The University of Sydney

Copyright in relation to this thesis*

Under the Copyright Act 1968 (several provision of which are referred to below), this thesis must be used only under the normal conditions of scholarly fair dealing for the purposes of research, criticism or review. In particular no results or conclusions should be extracted from it, nor should it be copied or closely paraphrased in whole or in part without the written consent of the author. Proper written acknowledgement should be made for any assistance obtained from this thesis.

Under Section 35(2) of the Copyright Act 1968 'the author of a literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work is the owner of any copyright subsisting in the work'. By virtue of Section 32(1) copyright subsists in an original literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work that is unpublished and of which the author was an Australian citizen, an Australian protected person or a person resident in Australia.

The Act, by Section 36(1) provides: 'Subject to this Act, the copyright in a literary, dramatic, musical or artistic work is infringed by a person who, not being the owner of the copyright and without the licence of the owner of the copyright, does in Australia, or authorises the doing in Australia of, any act comprised in the copyright'.

Section 31(1)(a)(i) provides that copyright includes the exclusive right to reproduce the work in a material form. Thus, copyright is infringed by a person who, not being the owner of the copyright, reproduces or authorises the reproduction of a work, or of more than a reasonable part of the work, in a material form, unless the reproduction is a 'fair dealing' with the work for the purpose of research or study as further defined in Sections 40 and 41 of the Act.

Section 51(2) provides that "Where a manuscript, or a copy of a thesis or other similar literary work that has not been published is kept in a library of a university or other similar institution or in an archives, the copyright in the thesis or other work is not infringed by the making of a copy of the thesis or other work by or on behalf of the officer in charge of the library or archives if the copy is supplied to a person who satisfies an authorized officer of the library or archives that he requires the copy for the purpose of research or study'.

*"Thesis' includes 'treatise', dissertation' and other similar productions.
Composition, Assessment and Pedagogy in NSW Senior Secondary Music Education

Pauline Beston

A thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

University of Sydney
2001
The investigations described in this thesis are my own original work and have not been submitted to any other institution for the award of a degree.

Pauline Beston
Abstract

In 1994 a change in the 2 Unit (Common) NSW music syllabus and examination altered the position of composition in the senior secondary music curriculum. As a consequence, music teachers were required to teach and assess music compositions written by students at that level. This change, a lack of research in composition assessment as part of a senior curriculum, and evidence which suggests that for many music teachers, implementing creative music programs in secondary schools is challenging, provided a rationale for the investigation. The purpose of this thesis is to explore how secondary music teachers in NSW responded to this change, by examining their practices in and perceptions of assessment of composition written in the senior secondary school. An underlying purpose of the study is to find how assessments influence teachers' composition pedagogy in the context of the senior secondary music curriculum.

Multiple-method triangulation was used in the investigation. The data-collecting instruments were a survey and an experiment, which were conducted with different samples of NSW secondary music teachers.

Results of the investigation show that teachers have similar perceptions about composition assessment and composition pedagogy. Teachers agree on assessment criteria, schedules, procedures, and have similar backgrounds in composition and its assessment. Identified issues which have potential to influence composition assessment and pedagogy are gender, teaching experience, and a lack of consensus on a definition of 'composition'. Although criteria consistently most valued are those related to the demonstration of craftsmanship in compositions, different assessment procedures result in changed assessments. There is a very strong relationship between composition assessment and pedagogy, and teachers integrate assessment into their composition teaching strategies. The introduction of syllabus and examination change in senior classes have influenced teachers' pedagogy at the senior secondary level. These changes have been instrumental in changing teachers' pedagogy throughout the whole secondary school music curriculum.
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CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND TO THE STUDY

