical listening, and that music educators should consider the intent and (or) the context of the music they choose for study: “Different music rewards different modes of attention” (2007, p. 143). In
short, there is no one scheme for music listening that works with anyone, anywhere; rather, each scheme is context and content dependent.

The research presented throughout this chapter reveals distinct gaps in the literature on the topic of analytical listening. Most of the research regarding music listening in education is based on the learning systems and pedagogies of countries other than Australia, and in particular those of Britain and the United States. There are some studies that are based on Australian models: Winter (2004) evaluated the effects of an integrated, popular music-based curriculum on senior secondary students, which was presented to a small sample of students. Jacob (2008) analysed the evolving nature of the aural comprehension (theoretical) component of the Victorian Certificate of Education (VCE) and how it affected popular music students and senior secondary lesson design. Miles’s Doctoral thesis (2006) is a wide ranging study on the strengths and weaknesses of the VCE, focusing particularly on the music curriculum as a whole, and its assessment practices. However, none of these studies examine what takes place specifically in actual lessons, that is, how the teachers are actually teaching. Most, if not all of the research is critical of how analytical listening has been taught, or discusses approaches and techniques for how it could be taught. Research is scarce on how music listening is being taught. How can change be recommended if there are no accounts of what is actually going on? This thesis seeks to address such questions.
CHAPTER THREE
Syllabus Analysis and Critique

Introduction

In New South Wales, most Stage 6 senior secondary students choose to undertake the program of study required to qualify for a Higher School Certificate (HSC). The majority of these students are subsequently eligible for an Australian Tertiary Admissions Rank (ATAR), which universities can then use to determine their suitability for particular tertiary courses. In order to receive an ATAR, students must complete at least ten HSC course units, comprised of at least four subjects, of ATAR courses (Universities Admissions Centre (NSW & ACT), 2015). The subject of Music can be one of these courses, and students can elect to study the Music 1, or the Music 2 course. There is also the option of a Music Extension course, which is a one unit elective course undertaken in the HSC year; it has a co-requisite of the Music 2 course, and Extension students undertake a major project that showcases their abilities and interests in either performance, composition or musicology. In the following discussion, and for the purposes of this study, only the Music 1 (Board of Studies, 2009f) and Music 2 (Board of Studies, 2009g) course syllabuses are considered.

Both the Music 1 and Music 2 Stage 6 courses have core similarities. Both courses revolve around the four learning experiences (performance, composition, musicology and aural) and involve application of the six concepts of music—duration, pitch, texture, structure, tone colour, and dynamic and expressive techniques—in the structural analysis of music.
Besides these foundational similarities, the two Stage 6 Music courses differ with regard to their overall purpose and aim, topics available for study, assumed student knowledge, and the extent to which they detail knowledge outcomes.

It is important at this point to clarify certain syllabus components since these contribute to the framework within which NSW teachers are working. A description is also provided of the structure of the HSC Aural written exam for both Music courses—since this exam is mandatory for all music students it is also important for teachers of music to consider it as part of the design of their teaching program. Finally, this section compares and contrasts the two Music course syllabuses (those of Music 1 and Music 2) and how these can be understood in the context of parallel Stage 6 syllabus frameworks.

**Key Syllabus References and Definitions**

Throughout the interviews, teachers made references to several areas of the syllabus that would be common knowledge to NSW music teachers, but which may have little relevance to readers with no knowledge of NSW Stage 6 Music syllabuses. In order to maintain clarity and to support the analysis, a summary of the key elements of the syllabuses is as follows.
The Concepts

During almost all of the interviews, the concepts of music were mentioned in various ways, either as a collective noun or in reference to a specific concept. 'The Concepts' is a syllabus term that refers to the concepts of music, which in the syllabuses are briefly defined as follows:

**Duration:** The length of sounds and silences in music and includes the aspects of beat, rhythm, metre, tempo, pulse rates and absence of pulse.

**Pitch:** The relative highness and lowness of sounds. Important aspects include high, low, higher and lower pitches, direction of pitch movement, melody, harmony, indefinite and definite pitch.

**Dynamics and Expressive Techniques:** Dynamics refers to the volume of sound. Important aspects include the relative softness and loudness of sound, changes of loudness (contrast), and the emphasis on individual sounds (accent). Expressive techniques refers to the musical detail that articulates a style or interpretation of a style.

**Texture:** The result of the way voices and/or instruments are combined in music. Students should be able to discriminate between different layers of sound and types of texture, and the ways it is created and used.

**Timbre/Tone Colour:** That aspect of sound that allows the listener to identify the sound source or combinations of sound sources.

**Structure:** The idea of design or form in music. In organising sound, the elements of duration, dynamics, pitch and tone colour are combined in some way for a particular purpose. Unity and variety are produced by the
use of repetition and contrast. Structure, therefore, relates to the ways in which music sounds the same (or similar) and/or different (Board of Studies, 2009g, pp. 15-19).

Students are expected to study the concepts of music in contrasting degrees of detail at each stage of schooling, including in Music as a mandatory subject in Early Stage 1, Stage 1, Stage 2, Stage 3 and Stage 4 (which equates to Kindergarten through to Year 8). As stated in the Music 2 Syllabus, “Investigating the concepts enables students to examine the ways in which sound is used to create music and apply this to their own experience of performance, composition, musicology and aural” (2009g, p. 15).

**Learning Experiences**

The Stage 6 Music syllabuses define four main Learning Experiences: Performing, Composing, Musicology and Aural. As outlined in the Music 2 Syllabus, “students will constantly be involved in the integration of learning experiences in Performance, Composition, Musicology and Aural in both the Preliminary and HSC courses” (Board of Studies, 2009g, p. 20). The four learning experiences are briefly defined in the Music 2 Syllabus as follows:

**Performing:** Participation in any form of practical music making.
Composing: The organisation of sounds.

Musicology: The study of musical styles, periods and genres. This occurs through listening, score observation, analysis, performance and composition.

Aural: The ability to discriminate between sounds and to make judgements about their use in a variety of styles, periods and genres (Board of Studies, 2009g, pp. 20-22).

During the interviews, some teachers alternated between the terms ‘listening lessons’ and ‘Aural lessons’. For the purpose of this study the descriptions are interchangeable ways of referring to lessons in which students engage in activities that require an aural focus. It is worth noting that ‘Aural’ is a term that is specific to the Stage 6 syllabuses. In all previous syllabuses (from Early Stage 1 through to Stage 5) there are only three learning experiences: Performing, Composing (or Organising Sound for Early Stage 1 to Stage 3) and Listening. Musicology appears to be integrated with the other learning experiences, instead of comprising an experience of its own as it does in the Stage 6 syllabuses.

Topics

Occasionally during the interviews, teachers made reference to some of the topics they taught during senior secondary Music. The Music 1 and Music 2 syllabuses provide a list of topics, or contexts that teachers can
choose to teach from. The options available vary between the courses, although there is a small degree of overlap.

**Music 1**

In the Music 1 course, teachers are provided with the following list of topics from which to choose.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>An instrument and its repertoire</th>
<th>Music for large ensembles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australian music</td>
<td>Music for radio, film, television and multimedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baroque music</td>
<td>Music for small ensembles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jazz</td>
<td>Music in education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval music</td>
<td>Music of a culture (Preliminary course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods of notating music</td>
<td>Music of a culture (HSC course)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and religion</td>
<td>Music of the 18th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music and the related arts</td>
<td>Music of the 19th century</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock music</td>
<td>Music of the 20th and 21st centuries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology and its influence on music</td>
<td>Popular music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre music</td>
<td>Renaissance music</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1. List of topics available to study in the Music 1 syllabus** *(Board of Studies, 2009f, p.11).*

At least three topics of study are required for the Preliminary Course (Year 11) and a further three topics of study are required for the HSC Course (Year 12). Of the three topics of study for the HSC Course, one can be a topic studied in the Preliminary Course however it must be shown to have been explored in greater depth, include new repertoire and a comparative
study. No topic is mandated for study, as is the case with the Music 2 course, as will be seen. With regard to the selection of topics, according to the Music 1 syllabus, “Teachers and students should take into account the abilities and interests of students when negotiating topics” (2009f, p. 22). This approach to topic choice appears to be based on a syllabus assumption that the Music 1 cohort will contain students of varying ability and knowledge levels, which should be acknowledged in the choice of topics for study. However, the syllabus does not explicitly state whether topics are to be negotiated with students individually, or simply as a group.

**Music 2**

The Music 2 Course list of topics for study, as follows, is more concentrated on art music.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary course (Year 11)</th>
<th>HSC Course (Year 12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mandatory:</strong> Music 1600-1900</td>
<td><strong>Mandatory:</strong> Music of the last 25 years (Australian focus)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian music</td>
<td>Music of a culture (different from Preliminary course study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music of a culture</td>
<td>Medieval music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medieval music</td>
<td>Renaissance music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renaissance music</td>
<td>Baroque music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music 1900–1945</td>
<td>Classical music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music 1945 to music 25 years ago.</td>
<td>Music in the nineteenth century</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. List of topics available to study in the Music 2 syllabus (Board of Studies, 2009g, p. 11).
Teachers are required to teach the Mandatory topic for each course, and then choose one other topic for study for each course.

According to the respective syllabuses, Music 1 has a contemporary music focus (2009f, p. 6), which is generally interpreted to involve popular music in some form, and the wide range of topics is intended to benefit a cohort with a range of needs and abilities. Music 2 is a course with a focus on Western art music (2009g, p. 5), and is designed to build on the knowledge and experience gained during music study in Years 7-10.

**Assessment and Examination**

**Internal and External Assessment Requirements**

Each Stage 6 Music course has varying Core and Elective requirements, across both the Preliminary and HSC courses. In the Preliminary courses, the assessment structure is determined by the teacher, as long as all four learning experiences are assessed. In the HSC course, students are assessed internally, that is, by their own teacher, throughout the year on their core and elective elements, as well as externally, that is, by independent markers. The external assessment comprises of a compulsory written aural examination, as well as a combination of instrumental performance, composition, or prepared spoken presentation (viva voces).
Assessment in Music 1

In the Music 1 HSC course, all students are internally assessed on the four core learning experiences, as well as on their three chosen electives. The prescribed weighting for each assessment item is set out in Table 3 (Board of Studies, 2009a).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Core</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition Core</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musicology Core</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aural Core</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective 1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective 2</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective 3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Mandatory weightings for the internal assessment in Music 1 (Board of Studies, 2009a, p. 8).

As can be seen, each Core is weighted 10 percent, with Aural being the exception, weighted at 25 percent. This weighting may appear significant when compared to the other components. However, a student is not permitted to select Aural as an elective learning experience. Therefore, if a student chooses all performance electives, the total weighting for performance would then equate to 55 percent of the total internal assessment mark.
The external assessment structure is similar to the internal structure. Each student must sit an external aural written exam worth 30 marks, and present a core performance, worth 20 marks. They must also choose three electives—any combination of performance, composition or musicology—each of which is worth 20 marks. The core performance mark and the electives marks are then combined and converted to a mark out of 70.

**Assessment in Music 2**

In Music 2, all students are internally assessed on each of the four core learning experiences, and one elective. Each assessment is weighted equally.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core Performance</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Composition</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Musicology</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Aural</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elective: Performance, Composition or Musicology</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Mandatory weightings for the internal assessment in Music 2 (Board of Studies, 2009b, p. 6).

Unlike Music 1, Music 2 candidates must submit a composition for external examination, which is worth 15 percent. They must also undertake a practical examination, which contains both an instrumental performance and sight singing, that is worth 20 percent of the course marks, and an aural written exam worth 35 percent. Students must then choose one
elective, worth 30 percent: the performance of two additional pieces; the composition of an instrumental piece; or the development of a 1500 word musicology essay. Similar to the Music 1 assessment structure, the aural written exam is given the largest singular weighting. However, again, if a student chooses their elective to be performance, then performance will end up forming half of their total external mark. The documents give no explanation as to why aural cannot be selected as an elective in both courses.

**Aural Skills Written exams**

The Aural Skills written examinations in Music 1 and Music 2 have different structures, yet with core similarities. Both exams have retained the format that originated with the most recent syllabus revision in 2001. The final HSC written examinations are marked externally by independent markers. The Aural Skills examination forms the aural component of the external assessment mark detailed earlier.

**Music 1**

The Music 1 Aural Skills written exam typically comprises four questions, with each question based on a specific musical excerpt that is played a number of times. The musical excerpts for the examination are selected by a committee and are therefore ‘unseen’, that is, there are no set pieces for study in the course. Instead, the musical excerpts are related to a topic or topics recommended for study in Music 1, which, as already noted, creates
a diverse repertoire from which examiners can choose. Recent excerpts have included orchestral film music, country rock, Baroque, Aboriginal pop music and big band jazz.

The exam is conducted according to a strict schedule, based from a recording that contains each of the excerpts plus defined periods of writing time. Each excerpt is played from five to six times, with pauses of between 30 seconds and two minutes between each. The duration of the exam is one hour: students are given on average 15 minutes per question, inclusive of time for listening and pauses between playing for writing responses to the questions asked. Questions typically refer in some way to either the concepts of music, or the way in which the composer has created interest, unity and (or) contrast through their musicological use of the concepts. Recent questions include:

- Describe the musical features of this excerpt (Board of Studies, 2014, p. 5).
- How does structure contribute to both unity and contrast in this excerpt? (Board of Studies, 2014, p. 9).
- Describe the use of pitch in this excerpt (Board of Studies, 2013a, p. 2).
- How is musical interest achieved in this excerpt? In your response, refer to duration and at least one other concept of music (Board of Studies, 2011a, p. 5).
Students may respond to these questions in dot-points and include musical notation (although in recent years the official provision of manuscript paper has been discontinued), and not necessarily in formal prose. Writing in this way ensures that students are able to respond as thoroughly as possible to what they hear.

**Music 2**

The Music 2 Musicology and Aural Skills written exam is more complex and detailed in structure than the Music 1 examination described above. Students are expected to divide their attention between the written paper, manuscript paper and score attachments during the course of the examination. The Music 2 exam also consists of four questions, and these are often divided into sub-questions. Each question has a particular structure and focus and most questions are accompanied by score attachments related to recorded musical excerpts. The style of music used in excerpts varies; however the majority of musical examples used since 2001 have been Western art music, with an emphasis on pieces by Australian composers. As with the Music 1 exam, the Music 2 examination is conducted in real time—all musical excerpts and pauses between playings and questions are incorporated into an official recording that is provided to schools and their examination supervisors. The number of times an excerpt is played varies, depending on the nature of the question. Time is also allocated for score reading.
Question 1 often consists of several short answer sections. It usually requires students to refer to particular parts of a score. Questions can be broadly concept based - “Describe the dynamics and expressive techniques used in bars 15-23” (Board of Studies, 2011b, p. 3), or call on the student’s technical musical knowledge - “How has Haydn used the interval of the 5th in this work? In your response refer to the score” (Board of Studies, 2012c, p. 2). Occasionally questions may require a specific answer - “What is meant by Flt. at bar 256?” (Board of Studies, 2003a, p. 2), although these kinds of questions have been less common in recent years.

Question 2 is primarily a transcription exercise. Students are played an 8-10 bar excerpt six times and are required to accurately notate the rhythm and pitch of what they hear. Usually a rhythm here or note there is provided to guide the student. A second part of this question usually refers to another section of the transcribed piece, that is, either a section that follows or precedes the transcription excerpt, or another part of a larger work. For example, in the 2011 HSC Exam, students first answered questions about the Prelude in Bach’s Prelude and Fugue in A Major, and were then asked to transcribe a bass part of the Fugue (Board of Studies, 2011b, pp. 5-6).

Question 3 tests score reading more extensively. This question usually requires students to listen to and analyse whole movements, or large
excerpts of musical works. This involves following and interpreting a previously unseen score, which on occasion has been hand written, such as the 2011 Music 2 Exam Score attachment C i) and ii): *Samsara – Trio No. 6 for flute, clarinet, and piano* by Larry Sitsky (Board of Studies, 2011b).

The subject matter of the question can range from particular elements of a section - “Describe the use of duration in bars 1-18 of this movement” (Board of Studies, 2012c, p. 7), to analysis of the excerpt as a whole - “Analyse the thematic development in this movement, with specific reference to the score” (Board of Studies, 2013b, p. 8).

Question 4 is a long-answer question, where candidates are expected to respond with essay-style writing. It is worth 10 marks out of the possible 35 for the whole examination, and the final 20-30 minutes of the exam is allocated to answering this question. The premise of the question differs from year to year: in some years a score is provided, sometimes a recorded musical excerpt is heard, and in some years a work addressed in a previous question is referred to again. In their answers, candidates are expected to refer to works they have studied from the Mandatory topic Music of the last 25 years (Australian focus), and are often asked to quote from the scores of works studied. Exemplar questions include:

- **Composers both break with and maintain musical conventions in their work.** With reference to specific concepts of music, critically examine this statement in relation to at least TWO works you have studied from the
Mandatory Topic *Music of the last 25 years (Australian focus)* (Board of Studies, 2005, p. 17).

- Compare Bernstein's treatment of musical ideas in *Turkey Trot* with the treatment of musical ideas in a significant work you have studied (Board of Studies, 2012c, p. 9).
- How have composers manipulated the concepts of music to achieve unity in their works? In your answer refer to significant compositions that you have studied in your Higher School Certificate course. Note: the works in Questions 1, 2 and 3 are not to be used in your answer (Board of Studies, 2011b, p. 9).

**Comparative Summary – Exam and Assessment**

As has been shown, the Music 2 written examination is more complex and demanding than the Music 1 examination, and this is indicative of the differing content of each course. The Music 1 exam assumes a sound knowledge of the concepts of music, and the ability to recognise and identify these in a range of musical examples drawn from classical and popular repertoire. In addition to these skills, the Music 2 exam assumes skills and knowledge in score analysis, notation and transcription. These differences are also specified in the syllabus outcomes for both courses. Thus, by examining the common ground of the Aural Skills examination in both courses, the differences between the levels of complexity and sophistication in relation to aural skills becomes evident.
However, not all elements of the Aural Skills examinations are explicit reflections of the syllabus requirements and expectations, and the latitude between examination and syllabus for both courses is a point of interest. Nevertheless, the importance of the examinations, and their specific areas of focus, means that teachers must consider the examinations in their teaching, to some extent at least, in order to prepare their students for what to expect in the examination. The Music 1 exam requires no prior study of any specific works, whereas Music 2 students are expected to be able to potentially compare and reference previously studied works with an unseen excerpt, or at least be able to apply them in answering an essay question. The standard of written expression is also in contrast—dot-point answers are acceptable in Music 1, while Music 2 requires more formal prose, particularly in Question 4. Even the practical nature of the exams is different: Music 1 students progress through the exam booklet in time with the excerpts, whereas Music 2 students are constantly moving between listening, writing in one booklet, identifying and analysing separate score attachments and drafting transcriptions on manuscript paper. When compared, it seems Music 2 students are expected to perform at a much higher level to Music 1 students—musically, cognitively and academically. This is reflected in the differing demands of each examination, and thus, to some extent, their syllabuses.
The Syllabuses

Introduction

After a consideration of the examination requirements, this section will analyse the differences between the two Stage 6 syllabuses, Music 1 and Music 2. The differences in content of the syllabuses, including their treatment of the concepts of music, topics for study, student outcomes and objectives, as well as the hypothetical students themselves will be examined to gain a better understanding of the differences between each course, and how the syllabuses can be interpreted and implemented.

Music 1

The Rationale for the Music 1 syllabus (Board of Studies, 2009f, p. 6) states that the purpose of the course is to “provide students with an opportunity to acquire knowledge, skills, understanding and attitudes’ about the music they will study” (emphasis added). It also states that the curriculum is structured to “meet the needs and interests of the students with varying degrees of prior formal and informal learning in music.” A “range of musical styles” is offered for study, specifically including contemporary popular music, which is offered as a stand-alone topic, and is also explicitly featured in the ‘Suggested aspects for study’ for six of the 21 remaining topics (pp. 22-25). For many of these students, the Music 1 course will then serve as a pathway to “further training and employment in the music
industry or in contemporary music fields.” (p. 6) Tertiary education entry is not mentioned.

The hypothetical students are described further on page 8, in the Continuum of Learning (Board of Studies, 2009f). Here, the syllabus acknowledges that students who undertake Music 1 may range in their musical abilities, from beginner level to advanced. However, it also assumes that many of these same students have “highly developed aural skills”, and skills in improvisation, which have been nurtured through performance by imitation. It also assumes that these students have at best an elementary knowledge of musical notation, and that they will therefore be required to revisit elementary musical skills and understanding.

To summarise, the Music 1 course structure and design caters for students of broad and varying backgrounds, yet with specific skills. Music 1 students will have varying degrees of musical experience, but it is more likely they will be relative beginners, due in part to the prior knowledge and experience requirement of Music 2. These students may have highly developed aural and improvisational skills, yet may also have limited musical literacy knowledge and elementary musical analytical skills. They are also more likely to be proficient, and interested in, contemporary popular music, and will most likely progress into some sort of employment in the popular music industry, as opposed to tertiary levels of music study.
With regard to the content of the Music 1 course, the syllabus description is very general, and the language used throughout is often vague, with an emphasis on student autonomy and negotiated control over what they will learn. The Higher School Certificate (HSC) Outcomes on page 12 state that by the end of the course, students should be able to demonstrate their musical ability in a number of ways, but is unclear regarding the minimum standard that should be achieved. This is, presumably, because those that undertake the course will begin with varying levels of musical ability, and thus will end the course also at various levels of ability.

The Music 1 syllabus provides 22 possible topics (or contexts) for study (Board of Studies, 2009f, p. 11), with a minimum of six required over the two-year course and no mandatory topic required. Of the topics listed, only six have a historical Western art music orientation (for example, Renaissance Music, Baroque Music), while most of the others are popular and contemporary music genres (for example, Rock Music, Popular Music, Music for Radio, Film, Television and Multimedia). There are no mandatory pieces of music listed for study; teachers are only given examples of aspects of each topic for study, which are not prescriptive and provide a “springboard for students” (p. 22), not teachers. In terms of how the topics for study are to be selected, the syllabus states, “Teachers and students should take into account the abilities and interests of students when negotiating topics” (p. 22).
The concepts of music, which are central to the musicological approach of the NSW music syllabuses, are discussed in this section of the syllabus. The definition of each concept, starting on page 16, is brief and broad. The language used to describe the key aspects of each concept is straightforward, and the definitions are very similar in scope to the concept definitions found in the Music Years 7-10 Syllabus (Board of Studies, 2003b) with only a few noticeable modifications and additions.

For all of the concepts, the Music 1 syllabus contains almost identical examples of aspects to be discussed as are set out in the Music Years 7-10 Syllabus, although the order of dot points is occasionally altered. The main addition to the Stage 6 syllabus is that each concept description, except for texture and structure, also contains a list of musical sub-concepts that students are expected to “understand and apply” (Board of Studies, 2009f, pp. 16-18). The concept, dynamics and expressive techniques, shares identical content in both syllabuses, except in Music 7-10 students “manipulate and discuss the following aspects” (Board of Studies, 2003b, p. 16) and Stage 6 students “understand and apply” these (Board of Studies, 2009f, p. 17).

It appears that the general purpose of Music 1 is to provide students with the opportunity to develop their musical skills, regardless of their ability or skill level when they begin the course in Year 11. The wide variety of topics for study and the underlying understanding that topic choice is to be negotiated between teacher and student strongly suggests that the
The course should be highly student-focused, with the most important outcome being the development or musical progress of the individual.

The HSC exam process appears to contradict this syllabus model however. The final examination is an indicator of what the student knows at that moment, and their success is not measured against themselves but against the same standards of examination applied to everyone else enrolled in Music 1 across the state. So how are students meant to determine what is valuable about what they know and what they can do, when the syllabus vaguely states one thing and the HSC examination process measures another?

**Music 2**

The Music 2 (Board of Studies, 2009g) syllabus is both more specific and definitive with regarding the topics and contexts for study, and what knowledge students will acquire by the end of the course. As with the Music 1 syllabus, there are no mandated pieces of music for study or recommended textbook (although there is a Mandatory topic), but it is more specific in terms of how the topics should be studied, the level of detail concerning concept analysis, and in general how teachers should approach teaching the course.

The Rationale and Continuum of Learning in the Music 2 syllabus (Board of Studies, 2009g, pp. 5-7) make statements regarding the purpose of the course and the type of candidature for which the course is suitable. The
The purpose of Music 2 is to build on the knowledge already previously acquired in Music courses in years 7-10, and provide opportunities for individual specialisation. The syllabus “assumes students have a formal background in music” (p. 7), with a considerable level of musical knowledge and familiarity with music literacy skills, including the ability to read and write in traditional Western notation. It does not explicitly assume the style of music in which students should already be proficient; rather it makes clear that the Music 2 course has a considerable focus on Western art music, which implies that it is more suitable to students already trained in the Western art music tradition.

The topic list for Music 2 (Board of Studies, 2009g, pp. 23-27) is considerably smaller than Music 1. Besides the two Mandatory topics, there are nine other possible topics, generally with a historical Western art music focus. Although the Preliminary Mandatory topic is extremely broad (Music 1600-1900), the syllabus gives specific requirements for how teachers should structure their course study, including: mandating at least five different works for detailed analysis; a focus on Baroque, Classical and Nineteenth century music; and several genres to choose from within the aforementioned three key historical areas (2009g, p. 23). Similar detail is given for the HSC Mandatory topic (“Music of the last 25 years, Australian focus”, p. 25) and the extra topics are listed with “suggested aspects for study”, as well as the requirement that students must study “a number of works” within each topic (2009g, p. 26).
Beginning on page 15, the explanations for how each of the concepts of music should be studied are detailed (Board of Studies, 2009g). They include several specific aspects of study for each concept, as well as notated examples for both duration and pitch. The syllabus states that students should have the foundational knowledge of music concepts as set out in the Music 7-10 syllabus, which should then be “consolidated and extended to include understanding and application of” the sub-concepts that follow (Board of Studies, 2009g, pp. 15-19). In contrast with the Music 1 syllabus, the Music 2 syllabus includes several examples of notation with which students should explore and experiment.

The Music 2 course is much more explicit regarding what students should study, and even in how the course should be taught. For example, on page 23 it specifically states, “The study of music within this course will involve an integrated approach which explores the relationships between Performance, Composition, Musicology and Aural” (Board of Studies, 2009g, emphasis cited from original). As with the Music 1 syllabus, the interests and abilities of the student cohort should still be considered, however more for their own specialist musical or instrumental projects, as opposed to what topics they and their cohort should study. The syllabus appears to assume that as the students already know more and are capable of achieving at a higher level from the beginning of the course, it can be more explicit about what knowledge and experience they should go
on to acquire. Thus, the Music 2 course places greater demands on students.

**Syllabus outcomes pertaining to listening**

In both syllabuses, there are four main objectives that have various outcomes. Outcomes are prefaced with “Through activities in performance, composition, musicology and aural, a student...” (Board of Studies, 2009f, pp. 12-13; 2009g, pp. 12-14) implying that all of the outcomes should be able to be achieved through the four learning experiences. However, the language of each of the outcomes intuitively lends itself to particular learning experiences.

Table 5 is a comparison of language used in the objectives and outcomes pertaining to listening or aural in the Music 1 and Music 2 HSC Courses. Words in square brackets in the objectives denote the modification found in the Music 2 syllabus. Objectives and outcomes in the Music 1 and Music 2 courses begin on page 12 for each syllabus.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Music 1 Outcome</th>
<th>Music 2 Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To [continue to] develop knowledge and skills about the concepts of music and of music as an art form ... in a variety of cultural and historical contexts.</td>
<td>H4: Articulates an aural understanding of musical concepts and their relationships in a wide variety of musical styles.</td>
<td>H5: Analyses, discusses, evaluates and clearly articulates compositional processes with stylistic, historical, cultural, social and musical considerations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop the skills [to synthesise ideas and] to evaluate music critically.</td>
<td>H5: Critically evaluates and discusses performances and compositions H6: Critically evaluates and discusses the use of the concepts of music in works representative of the topics studied and through wide listening</td>
<td>H6: Discusses, constructively criticises and evaluates performances and compositions of others and self with particular reference to stylistic features of the context H7: Critically evaluates and discusses in detail the concepts of music in works representative of the mandatory and additional topics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop an [awareness and] understanding of the impact of technology on music.</td>
<td>H8: Identifies, recognises, experiments with, and discusses the uses and effects of technology in music</td>
<td>H9: Identifies, recognises, experiments with, and discusses the uses and effects of technology in music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To develop personal values about music</td>
<td>H10: Demonstrates a willingness to participate in performance, composition, musicology and aural activities</td>
<td>H11: Demonstrates a willingness to participate in performance, composition, musicology and aural activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5. HSC level Objectives and Outcomes that pertain particularly to listening in Music 1 and Music 2 syllabuses (Board of Studies, 2009f, pp. 12-13; 2009g, pp. 12-14).
As can be seen in Table 5, in the Music 1 Course, students are expected to learn about how the concepts are used in a variety of musical styles and genres, evaluate and discuss performances and compositions, identify how technology is used in music, and be willing to listen. In contrast, in the Music 2 Course, students are expected to critically evaluate music within its contexts, discuss and critique performances and compositions, evaluate the use of the concepts of music in works studied, identify the use of technology in music and be willing to listen.

Again, the way the outcomes are written for each syllabus seems to assume more about the intellectual and analytical abilities of the students undertaking these courses than it does about their musical abilities. The Rationale and Continuum of Learning in each syllabus also make reference to where students should be at in their musical study prior to undertaking each course, as well as the potential for advancement after secondary school (Board of Studies, 2009f, p. 7). The Music 1 Course primarily builds upon the Mandatory Course (Year 7 and 8) and students can potentially look forward to “a pathway for further training and employment in the music industry or in contemporary music fields” (Board of Studies, 2009f, p. 6). Music 2, however, builds on the Elective Course (Year 9 and 10) and ideally serves as “a pathway for further formal study in tertiary institutions or in fields that use their musical knowledge” (Board of Studies, 2009g, p. 5).
It is difficult not to see the Music 1 Course as being designed for those who are less academically capable, particularly since it claims to build on the Stage 4 Year 7-8 Mandatory Course. Music 1 appears to be an extension of the Year 7-8 course, with an increased focus on popular music. By implication, Music 1 students will be learning content suitable for students at Year 9 and 10 levels. In contrast, Music 2 is more clearly directed towards Year 11 and 12 levels, with a pathway for further musical study.

**Comparative Summary – The Syllabuses**

Neither syllabus prescribes what pieces should be studied or how teachers should structure their lessons. However, they do make assumptions about the ability levels and interests of the student candidature that each course will attract. Music is not alone in this regard; several other subjects in Stage 6 provide different courses with varying levels of academic difficulty to cater for the range of student ability and knowledge. However, with the Music courses, the differences in student ability levels seem to be a key factor in also determining the genres of music that are appropriate for study, whether or not the musical preferences of the students should be considered in determining curriculum choices, and the level of complexity for musical analysis.

Considering the design of other HSC level subjects with multiple courses (English, Mathematics, Languages), in essence Music 1 is meant to be a beginner level course, and Music 2 is meant to be an advanced level
Table 6 provides a brief, paraphrased description of the candidature requirements and/or outcomes described in the syllabuses for other split level courses. These descriptions are provided in the relevant syllabuses in order to give students the opportunity to select the course most appropriate to their knowledge and ability levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Courses Available</th>
<th>Candidate Requirements/Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| English | Studies Standard Advanced Extension 1 and 2 As a Second Language | **English Standard**: Increase their ability to respond to and compose texts. Students become proficient in English, and become confident communicators (Board of Studies, 2009c, p. 20).  
**English Advanced**: Undertake challenging and higher-order thinking and develop critical and creative skills. Learn to use language in complex and subtle ways, develop appreciation for and understanding of aesthetic values and literary expression (Board of Studies, 2009c, p. 36) |
| Mathematics | General Mathematics (2 Unit) Extension 1 and 2 | Both the Mathematics General and the Mathematics 2/3 Unit Syllabuses make clear statements regarding the levels of prior knowledge required in order to understand the content of the Stage 6 courses. They also indicate their appropriateness in terms of future study or post-school pathways (Board of Studies, 1982, 2012b). |
| Languages | Beginners Continuers Extension | Each Language Course Syllabus gives a Description of Target Group (found in the Introduction section of the syllabus) which specifically states the |
Table 6. General summary of the requirements and/or outcomes of the English, Mathematics and Languages Stage 6 syllabuses.

Overall, the implication, based on the above comparison, is that the more challenging courses in all areas are designed for students with significant or specific prior knowledge and experience, or who are capable of understanding a higher level of complexity in a particular subject. These descriptions are not intended to reflect student intelligence or ability, but rather to indicate the level of academic rigour required to successfully complete the courses and understand the prescribed content. It gives students the opportunity to consider their capabilities, knowledge and experience in order to decide which course best suits their personal career or academic trajectory (particularly for Mathematics), or their present academic foundation (particularly in Language course selection). The subsequent course content is then appropriate for the overall level of complexity of the course, and not necessarily based on the hypothetical interests and previous experience of the student cohort.