Introduction
In 1994 a new syllabus, *Stage 6 Music Syllabus 2 Unit (Common) 3 Unit* (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a), was issued for senior secondary music classes in NSW. This syllabus mandated that each student in the 2 Unit (Common) component of this course submit an original composition as part of the Higher School Certificate (HSC) examination in that subject. Prior to 1994, only students who elected original composition as an HSC option submitted a composition for this examination. The submitted composition in the new 1994 HSC syllabus was to represent the mandatory topic, 'Music 1970 onwards' (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, p. 31). All students undertaking this were required to maintain a record of their compositional processes in a process diary. This was a new approach to composition in the 2 Unit (Common) syllabus, and signalled rejection in examinations of exercises in harmony, melody writing, and word setting, which for many decades had been used to assess student abilities in this area. Seemingly a small change in the way teachers prepare students for examination in music at HSC level, this was one of a number of changes which occurred in other parts of the syllabus at that time. However, this shift had wide implications for NSW music educators in their teaching and assessment in this course. This study investigates whether this change in syllabus and examination had an effect on NSW music teachers and their assessments of compositions written by senior secondary students. As this is a wide field with broad implications, the focus of the study is restricted to the relationship between how teachers assess composition and how they teach composition.

Before presenting the rationale for this study in greater depth, it is important to outline what is meant by the term 'composition', to place it in the broad context of music education, and to clarify details of its characteristics. The term 'composition' is used throughout this thesis both to refer to an artistic process and the product of that artistic process. Several educationists have defined composition as a process, and an act of creation which is highly personalised, requiring time, inventiveness, and varied working strategies (Burnard, 1995; Paynter, 1982;
1992). As an educational process, Reimer (1989) observed that the purpose of composition was a pedagogical one, as composition initiated instruction, demonstrated learning, provided students with artistic encounters with music, and led to musical understanding. As a product, composition is an original and 'unique set of pitches and durations that its composer can replicate' (Kratus, 1989, p. 8). Compositions as completed products at senior secondary level are required for HSC examination assessment in NSW through submission of both sound recording and written notation. Throughout the thesis, 'composition' refers to processes and products constructed through student invention within a music curriculum framework.

Composition products can result from application of a variety of proficiencies in music education. For the purpose of this thesis, selected proficiencies are included as process skills rather than outcomes of composition. The first of these is improvisation. Improvisation is frequently identified as a composition product in music education literature (for example, McMillan, 1999; Meadows, 1991; Tasmanian Secondary Assessment Board, 1998). Other writers consider that improvisation can encompass all parts of the composition spectrum, from process to product, or a combination of both (for example, Burnard, 2001; Kratus, 1991a). Most commonly, however, improvisation is a possible means of music learning in the production of a composition (for example, Paynter, 1982, 1992; NSW Board of Senior School Studies, 1983; NSW Board of Studies, 1994a). In this thesis, in accordance with the parameters defined in the latter literature, improvisation is defined as a technique used in composition writing as part of the developmental process which leads to the creation of an original, unique, and replicable product.

Several other competencies are also not included in the definition of composition which will be used throughout this thesis. Harmonic skill, melodic invention, and notation, like improvisation, are competencies which are demonstrated through their application in composition products. Arrangement of pre-existing music is an additional creative music competency. By 'arrangement' is meant 'the adaptation to one musical medium of music originally composed for another' (Scholes, 1991, p. 53), and as such it is a unique and valuable inventive skill which has been utilised by many composers such as Bach, Beethoven and Liszt.

Arranging was included in early NSW syllabuses to demonstrate students' creative abilities (for example, NSW Department of Education, 1972; NSW Board of Senior School Studies,
1983). However, arrangement of pre-existing music is not included as 'composition' in this thesis, in accordance with the definition of 'composition' in *Stage 6 Syllabus, Music 2 Unit (Common) 3 Unit* examination requirements as 'original composition' (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, p. 37). In this syllabus composition refers to 'the organisation of sounds' (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, p. 27). As 'arranging' is defined as a separate competency, in reflecting the underlying implications for creativity in the syllabus definition of composition, this thesis omits arranging from its definition of composition.