Of all the Creative Arts in the New South Wales curriculum (which includes Dance, Drama and Visual Art), Music is the only subject that offers two different courses. Given the design of other subjects that offer
alternative courses, as well as the language and descriptions utilised in the relative syllabus documents, it can be logical to assume that one course is intended for beginners or the less formally trained (Music 1) and the other for more advanced or musically literate students (Music 2). This, then, raises the question of why each course is so distinctly focused on either popular music or art music? What does this then say about the legitimacy, or value, of either genre? In essence, these syllabuses are communicating that if you are a student of popular music, you must either be a beginner, or you are not capable of or interested in complex musical analysis and creation. If you are trained in the classical tradition, it means you must be a more accomplished performer, more experienced and knowledgeable, and capable of and interested in higher level aural analysis and composition. In the final analysis, such assumptions underlying the Stage 6 syllabuses can guide the ways many senior secondary music teachers determine what course is the most appropriate for their student cohort, particularly in schools where only one Music course is offered. In the light of the developments discussed in the literature review, particularly in the section on Musicology, these assumptions are outdated and faulty, and this aspect of the syllabuses requires revision.
CHAPTER FOUR

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter provides details concerning the methods employed in collecting and analysing the data for the study. Due to the investigative nature of the study, it was determined that a semi-structured interview process was the most appropriate form of data collection. Following their transcription, interviews were coded and analysed according to the initial, focused and axial coding procedures found in Charmaz (2006), with the data provided from the interview responses providing a basis for comparing the teachers’ approaches. Overall, the study utilised the methodology of grounded theory, in that the resulting concepts and theories were determined by the data collected. The following is a brief description of grounded theory and its suitability for use in this study, as well as an account of the process of data collection and the development and implementation of the coding processes.

Grounded Theory

This research topic is of significance to the teaching of music at a senior secondary level in NSW, Australia. As a result, a specific and targeted research design was required. This project utilised the qualitative methodology of grounded theory. According to Strauss and Corbin (1998), grounded theory is “theory that was derived from data, systematically gathered and analysed through the research process”. This data will in
turn “offer insight, enhance understanding and provide a meaningful guide to action” (p. 12). The selection of grounded theory as an approach ideally suits the investigative nature of this issue, as it allows for the formation of hypotheses after the data has been collected, and to identify the similarities and differences in pedagogical approaches in the field (Creswell, 2009). Grounded theory has also been used in other research contexts, as a means of generating new ideas and research in the area of music teacher experience and lesson planning (Niessen, 2008), and as a means to describe and develop tools to analyse historical musical performances (Mateos-Moreno & Alcaraz-Iborra, 2013). Essentially, it is a useful research method for areas that lack precedent or where the essential information required lies within the research data itself.

The data for this study were collected from interviews with teachers of senior secondary music courses in New South Wales, regarding the ways they teach aural analysis. According to Bogner (2009), professional knowledge, the knowledge of those active in the profession, can be treated as an expert insight, and the most effective method of extracting this knowledge is with “an open interview based on a topic-guide” (p. 31). This strategy allows the interviewee the opportunity to expand on their views and experiences.

The data collection process included documentary analysis of the Stage 6 Music 1 and Music 2 syllabuses, and the past HSC Aural Skills written exam
papers and related exam resources. This was undertaken in order to provide an understanding of the specific schooling culture and structure within which the participants were working. The syllabus and exam analysis is provided in Chapter 3. The interview data collection process concluded with a two stage analysis process: broad categorisation of the data based on the initial research questions, followed by microanalysis of the data (Strauss & Corbin, 1998), with initial, focused and axial coding (Charmaz, 2006) in order to produce a theory which has been grounded in the data.

**Participants**

This study aimed to use a purposeful sample of music teachers who had experience with teaching Stage 6 Music courses (Music 1 and/or Music 2), in order to best address the nature of the investigation (Cohen & Holliday, 1996). Ideally there was to be a wide range of teaching experience within the participants chosen. Participants were asked to partake in the study by means of a mail-out to schools across Sydney (see Appendix 1: Participant Recruitment Letter). Participation in the research was completely voluntary; participants were aware that they could choose to withdraw from the project at any time during the interview process.

This project aimed for a participant sample of ten to fifteen teachers, with the final sample comprising fourteen teachers. A similar methodology was used in Cox (1999), producing meaningful results, although he did use a
smaller sample of ten teachers and discussed general issues pertaining to music education, rather than specifically addressing the teaching of aural analysis. Countryman (2008) also used one-on-one interviews as part of her data collection process in order to determine effective teaching methods. These interviews produced meaningful insights into the current state of teacher’s methodologies and attitudes based on their experience in the field. In contrast, Button (2010) submitted a questionnaire to 26 British music teachers, asking them to rate 48 pre-conceived statements about effective teaching in music. His results showed that there are a variety of strategies teachers employ in their efforts to teach their students effectively, but Button himself acknowledges that the nature of data collection meant that the actual efficacy of the strategies employed could not be determined. This is also to be acknowledged with the present study – determination of the efficacy of the strategies and techniques used by the teachers is not the purpose of the study.

The study undertaken for this thesis aimed for a significant number of participants which, with a focus on educational approaches and techniques relating to a specific educational stage, aimed to produce a comprehensive view of commonalities and anomalies prevalent in current approaches to analytical listening.
Participant Profile

Fourteen teachers were interviewed for this project. Of these, seven were female and seven male. At the time of the interviews, five teachers were teaching a Music 1 class, three were teaching a Music 2 class and the remaining six taught a combined Music 1 and Music 2 class, as well as International Baccalaureate Music, Standard and Higher Levels. Four of the teachers were head teachers of Music or Creative Arts. One teacher was a deputy principal and was not teaching a senior secondary Music class in the year the interview took place.

Two teachers had been teaching Music for three years or less. The remaining twelve teachers had been teaching for more than ten years. One teacher had more than thirty years teaching experience. Of the fourteen participants, four of the teachers had only taught one course (Music 1) thus far in their teaching career. The other ten participants had all taught the Music 1 and Music 2 courses, and most had also taught the Music Extension course.

The teachers were employed at a variety of schools across New South Wales, both public and private, Catholic and independent, non-systemic Catholic schools, as well as schools that were secondary only, senior secondary only, and combined primary and secondary. Most of the teachers were also teaching Stages 4 and 5 (Years 7-10) Music classes, and at least one teacher was also teaching Stage 3 (Year 6). The final sample of participants is described in Table 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Years exp.</th>
<th>Course taught</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 Music 1 and 2</td>
<td>Private, K-12</td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35 Music 1 and 2</td>
<td>Private, K-12</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25 None current; both prior</td>
<td>Public, 7-12</td>
<td>Deputy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11 Music 1, IB Music</td>
<td>Private, K-12</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TT</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24 Music 2</td>
<td>Ind. Catholic, 7-12</td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>3 Music 1</td>
<td>Ind. Catholic, 7-12</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24 Music 2</td>
<td>Ind. Catholic, 7-12</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>15 Music 1 and 2, IB Music</td>
<td>Private, K-12</td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25 Music 2</td>
<td>Public, 7-12</td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>13 Music 1, IB Music</td>
<td>Private, K-12</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>2 Music 1</td>
<td>Catholic Boys, 7-12</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14 Music 1</td>
<td>Public, 11-12</td>
<td>Head teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8 Music 1</td>
<td>Public, 7-12</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>8 Music 1</td>
<td>Public, 7-12</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. The interviewed teachers. The table lists each teacher’s gender, years of experience in teaching Music, the Music course taught at the time of the interview, the type of school and the teacher's position.

**Interview and Data Collection Procedure**

As previously discussed, the implementation of interviews in this qualitative investigation allowed for the research questions to be addressed by drawing upon the expertise of the teachers involved in the
field, thus reflecting the changing nature of humans from subjects of study, to sources of information for study (Kvale, 1996). By their nature, the ability of interviews to capture multiple representations and interpretations of reality is of particular use for this project, given the potential range of individual approaches to the teaching of aural analysis (Bresler & Stake, 2006). Benefits of practitioner interviews include the ability for participants to provide illustrative historical and contextual information, thereby a far deeper investigation than a questionnaire, with the informality of a discussion to ensure the provision of appropriate data (Creswell, 2009). The use of a semi-structured interview approach provided the control of standard questioning, whilst also making allowances for areas of interest which may surface during the investigation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Once recruited, participants were informed of the general nature of what was to be discussed during the interview and were sent, by mail or by e-mail, a copy of the list of interview questions, a brief questionnaire, a participant information statement which they could keep, and a participant consent form (See Appendices 2, 3, 4 and 5). An appropriate and convenient time and venue was negotiated between the participant and researcher, with the understanding that the interview would take between half an hour and an hour to complete. All interviews were conducted at the work site of the participant, with most interviews taking
place inside their staffroom, meaning they were able to show the
interviewer any resources they may have referred to during the interview.

The interviews were semi-structured, that is, specific topics and questions
were used to frame and focus the interview, but participants were
encouraged to expand on answers and ideas in any way they wished.
Participants were asked to answer with specific reference to the syllabus
learning experience termed ‘Aural’, however the researcher also made
clear that reference to other learning experiences (Performance,
Composition and Musicology) was encouraged, particularly if the
participant was describing an integrated approach. This was partly
achieved by use of the word ‘listening’ instead of ‘Aural’ by the researcher,
as ‘listening’ implies a process which could occur in any type of musical
activity, whereas ‘Aural’ implies a more specific, syllabus defined process.

During the interview the participants were asked to describe and discuss
their approaches and techniques for the teaching of aural analysis and the
resources they utilised, as well as to reflect on how their practices might
have changed as they have gained experience in the field. The interview
questions were structured so that the participants first discuss their
teaching practice more broadly at first, and subsequently make reference
to more specific elements (see Appendix 3: Interview Questions). The
interview questions were designed to address the initial research
questions posed for the overall project. Thus, the interview was structured
in order to encourage responses from the participants regarding aspects of their approaches and techniques for teaching listening, the resources they use in their teaching, and the depth and breadth of their teaching experience. All interviews were audio recorded, and the researcher also made brief field notes. Participants were informed that they may choose to stop the interview at any time, and that their identity, as well as that of their school or any other persons mentioned would remain confidential, adhering to the ethical requirements of the University of Sydney’s Human Research Ethics Committee. Participants’ confidentiality has been maintained; each created his or her own pseudonym, which is represented by initials in the discussion of the data in the next chapter.

**Coding and Analysis**

Upon completion of the interviews, the recordings were transcribed and analysed in order to determine recurring themes and to compare and contrast each teacher’s experiences and ideas. According to Charmaz (2006), “Coding means we attach labels to segments of data that depict what each segment is about... Our analytic categories and the relationships we draw between them provide a conceptual handle on the studied experience” (p. 3). The transcribed interviews were subjected to a series of coding processes, which were created and refined as the codes revealed certain similarities, differences and relationships between how the participants described their approaches to the teaching of music listening.
Analysis of the data collected began with initial coding where overarching themes and recurring ideas were identified. In accordance with the research questions, these broad categories primarily centred on the following:

- Teaching approaches and techniques
- Resources
- Teaching experience in the field

During this initial coding process, it became clear that there were certain techniques and resources that were being frequently mentioned by the teachers as they spoke about the way in which they approached the teaching of listening. This led to the development of a coding system that aligned more with the list of code types described by Bogdan and Biklen (1992) or “focused coding” (Charmaz, 2006, pp. 57-58) that can include those based on setting and context, participant perspectives, activities, strategies and processes. Recoding of the interviews was undertaken in an effort to identify teacher responses relating to the following fields:

**HSC/Past Papers:** Using them for revision, or devising lessons based on the structure and requirements of the written Aural exam papers.

**Technology:** Several teachers mentioned different ways and reasons for using particular technology for listening lessons, such as Youtube, mp3s and transcription software.
Specific pieces of music: Initial analysis showed that there was no particular composer or piece of music that was consistently mentioned, however all teachers made reference to at least one composer or piece during the interviews.

Personal experience: Although the premise of the interview was that teachers were talking about how they themselves taught listening, in contrast with how they believed it should be taught, the teachers would occasionally make specific reference to elements of their teaching experience that were unique to them and influenced the pedagogical choices they made, such as the length of their teaching career, or how they utilised their instrument performance ability in the classroom.

Examples of formal and informal teaching practice: Interview responses were coded according to whether a participant’s teaching was more teacher directed or more student centred. This code eventually led to the development of a more comprehensive coding system and to the formation of the Systematic-Intuitive Continuum.

In analysing the interviews and utilising these codes, it became clear that the codes were too general and were not able to be applied uniformly. However, this secondary coding process did lead to the creation of a more comprehensive axial coding system, relating more specifically to one of the primary research questions regarding the approaches and techniques that teachers used with listening in the classroom. These codes were generated from the data and included techniques such as using
worksheets in listening lessons; focusing on a particular composer, piece, concept or terminology; how textbooks were utilised by teachers; and whether they approached listening as a specific lesson focus or integrated it with other syllabus learning experiences (See Appendix 6: Codes for a complete list). After complete coding of the interviews, graphs were generated to display the distribution and frequency of the various kinds of codes throughout each interview (See Appendix 7: Systematic and Intuitive Codes graphs).

These codes began to point to the idea that there were certain teachers who seemed to be more dependent on and committed to the knowledge that the syllabuses and exam structures set out, whereas others seemed more committed to the holistic development of the student musician, and saw the syllabus as a guide and the final HSC exam structure as a step in the educational process, rather than a means to structure lessons around and dictate knowledge acquisition. This was made evident by the way in which they spoke about their resources, their lesson structures and what knowledge they considered to be important and why.
CHAPTER FIVE
Results and Discussion

Introduction

This chapter analyses and discusses the data collected from the interviews, as well as providing consideration of further implications and recommendations for research. Two key participants will be briefly described in how their interview data was used to form the cornerstones for consideration of the overall data. The development of the Systematic–Intuitive Continuum, a unique system created by the author and devised from the analysis of the interview data within the context of the Stage 6 Music syllabuses, will be discussed, as well as how it can be considered from the perspectives of goal orientation theory (Dweck, 1986) and Legitimation Code Theory (Lamont and Maton, 2010). The participants and the researcher’s reasons for their placement on the continuum will be discussed, as well as the emergence of certain commonalities amongst the responses from the teachers, regarding specific influences on their approaches to the teaching of music listening. The chapter will conclude with a summary of the findings, a brief discussion of the limitations of the study, as well as recommendations for further research.
Development of the Systematic–Intuitive Teacher Continuum

During analysis of the interviews it became apparent that two of the participants were at almost polar opposites in terms of the way in which they spoke about their teaching practice and their understanding of Music education. These were JF and JO.

JF was a head teacher of Music in a K-12 private school. The first notable difference between JF and the other participants was her primary interest in detailing the different kinds of textbook resources for listening she used with her senior classes. These textbooks appeared to be the lifeblood of her teaching, informing everything from choice of music to use in class to entire programs, but chiefly she used them to assist her students in their understanding of the concepts as outlined in the NSW Music syllabuses. Descriptions of her lessons were similarly important to her, and in these she focused on the concepts, musical terminology and on preparing answers to HSC-style examination questions. At one point, she stated: “So if you do everything, if you want really good marks, just teach for the exam.” JF was a passionate teacher, and her lessons, resources and assessments were directed towards ensuring her students’ success in their HSC exam.

JO was a Music teacher, also in a K-12 private school, who taught students from years 7-12. In my interview JO provided long, descriptive answers, so that it was more than twice as long as the interviews with the other
participants. JO’s understanding of music teaching and learning was framed in terms that were quite different to that of the others teachers interviews: he concentrated not on concepts, nor on HSC, but rather on “frameworks”, and on broadening his students’ musical and aural horizons. He admitted to having some textbooks detailing the music concepts, but stated that he was “notorious for actually not using [them]”. His method of teaching was, in his word, “haphazard”, and the activities in his lessons ranged from listening to and figuring out a weird chord, or creating a class arrangement of Led Zeppelin’s Kashmir. He accepted musical and educational possibilities wherever he could find them—from his own record collection, to a Year 7 student excited about Skrillex, to music from around the world. His purpose as a teacher was to build musicians, broaden minds and to work with whoever came to him.

It was the dichotomy between the pedagogy of these two teachers that led me to the idea that the participants’ teaching approaches could be understood as forming a continuum. Those whose main focus was HSC exam success can be termed the more systematic teachers, and those whose main focus was the holistic development of the student musician, the more intuitive. This is not to imply that one approach is preferable to the other; rather, it is more a recognition of the extent to which teachers embrace the structures and terms of the system within which they work. For those who focused on the exam, the logic appears to be that the syllabus that dictates the terms of the examination is rigorous enough to
produce excellent student musicians. Similarly, those who focused more on preparing their students to become excellent musicians appeared to believe that such an approach would also improve their ability to achieve a high score on the HSC Music examination. It is clear from the way that both JF and JO spoke, that they were passionate and confident in their own teaching approaches and believed they could create successful music students, as well as student musicians.

The perspective of goal orientation theory usefully casts light on these teachers' divergent classroom approaches and the broad goals, that is, performance (exam success) and mastery (learning), as initially postulated by Dweck (1986), further clarified in Dweck (2000) and comprehensively measured in Midgley et al (1998). Performance focused goals relate to a specific external outcome such as an exam or formal assessment, and success is determined by a person's ability to achieve at a higher level than others. Mastery focused goals relate to increasing personal competence in a particular field and these goals are not necessarily fixed, as there is always more to learn and accomplish. A mastery learner is intrinsically motivated and her success is not affected by the achievements of those around her. A more comprehensive examination of mastery and performance goals can be found in Ames (1992), and a discussion and revision of certain aspects of the theory can be found in Harackiewicz et al (2002).
The fundamental differences between JF’s and JO’s approaches to teaching music listening could also be viewed from the perspective of Legitimation Code Theory, as postulated by Lamont and Maton (2010). Legitimation Code Theory (LCT) distinguishes four codes, which determine the ways a knowledge field or subject is understood by students. The four codes can be summarised as follows:

**Knowledge Code:** Possession of particular knowledge/skills/procedures is paramount.

**Knower Code:** The attributes of the ‘actor’—her talent, ability, taste—are most important.

**Elite Code:** Both Knowledge and Knower Codes are important—success is determined by specialist knowledge and being the right kind of knower.

**Relativist Code:** Neither knowledge nor personal attributes are important—anyone is able to do it (Lamont & Maton, 2010, pp. 66-67).

At the most elemental level, the approaches to teaching described by JF and JO could be classified as Knowledge- and Knower-oriented, respectively. JF consistently spoke about the importance of musical knowledge in her teaching—the resources she used to help her explain and describe the knowledge, the fundamental terminology, and how she encouraged her students to better communicate their knowledge, in both oral and written practice. JO was more focused on the students—the
knowers—and how he could teach them to become better knowers and musicians.

After considering and analysing the coded data from the interviews, the ends or boundaries of the continuum were defined in the following ways, as described in Table 8.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Systematic</th>
<th>Intuitive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogy</td>
<td>Rational and teacher-centred. The teacher functions as the expert, determining what needs to be learnt, by what means and from what resources. Students rely predominantly on the teacher’s expertise.</td>
<td>Experiential and student-centred. The teacher acts as a guide, providing students with opportunities to discover knowledge through exploration and experience with music.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td>Works from concept-to-music. Knowledge acquisition begins with the concepts or terminology to be learnt, and moves towards experiencing these ideas in actual music.</td>
<td>Works from music-to-concept. Knowledge acquisition begins with the experience of music, from which musical concepts are distilled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC Exam structure</td>
<td>Central to all aspects of Music teaching, from lesson structure and design through to entire teaching schemes/units.</td>
<td>Serves as an element of the students’ overall musical development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Selected in order to illustrate and conform to syllabus principles and concepts. Seen as a resource – static and definable.</td>
<td>Selected for its intrinsic properties and cultural worth. Seen as an art form – fluid and subjective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syllabus</td>
<td>Teaching to the syllabus is critical for positive educational outcomes.</td>
<td>The syllabus serves as a framework; experiencing music holistically is primary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textbooks</td>
<td>An important part of music study.</td>
<td>A useful resource for confirmation of musical ideas/discoveries.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8. Summary definitions of the Systematic and Intuitive teacher-types.

From the interview data collected, each teacher-participant was placed along a continuum according to whether they were more systematic or
more intuitive. This was determined according to the frequency and quality of the following kinds of references within the interview data:

1. The prominence of references to the HSC examination in their teaching (and the kinds of ideas surrounding the place of the examination in their teaching).

2. The prominence of references to the syllabus in their teaching (and again, the kinds of references).

3. The perception of each regarding her or his role or place in the classroom.

4. Each teacher-participant’s perception of the student’s role/place in the classroom knowledge transaction.

5. The way each participant described how music featured in activities in their classroom; that is, whether is it employed more to illustrate principles or to be experienced for its intrinsic qualities.

6. The prominence each accorded textbooks and other analytical resources in their teaching.

It should be emphasised that neither JF nor JO fit one or other end of the continuum neatly. Although it is clear that JF’s teaching focuses on exam success, she still sees the importance of understanding music well beyond the concepts, and tries to incorporate listening practice into instrumental
performance lessons, a practice that moves beyond the scope of the Aural Skills exam.

JF: [Describing a lesson where the students were analysing *Friday on My Mind* by The Easybeats] So we play it together and I just talk about things, I say, “Do you notice how the verse is in the minor key and then it talks about [how] we’re going to have fun in the city on the weekend, it’s in a major key? That’s called word painting. So we just have a bit of a discussion about it, and I think it’s a little bit more accessible that way because they’re less threatened when they’re playing than when they’re sitting and you’ve taken away the [notated] music and they’ve got to come up with some answers on paper and there’s nothing there [from which to work].

And while JO would only refer to the concepts in “scare quotes”, he also acknowledged their relevance in the HSC Music courses and endeavoured to incorporate more traditional musical notation and terminology into his lessons, even if it was by stealth, as it were.

JO: So I tend to present those things as... Here’s a helpful framework that you can use, and the Board of Studies expects you in New South Wales to use these terms, but what they actually mean is... and some people call them elements of music, and some people call them parameters of music and some people don’t even give them labels... What people do intuitively
and how they communicate intuitively about music is actually not that
different to how you communicate formally about music, just using
different jargon...

From these interview excerpts, it can be seen that JF can also teach
through practical performance immersion and JO believes in the necessity
of a theoretical language. However, the way JF quite tightly controls and
guides the learning process can also be observed, and further, that JO
implies that formal and colloquial terminology are equally legitimate
(which may in reality be the case, not however in formal examination
terms).
Systematic–Intuitive Continuum
For Teachers of Music Listening

Figure 1. A graphic depiction of the Systematic-Intuitive Continuum, and where each participant could be placed, determined from coding and interview data analysis.

The graphic seeks to demonstrate that while there are ‘limits’ by according to which approaches to the teaching of music listening can be aligned, none of the teachers interviewed could be confidently placed in either category, including the teachers who were identified as exemplifying the outside limits of the continuum. The teachers have been placed along a continuum of two opposing gradients, an indication that they more frequently utilise approaches that are relevant to one side of the continuum, yet not to the exclusion of the other side.
The Teachers

The following section contains descriptions of the teacher participants for this study. The teachers are listed in order of their placement on the Systematic-Intuitive Continuum. It begins with MM, who was the most difficult to place, followed by JF and so on to JO. I felt it important to provide detail in order to clarify the placement of each teacher on this continuum. Although the continuum assists in elucidating how Systematic or Intuitive each teacher’s approaches to music listening are, it is important to consider these approaches within the broader context of the interview data.

MM

MM is a deputy principal, and at the time of the interview was not teaching a senior secondary Music class, although he had done so previously. The way in which he spoke about his Music teaching tended to be hypothetical, and his answers focused more on the student and how listening integrates into the overall context of the Music experience. Hence, the decision of where to place him in relation to the Systematic or Intuitive band presented difficulties. For example, when asked about whether his approach to Music teaching focused more on the syllabus or on the student, he answered, in essence, both:
MM: Well, there are syllabus demands, so you have to draw upon the outcomes that you’re looking at from there and at times they’re going to talk about topic based material, or at least larger ideas that fit into the topic idea. And other times, they also in a syllabus will outline the skills that you’re trying to develop within students so, one way or other you’ve probably got to touch on both.

During the interview, MM spoke of teaching the concepts of music, focusing on particular aural skills and the difficulty teachers have in achieving balance between the time allocated for lessons and the content to be taught and learned. However, MM did not commit to any particular approach, except that he advocated for integrating the learning experiences, saying, “It’s very hard to divorce listening from just about anything else you do, so in a sense a listening lesson really crosses the great divide... It’s almost impossible in music to move forward in any particular area [if] it’s not founded upon particularly good listening skills. So it’s a bit hard to describe just a listening lesson.” In the end, I decided to place him in the centre of the Systematic-Intuitive Continuum.

JF

JF’s codes were almost all clearly in the Systematic category. Based on the codes and the content of the interview, her main focus is on using textbooks as a resource—she spoke for almost fifteen minutes about these. In her interview she immediately began to talk about how and why
she used them, even before I asked the first question, and she went into much detail about which textbooks are the most useful and what their specific purpose was in the classroom. JF was also one of the only teachers who spoke about basing an entire program on a textbook. See Appendix 7 for websites and brief descriptions of textbooks mentioned by teachers.

JF: (About *Literacy Works: Music Aural Concepts* (Weekes, n.d.)) I tell the kids, ‘This is their music bible.”

(About *Fortissimo!* (Bennett, 1996)) If I give the kids an assessment and they really didn't get Duration or Texture, I’d come back to this and think, what can I play out of this that will solidify it for them?

(About *Musical Concepts: Music 1 Aural Skills* (Galettis, 2009)) I think the Galettis book is better for the kids as a take-home thing because it’s got those little sound samples and in the front of those books there’s a code, when you buy that textbook, and the kids enter that in [on the website]. So they can go home and go, “Oh, I don’t know what you were talking about with cross rhythms”, and they can download that sound sample and they can hear it.

Terminology was also a major focus in her teaching. Again, JF used the textbooks as a resource to help her students learn and understand the musical vocabulary of the course. In discussing the text *Fortissimo*, JF stated: “So it’s got examples of all… flutter tonguing and that sort of thing, so the kids can hear it, and it’s got this [glossary] which is great for Music 2
to give them that terminology." The terminology she spoke about is always very much grounded in the concept categories—duration, pitch, texture and so forth. She also particularly utilised textbooks that provide listening examples of the musical elements they discussed, either via an accompanying CD or links to online sound file databases. Overall, it seems that, when teaching concept terminology, she preferred to use excerpts with the features specifically identified, as opposed to listening to and analysing entire pieces or works. JF: “In terms of listening lessons, the best lessons are ones where you have some sort of summary sheet that they can focus on, like that. They have a couple of recordings and a couple of live demonstrations.” This means that her lessons were structured with the music concepts in mind, and selection of the appropriate music followed. As an experienced teacher with over twenty years in senior secondary Music, she was also able to use her own performance skills to improvise musical examples when teaching students about specific musical elements.

JF: So I did this thing, last lesson with them, where I handed out this sheet... I talked through things like melodic contour... I tried to explain things like a static melody and a step-wise melody and things like that. So for static melody, off the top of my head, Everything’s Alright out of Jesus Christ Superstar. So I can thump that out on a piano and talk about motif, you know, the Pink Panther motif, or the Jaws motif. So I just demonstrate that on the piano. Register—I was talking about register
and I was saying, register, it affects tone colour, but when you talk about pitch you've got to talk about the register, where it is, and you know that silly Mozart? (sings opening of *Sonata in C Major*) So I played that where you should play it, and then I went to the bottom of the piano and played it, and it sounded all *blublu*blublu*bawbaw*. And they looked at me and I said that register's really important, you need to talk about that. But... I've been teaching a long time so I can do those sort of things.

Aside from her previously mentioned statements about teaching to the exam, it is clear that the way in which JF teaches listening was primarily driven by syllabus categories and by what the HSC final examination measures. She admits to using past papers and exam questions more regularly than she herself would think: “I only use past exams for an assessment, so I’d find an exam question that I’d pull out for an assessment, or in preparation for their HSC or their Trial as revision. I don’t actually normally do that. I have been doing it with this year's Year 11 Music 2—so I’ve just been picking a Music 2 Preliminary Exam question so they can see it’s relevant for them. I use it for revision.” She revealed this towards the end of the interview, after she had spoken about using specific textbooks because they included HSC-style Aural questions, as well as having combined Music 1 and Music 2 lessons where she would choose an Aural question for them to complete that would be suitable for both courses. It is possible that she is more exam focused than she herself realises.
PT

In terms of Systematic code frequency, PT was the teacher most similar to JF. She said in her interview, “... Being a senior campus, we’re really always thinking very consciously [about] how does this affect what they need to do for the HSC.” PT's listening lessons revolved around the music concepts, and she described creating separate booklets for each concept, having a section of the walls in her music room devoted to a concept, and teaching lessons centred on a single concept.

PT: All around the walls of the room I’ve set up vocabulary posters and divided them into the six concepts, so one wall is all pitch, one wall is duration—there’s zones around the room. So if, say, we’re doing pitch, I’ll say, “Ok kids, pitch, let’s all look at the pitch wall. Let’s refresh ourselves, what are all these things for pitch?” And I try to always refer to that basic vocabulary that I want them to use.

Terminology was another focus in her listening lessons, ensuring that students could understand the language, and that they were able to identify what they heard and could write clearly and concisely, using appropriate musical vocabulary.

PT: One of the reasons we have the booklet system was to try and accommodate problems with vocabulary and learning, so we've done a booklet on each of the concepts, just focusing on vocabulary, and we've
got a gazillion copies of those, all colour coded and run off for the kids and they can access those at any time and take them and keep them... I do vocabulary practice sheets, but also, again, having up around the walls in my room all the terms on there. But also for the kids, the visual learners, the visual clues, each one of those terminology posters, they’re all on A4 paper and they’re colour coded according to the concepts.

Like JF, PT spoke about demonstrating (musically or dramatically) different concepts to the students, to help clarify their knowledge with humour: “I demonstrate it and then they laugh at me and then we discuss it some more... I’ve done my vocal impressions of bassoons and things and they get it. I guess, also having a drama background I’m not shy about looking rather silly.” Discussions feature prominently in the way she describes her lessons: “I teach it [listening] as a discussion style; I want them to tell me, not me to tell them... a typical listening lesson has just got lots of discussion, contrasting examples, and always trying to bring them back to the correct vocabulary.”

Of the exam-focused techniques, the ones she spoke most often about centred on utilising past HSC exam papers or creating exam-style questions: “The past papers. We use those a lot. Because in Music 1 the exam style is so highly structured, we get them into the habit of being able to answer within those short time frames really quickly.” Exam strategies seem to be a key part of her approach to listening—not just teaching the
students how to listen, what to listen for and how to communicate about it, but how to perform well in an Aural Skills exam situation. "There's no point in teaching them habits that aren’t going to be useful for sitting that exam." This includes answering within the specific time frame, scaffolding practice answers to suit the BOSTES criteria and covering all components of a hypothetical question. PT: “The good thing with listening is it may be a six mark answer but there might be eight possible things that they can pick up. So they can pick up marks in a wide range of areas that could cover the question.”

This intense focus on the examination is interesting in comparison with other comments PT made, regarding what inspires her and her personal opinion of the Music 1 Aural Skills exam. When asked about what inspired her teaching, PT spoke about her own high school music teacher and how he taught music: “Even though he had all the theoretical knowledge, it was more about how the music made you feel, did you understand the music, could you engage with it, and then the theory became the support for that.” The importance this teacher placed on the personal connection with music does not seem to be explicitly reflected in the way PT describes her own teaching. More tellingly, at the end of the interview I asked her if she had anything to add, and she made these comments about the Music 1 Aural Skills exam:
PT: The fact that they do sit an exam at the end where they have to write in these incredibly short, fast bursts to a piece of music that they've never heard or studied before, and there’s actually nothing that tests their theoretical knowledge... It just doesn’t seem to be developing good musicians in the Music 1 course. That exam, to me, is not a realistic skill. In the Music 1 course, unless they choose research or composition, they don’t get an opportunity to show deep knowledge in that exam. They’re trying to listen and process and write and then they’ve got a thirty second break and then a one minute break and then a two, where on earth does anybody ever actually do that in the real world? And they [Music 2 students] have scores to follow. That’s so much easier than trying to listen to music that’s just hanging in the air and picking out elements, and that’s also what makes listening hard for Music 1 kids. Music 2, they’ve always got a score, they can see what they’re listening to. Even if you’re a Music 1 kid and your music reading skills aren’t great, if you’ve got something visual on the page, you’ve got a chance. So that’s my gripe.

It is clear from this statement that PT does not believe that the Music 1 HSC Aural Skills exam is an effective measure of accumulated knowledge across the course, yet all of her descriptions of lessons and how she teaches are completely committed to what the exam demands. The logic, as previously expressed, of teaching Intuitively to produce good musicians who would then be able to successfully pass an exam may then not be
valid, if the exam itself is not an effective measure of musicianship, or if the
teacher does not believe it is. Given that PT is at a senior secondary school,
perhaps her choice has been to either teach and develop student
musicians and enhance their listening skills in a more natural, realistic
way, or to disregard her belief in the efficacy of the current system and
commit to a Systematic approach, to fall in line with the overall school
environment and aim for exam success. Even her students have absorbed
this line of thinking: “I get to a point with Year 12, I’m like, OK, Tuesday’s
our theory/aural lesson. I said to them, ‘What do you want guys?’ They
said, ‘We want to do more past papers, we want exam strategies.’” It seems
that, in such an environment, a Systematic approach is inevitable.