Composition in children's music education has emerged within a framework of a broad range of creative music activities in classrooms (Comte, 1988; Harris and Hawkesley, 1989; Hogg, 1994; Regelski, 1986; Swanwick, 1998). Outcomes of creativity research have encouraged problem solving and pupil-centred approaches in music pedagogy (Amabile, 1982, 1983; Gardner, 1982, 1983; Sternberg, 1999; Torrance, 1970; Webster, 1987a, 1987b, 1988; Weisberg, 1993, 1999). Internationally, from the 1960s, a creative music movement in music education has been seminal in the growth and acceptance of composition in the music curriculum throughout both primary and secondary schooling. However, the approach taken in this thesis, while acknowledging the influence of these dominant developments, focuses on teachers' pedagogy for and assessment practices in composition in the NSW senior secondary classroom. Rather than creativity, the focus of the thesis is composition in the school curriculum, where it is part of a broad and cumulative music education. References to literature and research in both creative music education and creativity are made when they are appropriate for the study. However, creativity itself is not the focus.

During the time of this research a more recent music syllabus, *Music 2 and Music Extension: Stage 6* (NSW Board of Studies, 1999b), was issued for implementation with Year 12 students in 2001. Although slight adjustments occurred in the later syllabus, the initiatives in composition implemented in *Stage 6 Syllabus, Music 2 Unit (Common) 3 Unit* (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a) were maintained. For example, the mandatory topic 'music 1970 onwards' (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, p. 31) of the 1994 syllabus, became 'music of the last 25 years (Australian focus)' (NSW Board of Studies, 1999b, p. 32) in the more recent document. The name of the process diary mandated in the 1994 syllabus was changed to a 'portfolio' in the later syllabus (NSW Board of Studies, 1999b, p. 44), and teachers were advised to conduct their total school-based assessment of compositions through this portfolio. The title of the course became 'Music 2' (NSW Board of Studies, 1999b, p. 6). However, despite these minor
adjustments, the position of composition and the requirement for its mandatory submission at HSC level did not change in the 1999 syllabus revision, so this study will concentrate on the 1994 document.

Therefore, in this thesis, terminology appropriate to the former syllabus is used. The course on which the study is based is identified throughout the thesis as 2 Unit (Common) Music. This was the compulsory component of the Stage 6 Music Syllabus, 2 Unit (Common) 3 Unit (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a) during the time of the research. In all references to this course, it is understood that it was introduced in NSW for implementation in Year 11 in 1994, and in Year 12 in 1995. Similarly, references to 'process diaries' are made, although this terminology has now been superseded by the term 'portfolio'.

1.1: Rationale for the study

Syllabus documents over the past forty years illustrate that the position, definition, and relevance of composition in the NSW senior secondary music curriculum changed gradually, and that assessments of composition have supported these changes. However, historically there has been little research on assessment of composition, and thus on how it influences teaching of composition. In 1956 the Syllabus in Music acknowledged composition as a skill for gifted students only:

Gifted pupils should be encouraged to compose or arrange music for the school choir or instrumental ensemble. It is important when this is done that the composer should hear his work performed, or at least be given sound reasons (with frank, constructive criticism) why it should not be used.

(NSW Department of Education, 1956, p.5)

Examinations provided no opportunity for 'gifted pupils' to demonstrate composing skills at that time, and assessed harmony, melody writing, and word setting exercises instead. Thus, while teachers were encouraged to support children's composing, they were required to prepare students for examination in outcomes which were purely theoretically based. In later syllabuses, Syllabus in Music in 1965 (NSW Department of School Education, 1965) and Higher School Certificate Syllabus in Music for Forms V and VI in 1972 (NSW Department of School Education, 1972), opportunities were still provided for 'gifted' students to compose for credit through submission of compositions. Although composed pieces submitted for examination through these syllabuses were assessed through notation only, a definition of composition as the creation of original music was implicit. In effect, teachers had dual
pedagogical responsibilities of teaching composition and teaching skill-based competencies. On the one hand was the need to encourage gifted students to write original pieces, and on the other was the need to instruct all students in harmony, melody writing, and word setting techniques.