**EB**

For EB, her range of techniques was broader than JF’s, but still mainly
Systematic in focus. She most frequently spoke about the use of musical
scores in her lessons (for both Music 1 and Music 2, even though the Music
1 Aural Skills exam does not require score reading), and how she uses
these as a visual guide to help her students understand the concepts of
texture and structure, as well as identifying patterns or melodic and
harmonic contour. EB encourages students to imagine what the music
might look like if or when written as a score, to help make an aesthetic
learning connection.
EB: I do score reading with them, and even the ones that don’t really read music still find it useful... they seem to think it is... just to see. And I say, “Look, can you hear that layer?” And you’ll look at the double basses and they’re doing an ostinato or whatever they’re doing and they can actually see it. I’m just hoping then that when they’re listening, then they can think, OK, yes, separate the layers as they do on a score... I think score reading is really valuable.

EB used textbooks as a teaching resource, but more to complement a program rather than to base an entire unit on a textbook chapter. She used textbooks mainly as a means of teaching the concepts with more depth, as well as going through the sample HSC questions that featured in some of the textbooks. Of the book *Musical Concepts: Music 1 Aural Skills*, she stated: “So look, tonality, so we talk about diatonic scales and all the rest of it and we look at all of that, which is a bit boring. But we try and match it up with pieces and that sort of a thing, so that they’re hearing it.” EB does not seem to use textbooks because the course demands it; it appears to be more about staying on a par with senior secondary Music teachers across New South Wales. EB: “When I first started teaching this, I didn’t know that there were textbooks and I certainly didn’t have any at my first school, so the other thing is that if there are textbooks, well, you better be using them to be the same as everybody else.”
EB also spoke about encouraging in her students’ informal listening practices, either in ensemble rehearsals at school or in their own time. She believed that exposure to a wide range of musical styles enabled a student to perform better in an exam where they are unable to predict what they will have to listen to and analyse.

EB: But look, with the listening business, they can do it any time, they don’t only have to do it when they’re in Music, every time they have their iPod in their ear, which is all the time, they should be doing it. That’s what I tell them... I mean, all the kids that come to orchestra and hear all the instruments and go to bands and everything around the place are streets ahead... Some kids have just had such a broad listening experience, they might not know any terminology but if they’ve got that broad listening experience, it’s at their fingertips.

This “broad listening experience” was something that she also provided for her students in the classroom. The historical development of music was something EB considered to be of fundamental importance: “Another thing I think is really the crux of the matter is that all of it [what you listen to] is dependent on what scales and things that you base the music on and the harmonic structure and that’s what’s really developed over the years.” The way EB tried to teach this was to start with Medieval music, in both Music 1 and Music 2, and listen to how music gradually developed, harmonically and structurally, through to the 21st Century. EB was also
one of the only teachers who spoke specifically about identifying the
differences between Western and non-Western tonal traditions. The
historical part of the curriculum she believes should be taught in various
ways:

EB: I start off at the very beginning because I just want them to realise
that what they’re listening to now has developed over the years. So we
start off with just a single line chant and we look at how harmonies
started developing, only very briefly, but just to point out that...

Everything develops. And so we look at the Baroque period just briefly,
and I make them do score reading and all things with it, so they’ve just
got some idea of the development. So that’s basically Course 1. In Course
2 I do start off with the Baroque period because you [just] do, but again I
talk about how it’s our Western system not Eastern music or any other
culture and it is... what we’re listening to is only based on our culture,
not everywhere, and then that can get Course 1 into other topics of
course, when they want to do Music of Another Culture and they can get
to other things as well. So we listen to Gregorian chant and then we listen
to organum and all that sort of thing... and we do try and perform things
from them as well, not all the time, it depends... and sing the parts, the
four part harmony and stuff so they get the idea. So we try perform
things but we more listen to the development.
The importance to EB of a broad listening experience reveals that there are Intuitive elements to her teaching, but overall her teaching appears to conform to a more Systematic, syllabus-based approach.

**JS**

JS had been teaching for three years, with experience of only teaching the Music 1 course. She was another teacher who relied on textbooks and found them to be a useful resource, for studying the Concepts, for appropriate musical examples to use in class, and for programming units.

**JS: (About Musical Concepts: Music 1 Aural Skills)** It’s got sound bites, CDs, and there’s an e-book as well and I let the kids have a copy of that. They can then study and revise things at home, and it has mind maps for everything that goes into, say, tone colour. It’s very thorough, and once I go through that, then they have an anchor of what to listen for. So it helps a lot.

JS’s lessons appeared to be heavily music concept based, and her teaching techniques centred on how to use the concept terminology appropriately as well as how to listen for specific concepts: “I had a class that’s my current Year 12, [and] last year they just did not get it, regarding being able to hear a piece of music and be able to talk about tone colour, until I took them through and said, ‘These are the components of dealing with tone colour,’ and I had to really do a ‘chalk and talk’ kind of thing, using
sound bites, the music…” JS found the BOSTES past paper and Marking Centre resources to be particularly useful in determining ideal exam responses, which in turn would reflect “good listening skills”. She explained, “So when I do an aural skills thing, like I might take a past paper and say, ‘Let’s have a go at that.’ The trials always have the recommended response and so I’ll say, ‘OK, let’s just see what’s been diagnosed as being a good response and what is a really thorough listening.’ And that’s how they start to get a handle of good listening skills.”

JS was one of two teachers who spoke about teaching individual, one-on-one listening lessons with students, and how such lessons developed these students’ musical understanding and built their confidence in classroom discussion.

JS: If you can get a couple of sessions with the one-on-one thing and you can tell, the lightbulb, they go, “Oh… I see that.” And then the next time you have class with them there, I will say, “Now could you hear that?” Because we’ve established in the one-on-one where I know they’ve got it, then I’ll get a genuine answer, not just a polite one.

JS was one of the teachers who spoke about using technology, in the classroom and informally. She would encourage students to access past papers by making them available to students via a Cloud-type system, meaning students could log in to a particular school-created intranet site.
containing music resources and download past papers and HSC-style questions. JS also encouraged informal listening practice by having students analyse Youtube videos and emailing her with responses:

JS: I’ll say to them, “Now I want you to go home and I want you to go on the internet, find a Youtube clip and send me an analysis of that. So, go to your mum and dad’s stuff if you want, or deliberately look up film scores and give me a minute and a half, two minute excerpt and tell me what concepts you’re going to be analysing and email it to me... just hand me anything, anything that you like to listen to, I don’t care what it is, and let’s go through it and talk about it”.

In this way, JS was trying to connect informal listening and online practice with the classroom. By widening the stylistic range of music to “anything you like to listen to”, as opposed to music that fit into a particular syllabus topic, it put the onus on students to connect what they learnt in the classroom to what they chose to listen to personally. JS is a teacher who clearly considers individual musical development to be of some importance, however with an overall focus on HSC exam papers, questions and concepts. Her approach could be considered predominantly Systematic.
AA

AA was the least experienced participant, having only been teaching for two years at the time of the interview. These two years had been spent teaching Music at a Catholic Boys secondary School with a high EAL/D (English as an Additional Language/Dialect) and LBOTE (Language Background Other Than English) population. There seemed to be some indecision over what AA considered to be an ideal approach to listening, and how she taught it. When asked about whether she had specific listening lessons or whether she preferred to integrate analytical listening with other learning experiences, she provided the following example of a hypothetical ideal lesson:

AA: So you can say, this is binary form, here’s an example, here’s what it is, have a listen, can you identify it, fantastic, now I want you to go create something in binary form and come back and show me so that I know [you understand]. So in a sense you’ve got a listening task and a composition task, because they’re being asked to create something and a performance task because they have to show the class, in one lesson... I’ve found it works better to try and incorporate stuff as much as I can.

However, for the majority of the interview she spoke about the importance of teaching her students basic musical vocabulary, and described listening lessons focused on identifying and understanding a particular musical element, and working out how to write concisely to communicate their
ideas. This is due to the knowledge and experience of the students that she is teaching.

AA: It has to be really flexible because, especially with the type of students we have, a lot of them are not exposed to a broad continuum of music, and they’re very often very narrow and very limited in terms of their formal music education. The majority of them have never had music lessons. So you’re spending a lot of time imparting some really basic knowledge in the first term and half.

It appeared that the integrated approach was what AA aimed for, yet the literacy demands of the HSC exam meant more emphasis needed to be placed on written communication of the music concepts. During the interview, AA described activities that involved comparative listening for the sake of identifying and articulating particular musical elements, rote learning musical terms and discussions filled with closed-response questions.

AA: One of the key things that we are really working on at the moment is getting them to not only recognise things but getting them to articulate what it is that they recognise, because they struggle so very much... Even though they have the content knowledge, like they know the instrumentation, they know particular nuances of the phrase that they could put down, but they don’t [do it].
AA explained that, in the two years that she had been teaching at the school, she had narrowed the scope of her musicological and music context teaching to focusing on only what they needed to know “to get through [the exam] and survive.” So for AA, being a Systematic teacher is not necessarily a question of personal preference, but of time and necessity. She is working with students who not only have less formal musical experience than the broader student population, but have the added difficulty of being educated in a system where their listening ability is evaluated in tandem with how well they can communicate using written English. This means AA would need to tailor listening lessons to both the language of the exam (the concepts) while also incorporating general musical terminology, leaving her little choice but to commit to a Systematic approach.

**BB, BS and SS**

BB, BS and SS were difficult to place on the Continuum. Each participant taught at a different school; however, due to proximal convenience, BS and SS were interviewed together. All three teachers, overall, had exam success in sight, however in the way they spoke about their teaching it was not as obvious. It appeared that they developed their teaching methods to suit the syllabus and the exam, but also consciously endeavoured to utilise intuitive practice whenever possible.
BB spoke about the trust his students had in him as a musician and how he utilised that for all aspects of his music teaching, whether encouraging students to listen to music that he knows is worthwhile, or in his choice of pieces for formal, classroom study:

BB: So if I’m presenting something new, even if they think it’s crap (and I have to say rarely they think it’s crap—they mostly think it’s interesting or bizarre rather than crap) ... They understand that I’m showing them this for a reason, and usually it must be a good reason because hopefully they think I’m a fairly decent musician, or I can discern what’s good music so they’ll take it on board.

BB’s main approach to listening was via particular pieces of music or specific composers, with concept analysis being of secondary importance: “We pick something because of its importance in the historical perspective and then say, what concepts are the best things to pull out of that?” The way BB described his teaching, it seemed he was able to use what was important to him as a musician, a performer, and a listener, and translate that into lessons that were engaging for the students and would fit with the syllabus requirements.

BB: In terms of mainstream [music] probably my one that I always do without fail is Rite of Spring by Stravinsky... Everyone talks about [it] as being probably the most important piece of the 20th century, so why is it
like that? I have large scores that we go through, we all sit down and listen to the entire thing. I try and embellish it a little bit by playing bits of a DVD that has the ballet, because it is a ballet, so they get a visual concept of what's going on, rather than just an aural one. I also have, in those DVDs, there's analytical parts where they talk about how the folk music was used, where the thematic material was poached from and how it was changed and all that sort of stuff. So [resource-wise] you try and take as much as you can from everywhere and just shove it all together and say here it is and make sense of it.

BS was another teacher whose techniques centred on the understanding and use of terminology; he would try as much as possible to make vocabulary acquisition a gradual, organic process. This was mostly by informal discussion, asking a student to justify an opinion about a piece using musical terminology, or generally doing oral analysis of the music they were studying, and then gradually moving toward formal, written analysis as the students progressed through Stage 6. “I try to get them to realise that they all have the ability to listen to music, it’s [more a question of] whether they can write it down using English and whether they [can] communicate it, so I tend to make it more verbal discussions at first before they start writing down aural responses using big fancy words.”

Like EB, BS also encouraged students to listen broadly, as he himself does: “I can’t teach something that I can’t do myself, so I just have to keep
listening and discovering new things.” He also felt his approach to listening had changed over the years, “The only thing that’s really changed is just getting them to learn how to listen in different ways, and not based on just sitting at their desks and now I’m going to press play and listen to things.”

SS also said that his approach to listening had changed: “[Rather than] just basing it on exams... more of a musician’s point of view, where you actually have to sit in an ensemble where you listen to other people playing and the groups around you, understand their role...” SS spoke of experimenting with different kinds of listening lessons, where individually, students analyse a piece according to music concepts and then have to create a single whole-class answer. Alternatively, students listen to music in the dark: “I put them in the dark, because it takes away every single sense except for their hearing... or they'll sit there and they'll shut their eyes, they're actually starting to do that now, they’ll close their eyes and listen.”

SS also spoke of combining listening with performing and composition so as to more deeply embed the understanding of a genre or more complex idea. “There’s other lessons where you are doing compositions so you’ve got to incorporate listening and performing because you want to get into the idea of what style they’re writing in and performing in.” Both SS and BS acknowledged their presentation of listening lessons designed to
maximise the possibility of exam success; these however appeared to be the exception rather than the rule.

SS: It’s a combination. Because I’ll have, depending on what’s coming... if they’ve got an assessment task that is their Aural exam then obviously the lesson is going to be specifically on the concepts and their listening. So yeah, it depends.

BS: There are times where I’ll be, like, this lesson, this 50 minute lesson we’re just doing some Aural based questions, or we’re just going to focus on this... [but other times it’s something else].

These interview excerpts reveal that BB, BS and SS are teachers who are dedicated to educating students in a way that keeps them on track to perform successfully in the HSC examination, without necessarily compromising their own—or their students’—beliefs about a meaningful music education. This sense is best conveyed in the way BS and SS described how they manipulate the syllabus topic requirements to suit the musical choices of their students, which allowed them to have the most freedom and flexibility.

BS: Yeah, we encourage [them to] pick a topic that’s very broad, so the three topics that they have for the HSC overlap like you wouldn’t believe, purely for that purpose of... they don’t really care. As long as they get to
play their piece, and if they change their piece they’re still covered, they can fit it under anything. So we design it for the game of the HSC...

SS: Not for interest. (BS laughs)

TT

Initially I placed TT in the middle of the Systematic continuum section. She is a Head Teacher of Creative and Performing Arts, and initial analysis of her interview showed she frequently mentioned the music concepts and their importance in listening lessons: “… there’s always concepts, you cannot do it with studying the concepts, you just can’t get away with it.” However, full coding of the data for both Systematic and Intuitive practices revealed that she was a teacher who utilises a broad range of approaches and techniques in the classroom, and who is passionate about providing a holistic music education for her students.

In describing her lessons, TT mentions integrating listening with the other syllabus learning experiences as if it is the most logical way to teach:

TT: Because composition is going to follow straight after and they have to always compose in that style, I always make them aware when we’re listening, when you come to compose, this is the technique that you need to incorporate into your [composition]. So I interrelate mine a lot, or I try as hard as I can to interrelate them.
TT employs a wide variety of musical resources, including a DVD music series of Howard Goodall’s *Big Bangs*, the Australian Music Centre teaching kits, and texts such as *In Tune With Music* (Allen & Dorricott, 1991) and *The Norton Scores* (Forney, 2011). She also allows students to direct their own listening and learning, particularly utilising a music eLearning website:

TT: There’s a lot of aural stuff, I use that with my classes, because they can access it at home. There’s listening stuff in there but there’s a lot of explanation of the different periods and things like that. They have singing, they have rhythm dictation, melodic dictation, things like that which are really good. Do the kids do it? Not all of them. But I give it to them.

Being a Music 2 teacher, TT utilises score reading in her lessons, however she alternates between using the score as a stimulus and as confirmation of knowledge.

TT: Especially by the time they get to Year 12, rather than them looking at a score I get them to listen to it first. I like them to listen to it about two or three times and write down things that they hear, then we go back and look at the score and it’s amazing how the kids actually, aurally, do that really well. But then they have to formalise it more by looking at the
score and saying, “What did I hear? I've written that down, where is it here [in the score] and what does it mean?”

TT creates arrangements of the pieces they study for the class to play together: “So they're aware when they're performing it, what they were doing when they were listening and then that makes them aware so when they come to compose, they can incorporate.” She also particularly encourages students to develop their own personal listening awareness, whether it be at home or during ensemble rehearsals and performance: “Even in orchestra, I will ask the kids questions about what we do in class, you know, Italian terms, what key is that in, what does ‘marcato’ mean, things like that.”

Although the music concepts are a prominent feature of her listening lessons, they are taught within the context of a holistic musical environment, with co-curricular music activities considered as important as classroom content: “I don’t know if I would teach music without all that co-curricular stuff, that’s what keeps our department alive… if we didn’t have all this co-curricular stuff, us as teachers and the students, I just don’t think there’d be that energy. There’s no purpose, is there?” From the way in which TT describes her resources and her teaching techniques, it is clear that she endeavours to teach the music concepts within a historical, cultural and structural context, and encourages students to develop both their practical and technical musical skills. It was this passion for the
holistic musical education of her students that led me to place TT on the Intuitive side of the Continuum.