One NSW music teacher from this time explained the conflict he faced in preparing students for examinations in conjunction with delivering a program in composition. Gill (1970), in a music education journal article, commented that he devised a pedagogy to teach composition with senior secondary classes. In these classes he used many strategies which required students to complete set tasks, improvise, perform their pieces in class, discuss their work with student peers, criticise outcomes, refine pieces, compete in composing competitions, and perform their works in concerts of original music. Preparing students for examinations within this composition program necessitated that he present a 'crash course' (Gill, 1970, p.14) in four part harmony which, after their training in composing, presented students with little challenge. This composition program, however, was not typical of secondary music pedagogy at that time. Reasons for this situation were attributed to a majority of teachers' preoccupations and experiences as music performers and critics, in addition to their self perceptions as non-composers (Gill, 1970; Hunt, 1970).

In 1983, a change was made in composition and its assessment in the Music Syllabus 2 Unit (Related) and 3 Unit Course for Years 11 and 12 (Board of Senior School Studies, 1983) for implementation with HSC classes in 1985. Three syllabus components of Performance, Music Reading and Writing, and Listening, which described music activities in earlier courses (NSW Department of School Education, 1965, pp. 1-4; NSW Department of Education, 1972, p. 2) were replaced by Performance, Composition, Musicology, and Aural Perception (NSW Board of Senior School Studies, 1983, p. 3). As one of these, the relevance of composition increased within the syllabus as each of the four syllabus activities was given equal weighting in the HSC examination. Additionally, students could elect further study from Performance, Composition, or Musicology. Integration between the four activity areas was a priority, and composition by imitation of previously composed music was suggested:

Whilst stressing the importance of performing and studying notated scores of contemporary compositions, the opportunity should be taken by students to compose in the various styles encountered as well, especially those in the experimental category.

(NSW Board of Senior School Studies, 1983, p.4)
Through observation of the works of others in Performance and Musicology activities, pursued in the study of selected units, students will gain and develop the ability to use artistically and musically techniques and skills in Composition and/or Arrangement.

(NSW Board of Senior School Studies, 1983, p.9)

However, while encouraging a stronger relevance for composition than was evident in prior music syllabuses, the 1983 syllabus introduced ambiguity into the definition of composition. This occurred because under the one title of 'Composition' multiple competencies were assessed. The first competency consisted of harmony, melody writing, and word setting, which maintained the tradition described in earlier documentation and which was mandatory for all students. A second competency was an additional option which was examined by submission of compositions. In this option, students could arrange pre-existing music, or write original compositions. In Course Description, 2/3 Unit Music, for implementation with HSC candidates in 1991, (NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1989) a minor adjustment required all submitted compositions to be presented in both notation and sound form. This had the potential to further integrate composition with performance, and music literacy with sound. Nevertheless, despite an increasingly relevant role in music education, during the period between 1983 and 1994, the composition of original music was still maintained for examination purposes as an elective option.

Teacher supervision of compositions submitted as part of the optional component of the HSC examination prior to 1994 had been of concern in examination committee reports (for example, NSW Board of Studies, 1985, 1986, 1987). For example, following the 1986 HSC, teachers were reminded of their obligations to guide students in seemingly fundamental aspects of compositions, such as the ranges of instruments:

All students require guidance in their choice of genre, instruments and layout of the scores, since many do not understand instrumental and vocal ranges, balance of parts and texture. Interaction between the student and teacher is important. Although the works must be original, it is not intended that students work in isolation.

(NSW Board of Studies, 1987, p.8).

There was an implication in later examination committee reports (NSW Board of Studies, 1992, 1993), that students should request advice from their teachers, as in 'students should seek teacher assistance' (NSW Board of studies, 1992, p.1), rather than that teachers were to provide instruction and supervision of composition writing.
A break was made with the tradition of composition as an option with the introduction of *Stage 6 Syllabus, Music 2/3 Unit Preliminary and HSC Courses* in 1994 (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a). In this syllabus, the position of composition changed. For implementation with HSC students in 1995, composition became a mandatory component, and all students were required to submit an original composition for examination. From then, the onus was placed on teachers to move composition out of 'isolation' and transfer it into the mainstream curriculum. Supervision by teachers was to be formalised with a process diary, which chronologically detailed student activities, research, experimentation, drafts, performances, reflections, revisions, recordings, and notation (NSW Board of Studies, 1995b, p. 110). Through a process diary, teachers could monitor evidence of student learning and application of knowledge, thus linking the process of composition to teaching and learning outcomes:

The Composition Process diary music must show evidence of the compositional processes by containing details of: background listening, musicological observations and performance within the style, the decision-making processes, the development of their compositional skills, performance considerations, their reflections on the composition, evidence of technology processes used, eg audio tapes, video tapes, computer print out, if relevant, and their appraisals of their compositions.

(NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, p. 36)

To this point, three changes have been identified as consequences of the 1994 2 Unit (Common) music syllabus: the obligation on teachers to teach composition in senior secondary classes; the position of composition as a mandatory component of this course; and the introduction of student process diaries. A fourth modification was the removal of ambiguity in the definition of composition. After 1994, composition was clearly outlined as an original enterprise. Arrangement was not available as a composing option, and no longer were students required to complete theoretical exercises for HSC examination purposes.

A fifth change equalised the weighting of composition, now restricted to original music, in relation to other learning experiences in aural skills, performance, and musicology. An assessment policy was introduced in NSW education in 1985 which made ongoing teacher assessments of senior student work compulsory. Guidelines for this assessment were provided by *Higher School Certificate: Assessment Guidelines* (NSW Board of Senior School Studies, Department of School Education, 1985). A later document, *Music 7 to 12 - Developing your HSC Assessment Scheme* (Statutory Boards Division of the NSW Department of Education, undated), was designed to show music teachers how to implement the earlier Board of Studies document, and to develop an assessment scheme using music
tasks and assignments. This document provided guidance to teachers, and formalised grading of student work during instruction, and on completion of work. The 1994 syllabus change, therefore, obliged teachers not only to conduct assessments of compositions to comply with mandated policy, but also to give equal significance to composition as to aural skills, musicology, and performance, by allocating it equal weighting in ongoing school-based assessments.

For teachers, the 1994 syllabus provided advice on how to teach composition. A clear description in the syllabus described composition, and expanded on ways teachers could develop composing in senior secondary classes:

Composition refers to the organisation of sounds. The development of skills in composing results from continued involvement in a wide range of experiences in class activities. This includes such activities as providing tuned and untuned ostinato patterns to songs, adding a bass line to a rock song, writing a variation on an existing tune, adding a counter-melody, spontaneously adding harmony to a melody, etc. These activities should range from the simple to the more complex and at times involve smaller tasks which can later be synthesised into the creation of whole pieces of music. This should include both group and individual work.

(NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, p.27)

Submitted compositions in the 1994 syllabus maintained the initiative introduced for implementation with HSC candidates in 1991, Course Description, 2/3 Unit Music, (NSW Board of Secondary Education, 1989). This was to integrate composition with performance through presentation of both a score and a sound recording at the HSC examination, although the score was to be the basis of assessment. In a similar way, composition was integrated with musicology by each submitted work being representative of the mandatory topic 'music 1970 onwards (Australian focus)' (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, p. 18). Integrating with other music activities suggested the need for a more holistic approach in teachers' pedagogy in music education than was previously expected. To comply with the change in composition assessment following the 1994 syllabus, teachers would be required to make adjustments to their teaching. They would need to ensure individual students would complete composing tasks with personalised solutions, as original composition was a compulsory component for all examination candidates. Teachers would need to allocate class time for the production of student responses, and integrate composition with other learning experiences in aural, performance, and musicology. Teachers were required to monitor students' composing efforts through supervision of process diaries. As school based assessments were required under the
policies of the NSW statutory board, teachers would need to gauge student achievement in composition as an ongoing responsibility in their teaching. The change in the 1994 syllabus, therefore, meant that teachers would not only be required to teach composition, but that they would need to assess it.