**NS**

NS was an interesting teacher, and it was her interview that led me to consider the non-musical factors that could influence the way a person teaches. From the way NS spoke about how she taught listening, it appeared that she was an Intuitive teacher in a Systematic environment. She spoke about having to justify to the students what she was teaching them: “I often jump between ‘this is interesting’, ‘this is interesting and could increase your marks’ and ‘you just need to know this to be a good musician—it doesn’t matter whether you need to know it for exams’. I guess I often use that sort of language.”

NS mentioned using a wide range of resources, both texts and technology, in her teaching. These include resources that were purely music concept focused, including the table of aural concepts and sub-concepts found on the Charles Sturt University HSC website (Owens, n.d.):“I make the kids learn the prompts so that they can just spew it out in an exam.” Other key resources included *The History of Music* (Bennett, 1987), a book first published in 1982 that has additional listening excerpts on cassette, and Youtube.
NS: Youtube's very helpful when you go off on a tangent and you didn’t realise you were going to do that... So we might be going back to *The Messiah* again and we might go on a tangent of how Vivaldi is different to Handel. Oh, I'll quickly show you this Vivaldi piece and... you'll go off on tangents.

After describing the kinds of resources she used, I asked NS about her most engaging method of teaching listening. She showed me a series of PowerPoint presentations she had created about sound sources, including pictures and audio of familiar and unfamiliar instruments. NS would use this as a stimulus for talking about anything from the Hornbostel-Sachs instrument classification system, instrumental playing techniques to recognising instruments and musical styles by their sound. The concepts were not mentioned at all. NS talked about what the students found interesting about it:

NS: What I’m trying to teach is that even if you don’t know what the instruments are, you can describe how the sound is made and how the sound is used... So I guess it’s teaching them strategies to be able to analyse and identify things, even if you don’t know the name of them. It’s still an intelligent thought process that you can apply. And the kids are intrigued by these! They like to think that they can invent things as well, so I think that they’re quite intrigued that people have gone out and tried
to create different instruments. Maybe it’s the visual thing. The visual aspect of seeing how the sounds are produced.

However, soon after speaking at length about this presentation, she acknowledged that even though this was an example of an engaging lesson for her and the students, at her school the students and teaching environment are ultimately geared towards successful exam performance.

NS: I’ll often say, I’ve never used this as a practising musician but you can pick up two marks if you do, because you can use it in your exam. I’ve found probably the most successful way to increase exam performance is to do a practice question and give kids feedback in front of each other. Like, mark it for them in front of them. I find that brings their answers up really quickly because they can just see how the examiner is marking, I guess. But that’s not engaging. But, because they want to get a good mark, they engage, because at our school the kids are really conscientious, but in my mind that’s not engaging.

This dichotomy between what could aid a student’s musicianship and what could aid their exam success seemed to guide all aspects of NS’s teaching approaches. She even seemed to be at odds with her own style of teaching, saying, “I’m a list person, so I tend to like a bit of structure to my lesson, but at the same time I’m annoyed that I’m a list person, so I like to abandon it whenever I can.” Her ideal method of teaching utilised an
integrated approach, but even that had to be modified due to the school’s geographic circumstances.

NS: Ideally ... you’d have your case study, your icon [a major historical work or composer], and you would study that, you’d analyse it through listening to it, and then you’d play it, and then you’d write a piece that uses some compositional methods that are from the icon in one lesson. But I found in my teaching, unless you’ve got a double period, it’s really hard to do that well and to make it meaningful. Plus, the logistical parameters of our school... we’re not close to public transport, so it’s difficult to expect the students to have their instruments every lesson. So I tend to say, tomorrow we’re going to be playing, bring your instruments tomorrow. Or, next Monday we’ve got a double period, bring your instruments because we’re going to be ... But, I don’t tend to say, Monday is playing, Tuesday is composition, Wednesday... I try and integrate it as much as I can, because I think that’s the best way.

NS is a teacher who appears to be continually in a state of discomfort, whether it is with the idea of the pursuit of students’ examination success, or the school’s pressure to perform well, or with trying to find a balance between syllabus requirements and intuitive musical development, or even herself and her own perception of successful teaching and learning. I placed her in the Intuitive side of the continuum since I felt that, given a different environment and the freedom to teach music the way she feels is
right, NS’s answers would be more along the lines of her final comment in the interview: “Sometimes I just want to play the music. Just shut up and play!”

**AD, PG and JO**

The final group of three teachers I have placed at the Intuitive end of the Continuum are AD, PG and JO. These teachers were just as notable for what they did say as for what they did not. None mentioned the HSC exam and none of them spoke of using past papers as part of their listening practice. All three specified a preference against textbooks:

**PG:** Noooo, not a textbook person, never, don’t even own one.

**AD:** If there’s something I’m not sure of I’ll look it up, do internet research. But most of it [what I teach] is from experience.

**JO:** With seniors I don’t tend to use textbook stuff much. We do have some textbooks of musical concepts and I’m notorious for actually not using it, but encouraging the students to go up and have a look because it’s got some useful frameworks in there.

Although there appeared to be some Systematic elements to their teaching, it was clear that the approach of these three teachers was predominantly Intuitive. JO’s approach has been described previously as exemplifying an Intuitive teacher, in that his focus is not on exam
performance but, rather, broadening and developing the musical abilities of his students. AD and PG hold similar views.

The two key factors to JO's approach to the teaching of music listening seem to be music—what he chose, why and how he taught it—and the way he understood the music concepts. With both factors, the aim seems to be to try and connect what you teach and learn in the classroom with what happens in real life, as well as encouraging continuous curiosity and active cognitive participation in the learning process. Rather than seeing the concepts as being the only way to describe and analyse music, JO presents them as an example of a knowledge framework, along with other formal and informal frameworks. “Every bit of knowledge is questionable. There’s another way of looking at it. You can flip it over, you can say this is not a rigid system, this is a helpful framework.”

For JO, music seems to be the ultimate resource. All of the lessons and experiences he described during his interview centred in some way on music and how it was utilised rather than on what was to be learned from it. However, that is not to say that learning is not at the forefront of JO’s teaching. For JO, what a student can learn from a piece of music is not rigidly classified in concept terms, nor according to its historical context. It can be those things, and it can be more—or less. JO lets the musical experience guide what the students can learn from it.
For example, he described a listening lesson as follows: to begin with, it is not just a listening lesson—“I tend to integrate stuff. I tend to say, if students say, ‘Are we doing theory or prac today?’, I usually say, ‘Yeah.’ They go, ‘What?’” JO went on to describe the premise of the lesson: “Say, for example, a class, if we go in and try to just learn a song... start off teaching it aurally in some way, play on an instrument, or let’s play along with this recording, see what we can figure out...” It is the statement, “see what we can figure out”, that consistently guides how JO describes the way the lesson unfolds.

JO: Of course some kids get a few things happening and they show each other... then I might pull out a chord chart or a piece of music and... like grow it, organically if you like, from a starting point, maybe a listening starting point. But then we’ll stop and talk about, well, about Led Zeppelin’s Kashmir or something, try to learn the riff, but then try and unpack and it go... what key’s this in?

“Oh, it’s in D.”

How do you know?

“Well, it’s got lots of Ds in it.” Yeah, cool. Does it start on a D? “Yeah.” Does it end on a D? “Yeah.” What else might be in there? What sort of modes are they using... and then stop that and go back to some playing for a while, but keep analysing. Keep playing, keep listening, but keep analysing and finding frameworks to use.
The lesson he describes contains several examples of syllabus endorsed content and learning experiences: listening, performing, aural transcription, score reading, and musical analysis as well as a discussion of pitch, tonality, harmony, melody. Other elements are implied: ensemble work, study of the rate of change in a chord progression, and rhythmic analysis. Later in the interview, JO describes another activity, where he might use a simple melody in a complex rhythm or metre, where the purpose of the lesson is to aurally analyse and transcribe the melody, perhaps with the aid of instruments, or notation, or even movement—clapping, dancing, physically acting out the rhythm. Similarly, this lesson conforms to particular syllabus requirements, however the syllabus, the music concepts, and even the technical knowledge learnt from the lesson are not the point. For JO, it is the music itself, the act of listening, performing, even analysing; the intrinsic value of the musical experience is what JO comes back to throughout the interview. And, always, broadening student musical horizons.

JO: My philosophy tends to be trying to expand student’s frameworks of vision and frameworks of understanding, and you’re trying to do that by any means possible. You try and do it by stealth, by in your face... like, “Hey we had an outbreak of learning today, sorry they’re late for Maths” ... I’ve sometimes done that, some incredible thing happened, let’s go with it, oops the bell’s gone...
I tend to try and, in my scanning the horizon—which I'm doing all the time—just go, “Woo, that'd be good, oh let’s do that in class this week”.

That can be viewed as haphazard, but it could also be viewed as integration of just ‘life’ stuff... Linking the formal to the informal, I suppose, is another way to think about it, and linking the intuitive to the articulate, you know, what people do intuitively and how they communicate intuitively about music is actually not that different to how you communicate formally about music, just using different jargon.

Similarly, AD appears to understand the practice of music listening as the means by which learning occurs, and he also sees music as more than a mere resource. AD actively tries to depersonalise music for his students, to deter listening analysis as a means of informing an opinion. Instead, “Whether you like a piece or not, you can still learn something from it... They're there to listen, to observe, which is the most important part of it.”

In an effort to remove the competitive element of the school music environment, AD approaches listening as a kind of art appreciation.

AD: If you go in there [a gallery] and say, I don't like this piece, well then you don't look at it. I think it’s important that you go in and look at it just as an art work. Contemporary music in particular, because then, quite often they'll develop an understanding of the work and their opinion will change.
For AD, teaching is not about ensuring a student can do better than someone else, whether in the same class or from across the state, but about furthering the individual students' musical understanding and fostering a supportive peer environment: "I never let kids judge other kids' work. I know that they have some rivalry ... that disappears when I’m teaching."

AD also believes it is important to reduce the fear of experimentation and broaden his students’ creative horizons. He describes a lesson that he uses with students from Years 7-12, that simultaneously integrates listening, performing and composing, as well as being exemplar of how he tries to impart his values of musicianship and musical community:

AD: There's a lesson that I do with all years, where I get them to come in and I get them to make five compositions. Composition one, I'll say go and make whatever noise you like, then I say stop. So we practice that a couple of times. That's composition one. What worked, what doesn't work? What do you think we can do to make the piece better? So we go through and we do about five compositions. Then at the end I say, right, I want you to write down a definition of what is music. And often you'll get really good definitions. That way they're listening, they're listening to each other, one of the exercises is they have to have a conversation with another sound around the room, so they're engaging... by the end, you
don’t tell them when the piece stops. You allow it to stop when it’s ready to stop.

From his interview responses, AD appears to teach Music in order to develop students’ creative and collaborative skills, as well as their knowledge and experience. He is teaching students to become music appreciators, to see that all music, whether or not they like it, contains something from which they can learn about the true nature of music. AD’s approach then, transcends the scope of the syllabus and certainly goes beyond what can be examined.

PG is in an unusual position since at his school he only teaches the technology and composition component of the senior Music courses. This is a role he takes on with pride, and frequently mentions during the interview how lucky he feels that he is able to connect with students in this unique way: “Yeah, because it’s not ‘teacher out front’, teaching to 30 or 25 kids, I don’t teach like that, and I guess my position here is a very unique position in that way, which I love... I’m really fortunate in that I get to teach the kids individually like that, it’s great.” So, by default, PG needs to consider listening from a more Intuitive perspective, as it is constantly framed by its relationship with compositional processes.

PG’s specific listening lessons are not dictated by the music concepts—in fact, he makes no mention of them at all during the interview. Rather, they
involve developing skills and musical language that will benefit his students and their ability to compose with and analyse compositional elements of the music that influences them: “Being able to have that skill, to transcribe things quickly, either on instrument or on paper, is the key to knowing about music. Because learning about transcription teaches you about melody, about harmony, which leads to composition, which leads to improvisation, which leads to just knowing so much more about music in general.” He encourages students to listen broadly, and is the only teacher interviewed who looks at sound engineering: he teaches his students to listen “behind the music into the sound of the music”.

PG enjoys his teaching position immensely and is passionate about what he teaches. His attitude towards education could be summed up in one word—fun: “I think teaching has got to be about fun and [in] everything I do I try and make it fun, and I think that’s why the kids like it. As long as you can present it in an exciting way, and as long as you’re excited about it, because I am, and as long as you’re passionate about it, you can sell anything.”

For JO, PG and AD, it seems that the Aural Skills exam, and even the syllabus, are merely points of reference for their music teaching, as opposed to being the essential elements that frame and influence their pedagogical decisions. The syllabus and exam touchstones – the concepts and the topics – hardly got a mention at all, in any of the three interviews.
Instead, it was the students, the music and their own passions and interests that framed how they spoke about their teaching. Their focus is on how they can broaden the minds and experiences of the students they teach, not on drilling the correct terminology or enhancing exam technique. This seems to be the essence of an Intuitive teacher.
Commonalities

It was difficult to pinpoint any particular approaches, techniques or resources that were commonly used. Each teacher’s environment, perspective and experience was different, and the non-prescriptive nature of the syllabuses (in that they do not specify exactly what musical material/pieces need to be studied or how teachers should structure their lessons) meant that each teacher needed to rely on their own experience and knowledge to determine their own methods of effective teaching. This is reflected in the music education literature. As was explained in the Literature Review: Listening Pedagogies section, there are a number of ways in which listening can be approached in the classroom, but their efficacy and suitability are dependent on a variety of factors, including the student cohort, the music chosen for study and even the nature of the teaching environment.

This led to further, alternative analysis and consideration of the interview data, to see how some of these elements noted in the literature influenced the teaching of music listening. I carefully studied the interviews once again and identified when a teacher would mention something that directly affected how they taught, either changing the structure of a listening lesson or affecting how they viewed and approached music teaching as a whole. This analysis of the extrinsic influences on the teaching of music listening led to certain insights into the daily realities of senior secondary music teaching. The syllabus and the HSC Aural exam
structure may form the basis of the Stage 6 Music courses, however what is actually learnt in the classroom depends on the details that unfold in a human, working environment.

**Students**

In relation to the teaching of listening, there were very few teachers who spoke about the ways they worked without mentioning external factors that influenced how they approached lesson design, planned activities and even programmed entire units of work. One of those key factors was the students, those to whom they imparted their knowledge of music in the classroom. The teachers interviewed spoke about how their students influenced the ways they taught, from their academic ability, language and literacy capabilities, attendance in lessons and the cohort sizes.

Some teachers commented about their students and how their ability (or the teachers’ perceptions of their ability) influenced the way they taught listening. JF for example, made many passing comments about the differences between Music 1 and Music 2 candidates, referring to the Music 1 cohort as the “rockhead kids”, “not quite as intellectual” and noting, “Sometimes Music 1 kids aren’t as bright as the Music 2 kids.” However, she qualifies these statements as being directly related to their understanding of the concepts of music and how to analyse music during listening lessons. “Their level of understanding [in Music 1] of that sort of
thing you need to work on... But that’s probably because they haven’t done Music [in Year 9 and 10], they’ve done ‘other’ [subjects] here.”

So, because the Music 1 students she teaches mostly do not have the grounding in the music concepts and terminology from studying music in Year 9 and 10, she spends a lot of time in her listening lessons with them on defining terms identifying what the syllabus terms the concepts of music. JF: “My little newbie Music 1s are going, ‘Ooh, I don’t understand what she’s talking about, what’s she banging on about monophonic texture, I just don’t get it, she’s talking another language.’” Because at the school where she works the Music 1 and Music 2 courses are taught in a combined class, she divides up their class time: in one lesson she may have the Music 1 cohort involved in a listening lesson, while the Music 2 cohort are in the studios practising their instrument. With Music 1 not being as well grounded in listening theory she spends more time teaching them, but also feels that she is “not doing the best job” with Music 2 as a result of the combined Course cohorts.

EB makes similar assumptions about Music 2 students not having to spend as much time on the concepts and terminology as Music 1 students: “We just assume they know more because if they’re doing Music 2 they need to, and they wouldn’t be doing Music 2 if they hadn’t done Music before and had a fairly large amount of experience, so we do tend to assume... but actually that’s probably not sometimes justified.” Her assumption about
Music 1 students is almost the opposite view: “In Course 1, a lot of kids have absolutely no idea, so we really do start from scratch and go through this [the concepts]... they’ve never listened to music other than just... heard it.”

EB also said that the ways she taught music differed depending on the cohort each year, especially in relation to the instrumental skills of each class: “I mean, some classes you’ve only got a 150 billion guitar players or something, you know…” This would then affect the kinds of music she chose for listening and its potential for arrangements for class performance.