This change in the position of composition in NSW senior secondary music education was seen by some authors as an example of a wider movement in music education in Australia, which recommended that teachers provide opportunities for students to create, present, understand, and study a variety of musical styles (McPherson, 1995). On a national level, it was recognised that teachers should encourage students to learn music by taking risks, using their imagination, questioning prevailing values, exploring, criticising, inventing, practising, refining, and sharing their opinions with others (Curriculum Corporation, 1994a, p. 12). In application, McPherson considered that in providing opportunities to learn music in ways different from those in use, the NSW syllabus initiative implied a 'revolution in the way music educators must practise their craft' (McPherson, 1995, p. 41). Similarly, Dunbar-Hall (1999) saw that the change in composition assessment and its teaching, based on philosophical considerations not usually encountered in pre-service training, had implications for teaching and learning, and the role of teachers in music education. This author considered that music educators were required to make a 'quantum leap' to bridge the gap between their then current pedagogy and pedagogy appropriate to the 1994 syllabus (Dunbar-Hall, 1999, p. 45).

In comparison with other countries, Australia was acknowledged, along with England and Canada, as 'farther ahead in their curricular effort to stress original music-making' (Webster, 1994, p. 146) and similar developments in composition to those which have occurred in NSW are evident nationally. In varying degrees, music education in senior syllabuses in other Australian states also define composition as an original enterprise and generally show an increase in relevance in music education. Music (Year 12) - E632 (Curriculum Council, Western Australia, 2000) in Western Australia offers composition as an option in the senior syllabus, although maintaining examination of harmony and melody writing. In Victoria, Unit 3 Music Styles (Victorian Board of Studies, 2000) includes outcomes which produce student compositions and arrangements in identified styles and traditions. Improvisation, composition and arrangement in Years 11/12 Course MS713C in Tasmania (Tasmanian Secondary Assessment Board, 1998) are included as a substantial option for student examination. Alongside listening and performance, composing is listed in the Queensland senior syllabus as
a learning experience (Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, 1996). Included under 'Composition', in the Queensland syllabus, is an extensive list of composing encounters which range from theoretical applications of techniques through to free composition. A definition of 'Composition' in the Queensland document stresses the importance of student-centred learning in the creation of new music:

Composing involves the acquisition, development and application of music-writing and problem-solving skills to create music in a variety of styles and genres. The appropriate expressive characteristics are applied by selecting, sequencing, synthesising, evaluating and making judgements about musical elements.

(Queensland Board of Senior Secondary School Studies, 1996, p. 49)

A syllabus with similar examination procedures to those used in NSW is *Year 12 Stage 2 Syllabus in Music* in South Australia (Senior Secondary School Assessment Board of South Australia, 1993). In this, a folio of three compositions or arrangements and a composition journal are submitted for final examination. Through these senior syllabus documents, teachers in other states of Australia are subject to similar responsibilities in composition and its assessments as their colleagues in NSW, and the 1994 changes in this regard can be linked to a national view as to the importance of composition in senior secondary music classes.

The change in the position of composition in NSW senior secondary music education reflects the growing importance of children's composition in music teaching and learning evident throughout the final decades of the twentieth century in other countries. Despite isolated programs earlier, for example the work of Doig (1941, 1942a, 1942b), the 1960s were important in a movement towards a creative music curriculum. Innovators and projects from the 1960s, such as Schafer (1976, 1986) in Canada, Dennis (1970, 1975), Paynter and Aston (1970) and Self (1967, 1976) in the United Kingdom, and The Young Composers' Project and the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program in the United States of America (Mark, 1978) influenced developments in composition as a component of school based music education on an international level.

These new approaches to composition and creative music in education were propagated in Australia through personal contacts, conferences, and publications. For example, Paynter's work was known through publications and articles in Australian journals (for example, Paynter, 1972, 1977; Paynter & Aston, 1970). Other influences by prominent educators were through conferences. An early conference at which Maxwell Davies and Meller presented
new ideas for classroom composition was held in Sydney in 1965 (Australian Unesco Seminar on School Music, 1965). Concurrently with these developments in music education, education generally moved towards a learner-centred environment which emphasized discovery learning, individual problem solving and student decision making (Abeles, 1994; Leonhard and House, 1972; Mark, 1978; Rainbow, 1989; Taylor, 1979).