For PT, teaching in a senior secondary school meant having to form almost instant relationships with students and having to assess their ability as comprehensively as possible within the first few weeks, in order to ascertain whether they had selected the right Music course: “When they do come in in Year 11 we actually do a hand written survey where they respond, [concerning] what topics they've done, what instrument they play. If necessary, we get them to sit a notation test, so the kids in Music 2 I usually get them to sit a theory test with no warning. Not very nice, but it does give me an immediate picture of what they can and can't do.” PT teaches the syllabus topic, ‘Methods of Notating Music’ in order to establish her students’ capabilities, and she will alter elements of the overall Music program to suit particularly capable, or deficient, cohorts:
“Sometimes we can’t even program until we get to know the students.”

The isolation of her position and her inability to influence and develop music students from Year 7-10 is something that she frequently mentioned during the interview.

PT: The other thing being in the senior campus, I don't have these kids from Year 9. So I haven't trained them up, as it were. They're not used to the words, it’s very different to where I've taught it in a 7-12 school where in Year 9 you start the basic modelling of what you want them to be achieving in Year 12. I get these kids in and it takes me the first term to get to know them, to actually get them writing and to look at their writing in depth and trying to work out what everybody’s done on each campus or at their other schools.

Both PT and AA spoke about the difficulties that arise when teaching at schools with a high EAL/D (English as an Additional Language/Dialect) population (AA cited 95 percent at her school), particularly in relation to listening lessons. With the final HSC Aural Skills exam being a written exam, with an extended essay response in the Music 2 exam, literacy and the students’ ability to communicate their ideas in written English come to the forefront in listening lessons. As AA says, “… it almost becomes a literacy lesson, in here’s how you would actually demonstrate your knowledge.” PT’s situation is similar: “We have lots of kids here with fairly average to poor literacy. Often those are the kids selecting Music... They
can talk quite well to you, but getting them to write anything down is really, really a struggle.”

Both PT and AA also described different ways in which they adapt their teaching in order to accommodate these recurring literacy issues. Due to the significant number of international students, in particular from China, PT goes to the trouble of having her concept terminology booklets translated by the language teachers in the school: “We’re very fortunate here that we have Chinese speaking teachers and a Chinese course running so I have teachers that I can go to, to say, ‘Can I ask you to translate this, can you write this in Chinese for me?’” Even so, it can get to the point where listening lessons are dictated by how much the students can understand and how fast they can translate what they are learning.

PT: Particularly in Music 2. If you’ve got four kids, like I had a little while ago, sitting in there, with [electronic] translators out, you’ve got to structure your listening lesson and vocabulary so that they can keep up. And when you’re talking with Music 2 kids who are working at a really high level, it can be really easy for the class discussion and conversation to get quite complicated and these poor kids, they get left behind really quickly. So I’ve found giving them a vocabulary list and talking to the Chinese teacher here and actually getting some stuff translated for them has really helped as well.
AA’s approach to literacy matters has been more about focusing on consolidating specific terminology, in relation to both music and sentence construction. To assist with the acquisition of musical vocabulary, AA narrows the scope of the possible answers to questions, in order to increase the likelihood of success and to build confidence.

AA: [When asked about her most engaging method of teaching] Probably actually limiting their options so they have a greater chance of getting it right. So for example, say if we were looking at tonality and I said, “Tell me about the tonality of this piece,” but if I gave them limited options, like if I said, “I can tell you it’s going to be in a major key or a minor key or it could potentially be blues,” then their chances of getting it correct are greater in the beginning so then they would actually gain more confidence in being able to say, “I do know what that is, that’s a Blues sound, I got that correct” … For me, I’ve found, that seemed to get them really happy about doing listening tasks.

AA also speaks of teaching students how to use specific sentence fragments in order to convey greater more clarity and continuity in their exam answers.

AA: The one [question] that they performed well above state average on was the one where I had actually specifically taught them that they need to use the phrase “This creates unity” or “Unity is created by….” Or finish
the sentence with “... thus creating unity.” So you've got to say “Unity is created by...” whatever your example is. So what's amazing is that I've gone to the effort of teaching them that at the beginning and the end of their sentences, but it has no impact on what they know in terms of what they can recognise... but it's just that they've put those words in there, so the markers have read it and gone, yeah, that's correct.

It seems clear that from the way PT and AA talk about the language and literacy needs of their students, that they in turn are restricted in the way that they teach music. In a situation where there is a language barrier, it may actually be easier and more effective to teach listening with a focus on the exam structure and required terminology, and not necessarily on the gradual development of individual musicianship.

Concerning student literacy issues, BS and SS contend with a different problem. Both spoke about having to chide students on their inability to write concisely when answering Aural Skills exam questions, particularly for Music 1. This seems to be due to how they are taught to answer exam questions in other subjects. SS: “Well, they're being taught in English to write proper sentences and paragraphs and stuff whereas Music, you don't need it. Just give me the point, give me the reason or justification of your point and that’s it. That’s the whole lot.” BS described how his frustration at how his students “waffle” led to an experiment with him video recording himself marking their Aural Skills written exams.
BS: I scanned all the papers in and then I put them on a screen and then I recorded the screen capture and then recorded everything, just to try something different. I had my mouse hovering over things as I spoke, so I was reading through their responses and then responding verbally and just recording what I’m doing and then saving it as a video and giving them the video. And I got really frustrated and the kids found it hilarious with my frustration, you know, “Just get to the point! What is this word? Why are you writing this, you just said this over here, why are you wasting my time?” I’d respond that way, and they finally got the point and they’d read along with me and just go, that whole paragraph was just a waste.

Another factor that can affect lesson design is student attendance, as well as the number of students in a given cohort. NS’s cohort is vulnerable. If it was any smaller, the school would require her to teach three out of her nine allocated Music periods outside of the timetable. BB says that listening lessons are only worthwhile if there is full class in attendance, which is why he is flexible in what he decides to do, lesson by lesson: “You could have two people there so you just go, let’s do some prac, or if you have the whole class there then let’s do some listening because then no one’s going to miss out.” For SS, the casual approach students have towards attendance seems to be a point of frustration: “I have one [double period] with Year 12, so I have two hours with them. That’d work if they
turned up.” Both PG and MM said that the number of students in the class could determine the type of activities they undertook during the lesson, and whether or not they would be able to get around and see each student individually. TT and JS work around this difficulty by having one-on-one lessons. JS: “There’s a few in my current Year 12 class that didn’t do it great last year and they still haven’t got it and I’m getting in there and having one-on-ones with them. Because in a class situation, they just homogenise into whatever anyone else is doing.”

From the way in which these teachers speak about their students, it is clear that they are what motivates them to teach, and also have considerable influence over how listening and music is taught in the classroom. The abilities and interest of any given cohort can dictate everything from how the teachers introduce and explain music concepts through to the frequency and design of listening lessons. If the purpose of teaching is to aid and encourage learning, it is clearly important for the teachers to consider who they are teaching and what makes the learning process more effective for them.

**Music**

Choice of music was a subject that came up regularly during the interviews. Occasionally, it was in conjunction with the topics chosen for study from the syllabus, however it was more often talked about in the context of the concepts of music.
There was no piece of music that came up in the interviews that could be said to be a ‘standard’ piece used by NSW senior secondary music teachers. The music of Igor Stravinsky was mentioned by three teachers: *Firebird Suite* was mentioned by JF because an excerpt of the piece was used in a Preliminary Aural Skills exam; and *Rite of Spring* was mentioned by both BS and BB. Most of the teachers did not specify particular pieces; instead, they spoke generally about composers, or genres, that their students would be studying, and went into more detail about what they would want the students to learn from such music. One of the interview questions asked about particular resources that teachers used frequently, including pieces of music. Many of the teachers who were interviewed seem to see pieces of music as a resource, something that assisted them in imparting knowledge generally about music.

Musical choice for some teachers seemed to be guided by how it would aid them in their teaching of the music concepts. This would include choosing music that highlighted particular aspects of a concept, or connecting musical examples with certain terminology. Examples from the interviews include the following:

- JF chose the song *Friday On My Mind* by The Easybeats because of its applicability in “talking about harmony and the rate of harmonic change, because there’s moments in that where it goes to the chorus where it
changes chord on every beat, and then there’s other moments where it’s
the same chord for a bar.” It also fits in with the topic Music for Small
Ensembles, which was what she was teaching to her Music 1 class at the
time.

- PT mentioned choosing particular songs that are distinct examples of
certain musical sub-genres, such as ragtime, swing or fusion in the study of
the topic, Jazz, or certain music concept features: “I tend to use Mozart’s
Theme and Variations on Twinkle Twinkle Little Star for teaching theme
and variations because it’s so clear cut.” As she makes explicit in her
interview, the Music 1 course in particular is heavily music concept
focused, and her listening lessons would be structured so that the choice
of music directly suited the concept or sub-concept under study. “In terms
of listening with Music 1, then I’m working on just specific concepts rather
than topics. I do have a couple of favourite things that I use in terms of,
right, I know this is a great example of tone colour or this is a really good
example of compound time.”

- AA spoke of considering the concept or terminology the students
needed to learn, rather than what music would best demonstrate it. She
particularly mentioned using original recordings and a cover version of a
song as a way of highlighting the stylistic features of particular genres of
music. This can then lead to a discussion of other musical features: “One
example is looking at a mariachi band doing El Condor Pasa, and looking at
Simon and Garfunkel doing El Condor Pasa and saying, ‘Here’s the
characteristics of 1960s folk music, and here’s the stylistic features of Central American mariachi music, and just using that sort of stuff for them to listen and say, ‘What is the trumpet doing here, what is the tone colour,’ and all that sort of stuff.”

Some teachers’ musical choices were influenced by the broader topics of study outlined in the syllabus. The topics, Music of the last 25 Years and Music 1600-1900 were raised most frequently, because these are Mandatory topics in the Music 2 course, and EB, BB and AD all noted how they worked their music choices into their lessons as a means of satisfying the study requirements for the topic. EB, who taught a combined Music 1 and Music 2 class at the time of the interview, spoke about starting Year 11 with a chronological approach, by listening to and studying particular art music genres and styles (such as single line chant, through to organum and Gregorian chants) in order to establish where music has come from, and to show that everything develops. This fits in with the Music 2 Mandatory topic, and she thinks it is important to give Music 1 students the same foundation, “... because a lot of them, all they know is rock music or whatever, and so I start off at the very beginning... this doesn’t fit with one of the topics but I do it anyway... we sort of fit it into various topics as we go.”

BB takes a similar approach, specifically with Music 2 classes. BB believes a teacher can “focus on certain areas and as long as you focus on a certain
amount of areas then you've covered the course.” His program structure is historically linear, and aims to teach the students everything, from Medieval music to Music of the last 25 years, with a focus on the key works and composers that occur through the centuries. The composers he specifically mentions are mainly Australian art music composers—Ross Edwards, Nigel Westlake, Peter Sculthorpe, Graeme Koehne—as well as György Ligeti, Igor Stravinsky and Claude Debussy. Instead of beginning with a concept or musical term and finding relevant music examples, BB chooses important works for study because “they're important for a reason, historically. Some of them you read about them, you know they're important, why are they important, and then we relate concepts back to that.”

AD briefly spoke about how he acknowledges that there is certain repertoire that is typical of a topic or genre, but he prefers to go beyond it and seek out the more obscure music. “There are specific pieces, stock standard ones, that you use for the repertoire but often I'll go beyond that. For example, with Baroque I did some Biber just to make it a little more interesting for me, as well as for them.” He will also look for interesting interpretations or versions of pieces. “I might do [Vivaldi’s] The Four Seasons and I might do a version with Nigel Kennedy, I might do one with... one of a variety of violinists that I follow, so they get an idea of the interpretation from each. That’s good for their listening. So both watching and listening. So with whatever piece I’m doing I might have three or four
different versions, so we can talk about comparison, talk about
collectors, talk about... you know.” AD also mentioned comparing a
studio recording to a live recording of a piece, “because then you can hear
the mistakes, [and] see if they can pick up where the faults are.”

Other than these examples, it was not possible to apply a general theory to
the way in which music could be chosen for study. MM did not mention
any particular pieces, or even genres, of music. Rather, he spoke about
how music in general could be studied and taught. NS reported a similar
approach to BB, in that she would choose particular “icons” (either pieces
or composers) to study, but then described in more detail the types of
resources she used and created for her lessons.

For JO, music could come from just about anywhere, whether from
students, a music textbook, a Youtube search, even the 70s rock music he
values. BS is similarly inclined. He did admit that there were certain pieces
that he might use consistently, but aside from those pieces his choice of
music could be based on something he heard in the car on the way to
work, some music he thought was really cool that students might enjoy, or
even music he knew that they would not like. “I love the lessons where
they hate what they’re listening to. So, when I play something that’s
‘ouchy’, or something that they don’t like, because I’m going to get them to
tell me why they don’t like it and then we move on from that... If they don’t
like something, they can respond by using musical language, awesome, and I'm fine with that.”

Because of his position as a Composition teacher, PG did not mention syllabus topics, since that was the role of the school’s other Music teacher. He even says at one point, “I don’t think it would matter one iota the kind of music [you listen to for classroom study]. As long as you can present it in an exciting way, and as long as you’re excited about it, because I am, and as long as you’re passionate about it, you can sell anything.” His choice of music really depended on the purpose it served at the particular point in the lesson, or for the particular student. For example, he talks about using ‘The Russians’ by Sting for a melodic dictation exercise, because of its distinctive, repeated minor melodic line (which is borrowed from Prokofiev). He also talks about exposing students to as wide a variety of music as possible, in order to inspire and (or) enhance their composition skills and ideas.

Generally, the musical choices of the study’s participant-teachers is mainly driven by what the students stand to learn from the piece, whether it be music concept related, historical, theoretical, or even a means of stimulating their understanding and use of music terminology. Neither Stage 6 syllabus is specific regarding selection of music for study. Because of this, musical choices can vary greatly from teacher to teacher.
Time

All teacher-participants considered time and the way it was allocated to be important. For almost all of them, the perception that there was insufficient time impacted their teaching, from their overall ability to cover the course, to how they planned and worked out individual lessons.

For MM, the 80 minute period was optimal for an integrated lesson approach.

MM: That was terrific, and you could set a lesson up where you introduced an idea, you did a little bit of listening, you then jumped and it could be 20 or 30 minutes in a small compositional task, and then came back out and you might do a class performance. That’s sort of the ideal and that wouldn’t happen every lesson, but it was certainly possible.

However, he also acknowledged that “time constraints are always something you struggle with as a teacher”, and spoke about the choices music teachers would have to make about lesson structure and allocating minimal amounts of time to individual feedback and assessment. Both NS and BS agreed with this, and explained that integrated lessons were the ideal type, and that short lesson times meant integrated lessons were unsuccessful. For PG, being primarily a composition teacher, finding the time during a lesson to see each student becomes a problem. More time spent with one student means less time for everyone else: “… you spend
20 minutes with that student, that’s nearly half your lesson gone, so what do you do with the rest? There might be three periods that go by where you haven’t seen someone—you haven’t been to them individually. So it’s hard.”

Many teachers remarked on not having enough time to really explore various musical aspects in any depth. EB lamented “not having ages” to spend on the *Music Composition Toolbox* (Hindson, Barbeler, & Blom, 2007), a resource containing composition activities and a broad range of listening examples. AA altered her entire approach to listening because she decided there was not enough time to deeply explore the pieces they studied: “To me I was casting the net very wide, thinking these kids have had such narrow exposure, I want to teach them everything that they need to know about music, but in Music 1 there just isn’t the time for that, there isn’t the scope for that on what they need to know.” For TT, the amount of theory that needs to be taught in Music 2 does not sufficiently correlate with the amount of time allocated in lessons, so she tries to give students work and notes for them to study in their own time, explaining, “I find I need to go into more depth and I should, but I don’t.” For NS, it was time for consideration of her own teaching in general, and not having enough time for truly mindful practice.

NS: Because it’s a busy job, not being thoughtful and thinking about presenting things in different learning styles to mine, because you tend
to teach how you learn... I’m quite a visual learner: I like to write things down and then ponder them, so how do I try not to teach how I learn, but to try and have a variety of approaches to cater for a variety of learning styles. I think I’m getting better at that because I’m more aware of it. But again, you’re so busy in the job, that it would be nice to have more thinking time.

For JF and EB, it is about dividing time between focusing on the Music 1 or Music 2 course, particularly for aural/musicology lessons, but also for composition or performance. From EB’s perspective, the capabilities of the particular cohort can affect that division—a less capable group means allocating more time with a teacher.

EB: There was one notable year where I worked with the Course 2 people all the time practically and left the Course 1 to their own devices and all of them got Band 6s [the highest achievement level] because they could just do it, whereas if I had left the Course 2 to their own devices they would have absolutely done nothing. Whereas other years you might just have two Course 2 people and you just say, “OK, you do this”, and [then] millions of Course 1 people and you really have to work with them all the time.

Even teachers with only one of the courses to focus on spoke about having to spend ‘offline’ time with the students. Both JF and AA said that students
would often spend time during breaks and free periods coming into the studios to practice. TT and JS undertake one-on-one listening lessons with their senior students, during periods where they and the students are available. BB creates ‘zero’ periods before and after school, and tries to allocate them at times that can turn first or last period Music lessons into double periods.

Clearly, time is a major factor in how teachers plan, create and implement their lessons. But can the perceived lack of time be more effectively resolved, and if so, how? For the teachers who spoke about being unable to work through all of the compulsory content, perhaps a more precise syllabus, or more concise exam, would allow for more flexibility and freedom. However, other teachers made specific reference to the amount of time allocated for their music teaching periods, which would mean the issue is more about timetable organisation. And then there is EB, who makes the point about the capabilities of the student cohort in determining how her teaching time is allocated. Ultimately, perhaps this is an issue that, like the choice of music for study, needs to be handled by the individual teacher.
**CHAPTER SIX**

**Conclusions, Limitations and Implications for Further Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine the ways teachers currently in the field approached the teaching of listening in New South Wales senior secondary music classes. The interviews were structured in relation to the study's research questions, and addressed teaching approaches and techniques, commonly used resources and repertoire, and the influences on teaching pedagogy. The study sought to fill a gap in music education literature relating to current classroom practices in Australia, by identifying how listening is taught by music educators in New South Wales. The study's conclusions are constrained by its small sample, nevertheless, the range of teaching experience as well as varying teaching environments and perspectives means that the findings have the potential for wider application and that they have the potential to contribute to future, larger studies of the topic.

The findings reveal that the teachers interviewed employ a range of teaching approaches, techniques, resources and repertoire. This range is apparent despite the fact that all of the teachers are constrained by identical syllabus requirements. The range of pedagogical approaches may well be due to the non-prescriptive nature of the syllabus, which makes statements on what is to be taught but not on how content should be taught. The key factors that influence the ways the participants teach
listening in the senior secondary classroom include: the student cohort; the HSC Aural Skills exam structure and syllabus requirements; and the overall teaching environment—which could include the physical classroom and school environment, as well as teachers’ musical preferences and perceptions. These findings are consistent with the nature of the literature regarding music listening pedagogies as discussed in the Literature Review; the research provides many examples of approaches and techniques that can be utilised to teach listening in the music classroom, with their efficacy dependent upon the suitability and balance of the previously described influences.

There were no common examples of teaching techniques, resources or repertoire shared by all of the teachers. However, there were certain similarities and differences amongst the teachers’ responses in terms of the way they viewed what aspects were most important concerning their teaching and the knowledge they were imparting. This led to the development of a systematic-intuitive continuum as a means of comprehending teachers’ teaching styles and approaches, which was generated from the data. Categorised coding from the interview data indicated the degree of importance each teacher placed on the HSC Aural Skills exam and the syllabus-described concepts, as well as the role of music in their listening lessons, and whether or not their teaching approaches and techniques tended towards being teacher-centred or student-centred.
Concerning further research, it may be interesting to see whether the guidelines or descriptors supporting the systematic-intuitive continuum could be applied fruitfully to other music teachers, and the extent to which a teacher’s systematic or intuitive approach significantly impacts the way in which students learn, or even the way in which they perceive music as a choice for formal classroom study. To what extent and in what ways is the cohort size undertaking music for HSC study influenced by how the courses are taught? It could also be worth investigating the influence student literacy levels can have on how music teachers approach listening, due to the importance of learning correct terminology and vocabulary for written exams and assessments. Given the literacy demands of the syllabus and final Aural Skills written exams, how effective would one or other kind of teacher be in a low literacy level environment?

Of more notable interest are the pedagogical approaches enshrined in the current Music 1 and Music 2 syllabuses. As previously identified, these syllabuses have not undergone any significant changes since first implemented in 2001. The current syllabuses bear striking similarities which their immediate predecessor, last reviewed in 1994, in the overall design of the Music course, the Learning Experiences, Concepts of Music, Contexts/Topics and the Objectives and Outcomes (Board of Studies, 1994). This means the syllabus currently taught in schools is essentially a framework that is, at its core, at least 20 years old, with a conceptual
analysis scheme derived from a 1950s model. Is it not pertinent to consider a restructure of these courses to incorporate developments in the fields of, for example, popular music studies and ethnomusicology? In an effort to incorporate such musicological practices appropriate to the expanded range of music available—and to some extent expected—for study, perhaps the Music syllabus could align more with the overall approach of the Mathematics syllabus. Each subject relies on a particular kind of knowledge that can be manipulated in many ways. Mathematical knowledge for examples, relates to numerical relationships and meanings, while music relates to sound relationships and meanings. In mathematics, students learn different formulas and equations according to the various mathematics subfields such as algebra or geometry or calculus, in order to make sense of how the numbers should be used. Could this not be the same for music—that is, employing different analytical models and practices to better understand different musical genres and contexts?

This would necessitate a review of HSC music assessment models. Again, looking at the exam design of other subjects, perhaps the HSC Aural Skills written exam could be designed in a way similar to the English Paper 2: Modules, where in examination students are required to choose the questions that best reflect the topics they have studied throughout their course. With the wide range of topics available, particularly in the Music 1 syllabus, an exam so-structured would give students the opportunity to refer to music they have actually studied, rather than that chosen by the
examination committee, and answer relevant questions in more depth, thus staying true to the syllabus's commitment to catering to the individual interests and abilities of the students.

This study contributes to the body of research on the teaching of music listening, and addresses the gap relating to research on the practices of music teachers currently in the field in New South Wales. The focus on senior secondary music has meant that the interview data could be placed in the context of the Music 1 and Music 2, Stage 6, syllabuses. The ethnographic findings of the study indicate that knowledgeable and experienced music educators in New South Wales creatively employ a wide range of approaches and techniques in an effort to teach listening to a cohort of senior secondary music students that is gradually increasing in size, and hence significance. Understanding and analysing the nature of contemporary music education practice will benefit both the educators in the field and the students who learn from them.
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Appendix One

Participant Recruitment Letter

Dear ..................................................

Learning to listen: Music educators discuss their approaches to the teaching of aural analysis to senior secondary music students in New South Wales Schools.

We would like to invite you to participate in a study being conducted by Rachel White, a Master of Music (Music Education) student at the Sydney Conservatorium of Music.

The study involves interviewing teachers of senior secondary music courses Music 1 and/or Music 2. Interviewees will be required to reflect on their teaching practices, particularly in relation to the teaching of aural analysis to Year 11 and Year 12 students. Participants will be sent a copy of the interview questions and topics prior to interview, and time and date of the interview will be negotiated between the interviewee and student researcher.

If you would like register your interest in participating, or have any questions regarding the study, please contact:

Rachel White  0431 xxxxxx

Rwhi4128@uni.sydney.edu.au

We look forward to your correspondence.
Regards,

Dr Michael Webb and Rachel White

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email)
Appendix Two

Interview Questions

Basic

1. How long have you been teaching senior secondary music?
2. What senior secondary music classes are you currently teaching?
3. How many times a week do you see these classes?

Syllabus

4. Do you have a conceptual or topical approach to your curriculum structure? Or something different?
5. Do you have specific Listening/Performing/Composing lessons or do you try to incorporate all three practices?

Methods

6. What resources (songs, videos, performances, books) do you use when teaching listening in the classroom? How do you use them?
7. Can you describe some examples of listening lessons you have taught?
8. What do you think has been your most engaging method of teaching listening? Why?
9. How do you accommodate for the variety of abilities and knowledge of the students?
10. How do you evaluate the students’ listening skills?

Reflective

11. How have your approaches changed in relation to the teaching of listening?
12. What inspires your teaching methods? Do you rely on skills developed in your undergraduate study, personal listening experiences, advice/ideas from colleagues?

13. How important is the role of ‘listening’ in your Music teaching?
Appendix Three

Questionnaire

1. What is your gender?

☐ Male    ☐ Female

2. Please indicate your age group.

☐ 18 – 25    ☐ 26 – 30    ☐ 31 – 35    ☐ 36 – 40    ☐ 41 – 45

☐ 46 – 50    ☐ 51 – 55    ☐ 56+

3. Please specify the subject which you have had the most experience teaching.

☐ Music 1    ☐ Music 2    ☐ Both Music 1 and Music 2

4. How long have you been teaching senior secondary music?

..............................................................................................................................................................................
Appendix Four

Participant Information Statement

Learning to listen: Music educators discuss their approaches to the teaching of aural analysis to senior secondary music students in New South Wales Schools.

PARTICIPANT INFORMATION STATEMENT

(1) What is the study about?
You are invited to participate in a study of how senior secondary music educators teach aural analysis to their students.

(2) Who is carrying out the study?
The study is being conducted by Rachel White and will form the basis for the degree of Master of Music (Music Education) at The University of Sydney under the supervision of Dr Michael Webb, Chair of Music Education.

(3) What does the study involve?
Participants in the study will be required to engage in an interview with the researcher. Interviews will be audio recorded, and a short questionnaire will also be completed in regards to general details of the participant (age group, gender, years spent teaching). Interviews will be conducted at a time and place negotiated for the participant’s convenience.

The questions to be asked during the interview will be sent to the participant prior to interview, to ensure they are adequately prepared to
answer in as much detail as possible. The questions concern the teaching methods utilised by senior secondary music teachers when teaching aural analysis (listening) to their students, with a focus on the Music of the 20th and 21st Centuries. Teachers of both Music 1 and Music 2 are eligible for interview. Participants will be asked in particular to reflect on their practices, describe their resources and discuss how they have evolved as teachers during their experiences.

Any details that may directly identify participants engaged in the study will be kept confidential. All names, of interviewees as well as of the schools and students they may discuss, will be changed and/or modified in an effort to keep their identities confidential.

(4) **How much time will the study take?**

The interviews should take no longer than an hour, however if the participant is willing to discuss their ideas and answers in more depth, a longer period of time can be negotiated.

(5) **Can I withdraw from the study?**

Being in this study is completely voluntary - you are not under any obligation to consent and - if you do consent - you can withdraw at any time without affecting your relationship with The University of Sydney.

You may stop the interview at any time if you do not wish to continue, the audio recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.
You are also not under any obligation to consent to complete the questionnaire. Submitting a completed questionnaire is an indication of your consent to participate in the study. You can withdraw any time prior to submitting your completed questionnaire. Once you have submitted your questionnaire anonymously, your responses cannot be withdrawn.

(6) Will anyone else know the results?
All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the researchers will have access to information on participants.

A report of the study may be submitted for publication, but individual participants will not be identifiable in such a report.

(7) Will the study benefit me?
We cannot and do not guarantee or promise that you will receive any benefits from the study.

(8) Can I tell other people about the study?
You may disclose with others your participation in the study.

(9) What if I require further information about the study or my involvement in it?
When you have read this information, Rachel White will discuss it with you further and answer any questions you may have. If you would like to know more at any stage, please feel free to contact Dr Michael Webb, Chair of Music Education, on (02) 9351 1332 or email Michael.webb@sydney.edu.au.

(10) What if I have a complaint or any concerns?
Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact The Manager, Human Ethics Administration, University of Sydney on +61 2 8627 8176 (Telephone); +61 2 8627 8177 (Facsimile) or ro.humanethics@sydney.edu.au (Email).

This information sheet is for you to keep
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PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM

I, ...............................................................................................[PRINT NAME], give consent to my participation in the research project

TITLE: Learning to listen: Music educators discuss their approaches to the teaching of aural analysis to senior secondary music students in New South Wales Schools.

In giving my consent I acknowledge that:

1. The procedures required for the project and the time involved have been explained to me, and any questions I have about the project have been answered to my satisfaction.

2. I have read the Participant Information Statement and have been given the opportunity to discuss the information and my involvement in the project with the researcher/s.

3. I understand that being in this study is completely voluntary – I am not under any obligation to consent.

4. I understand that my involvement is strictly confidential. I understand that any research data gathered from the results of the study may be published however no information about me will be used in any way that is identifiable.
5. I understand that I can withdraw from the study at any time, without affecting my relationship with the researcher(s) or the University of Sydney now or in the future.

6. I understand that I can stop the interview at any time if I do not wish to continue, the audio recording will be erased and the information provided will not be included in the study.

7. I consent to:

- Audio-recording YES □ NO □
- Receiving Feedback YES □ NO □

If you answered YES to the “Receiving Feedback” question, please provide your details i.e. mailing address, email address.

Feedback Option

Address: ____________________________________________
_____________________________________________________

Email: ____________________________________________
...........................................................................

Signature
...........................................................................

Please PRINT name
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Final codes used on interview transcriptions and their descriptions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SYS-TEXT-CON</td>
<td>Using Textbook to teach concept/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-TEXT-MUS</td>
<td>Using textbook for musical example</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-TEXT-HSCQ</td>
<td>Using textbook for HSC Aural Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-TEXT-PRO</td>
<td>Using textbook to create program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-SCORE</td>
<td>Listening with score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-ISCORE</td>
<td>Listening and imagining score</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-PAPER</td>
<td>Using past HSC papers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-IND-LESS</td>
<td>Individual-0p listening lessons (one on one)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-TERM</td>
<td>Focus on literacy/terminology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-HARM</td>
<td>Focus on harmony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-COMP</td>
<td>Focus on a composer/piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-CONCEPT</td>
<td>Focus on a concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-COMP-SONG</td>
<td>Listening to different versions of the same song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-COMP-COMP</td>
<td>Comparative listening (eg. Of one composer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-SHEET</td>
<td>Listening with worksheet/summary sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-TEA-DEMO</td>
<td>Teacher musical demonstration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYS-TEA-LECT</td>
<td>Teacher as lecturer/expert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT-COMB-LP</td>
<td>Listening and Performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT-COMB-LC</td>
<td>Listening and Composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT-COMB-LPCM</td>
<td>Listening/Performing/Composing/Musicology in one lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT-ENG</td>
<td>Focus on sound engineering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT-INF-LIST</td>
<td>Encouraging informal listening practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT-STU</td>
<td>Student directed lessons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT-LIST-PERF</td>
<td>Listening to and performing the same piece</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT-LIST-VIEW</td>
<td>Listening and watching performance (DVD etc)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INT-SPEC-LIST</td>
<td>Focus on specific listening skills (eg. Transcription)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT-MUS1</td>
<td>Music 1 focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT-MUS2</td>
<td>Music 2 focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT-INFL</td>
<td>Influence of teacher musical preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT-ONLINE</td>
<td>Use of online programs or software</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT-YOUTUBE</td>
<td>Use of Youtube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT-MARKS</td>
<td>Importance of marks in teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT-INFL</td>
<td>Mentions particular influence on teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXT-CONTEXT</td>
<td>Importance of musical context</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Systematic codes graph

The following graph shows the distribution and frequency of the Systematic codes throughout the interview data. The distribution and frequency of the coding was considered alongside the quality of the coded data (i.e. what exactly was spoken about and how).
Intuitive codes graph

The following graph shows the distribution and frequency of the Intuitive codes throughout the interview data. The distribution and frequency of the coding was considered alongside the quality of the coded data (i.e. what exactly was spoken about and how).
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Textbooks mentioned by teachers during the interviews.

*Literacy Works: Music Aural Concepts* by Trish Weekes
is an Australian text which contains worksheets, templates and exam
techniques and tips. The website description says “This book prepares
students for music listening exams, where they have to write under
pressure.”

*Fortissimo!* by Roy Bennett
(http://education.cambridge.org/au/subject/humanities/music/fortissim
o!) is a British textbook with a historical format, offering information on
musical styles and instruments throughout the ages, as well as “fascinating
visual stimulus material to spark original ideas for composing and
improvising.”

*Musical Concepts: Music 1 Aural Skills* by Helen Galettis
(http://au.wiley.com/WileyCDA/WileyTitle/productCd-
0731408322.html) is a textbook written for Music 1 students. “It provides
succinct coverage of the syllabus and related concepts.”

*In Tune With Music* by Bernice Allen and Ian Dorricott
3/isbn/9780170214674) is a series of music education texts that
encourage “a completely integrated approach” to teaching music.
The Norton Scores
(http://books.wwnorton.com/books/webad.aspx?id=20351) are reproductions of the scores for pieces of music from the Medieval era through to the Classical era.

*The History of Music* by Roy Bennett
(http://education.cambridge.org/au/subject/humanities/music/cambridge-assignments-in-music/history-of-music) “presents a brief outline of the history of Western music, covering all important areas, with the main emphasis on recognition of style and period.”

*Music Composition Toolbox* by Matthew Hindson, Damien Barbeler and Diana Blom (http://www.hindson.com.au/MCT/index.html) is a textbook aimed at encouraging secondary and early tertiary students to learn about composing. It contains modules focusing on “targeted concepts, learning discrete compositional techniques which can later be used in combination.”