In recent years, interest in literature in children's composition has continued to broaden and grow. Considerable literature on this topic is appropriate to students at primary education levels (for example, Bamberger, 1977; Christensen, 1992; Davies, 1986, 1992, 1994; DeLorenzo, 1989; Hanley, 1994; and Levi, 1991). Similarly, studies have examined composition processes in the early and middle years of secondary school (for example Gamble, 1984; Preston, 1994; Mellor, 1999, 2000; and Wiggins, 1994). Most research from an Australian viewpoint in children's composing at these levels also concentrates on composition processes (Barrett, 1996; Hogg, 1994; Marsh, 1995; Merrigan, 1999; van Ernst, 1993a, 1993b; Wilson & Wales, 1995), while other Australian and overseas research has examined technology in relation to composition (Airy & Parr, 2001; Ely, 1992; Hickey, 1997; Mahin, 1986; Merrick, 1997). Other studies of student composition were at university levels (for example, Colley et al, 1992; Davidson and Welsh, 1988). Although some studies provided information on compositions written by students at senior secondary level (Burnard, 1995; Kennedy, 1999), research has highlighted student learning rather than teachers' roles in student composition.

In all the above studies, research into composition assessment was subordinate to the investigation of composition processes, although several composition studies did draw attention to assessment issues (for example, Bangs, 1992; Brinkman, 1994; Bunting, 1987, 1988; Hickey, 1995). Some studies have investigated teachers' assessments of children's compositions (for example, Pilsbury & Alston, 1996; Searby & Ewers, 1996; Simmonds, 1988; Swanwick, 1998; Webster & Hickey, 1995). These studies, however, were directed at assessment of composition written by students in primary and junior secondary classes, or at university level. Apart from these, no other literature was found which discussed compositions written by students at senior secondary school level, or which examined the ways in which these compositions were assessed by music teachers.
The present study was designed therefore to investigate NSW secondary music teachers' assessments of senior secondary students' compositions in response to a number of factors: change in the 1994 music syllabus and examination in NSW in the 2 Unit (Common) course; the gradual historical development of the position of composition in music education both in Australia and internationally; and a demonstrated lack of research at this level. To facilitate this, a number of research questions and hypotheses were formulated to examine if changes in the position of composition in the curriculum had influenced the ways teachers assess composition, and whether this had an effect on their composition pedagogy.

1.2: Research questions and hypotheses

In response to change in the position of composition in 1994 in the 2 Unit (Common) music syllabus, the purpose of this investigation is to explore the practices NSW music teachers use when assessing senior secondary compositions, and to reveal how teachers relate composition assessment to composition pedagogy. To enable this to take place, the following research questions were formulated:

Research Question 1

- In teaching composition to senior students in NSW secondary schools, what do secondary music teachers report are their:
  i) assessment strategies, and
  ii) assessment criteria?

Research Question 2

- What is the extent of the relationship between secondary music teachers' pedagogy in composition and their assessments of composition in NSW senior secondary classes?

The research questions are examined in a survey conducted with a large sample of NSW secondary music teachers. The survey is fully explained in Chapter 3 (pp. 72-83) and its results are reported in Chapter 4. These results show consensus among NSW music teachers on numerous assessment characteristics: scheduling of assessments; preferences in types of feedback; and teachers' opinions on the role of composition assessments. Literature on this
topic (reviewed in Chapter 2) similarly suggests that the issues of inter-judge reliability, assessment procedures, and assessment criteria, are problematic. A subsequent experiment conducted with a small sample of NSW secondary music teachers, tested teachers’ levels of agreement on these three issues. Three compositions were composed as exemplars of compositions written by students at senior secondary level, and they were assessed by teachers in the conduct of the experiment. The research experiment is described fully in Chapter 3 (pp. 83-96), and reported in Chapter 5. Issues identified in the review of related literature, from the *Stage 6 Music Syllabus, 2 Unit (Common) 3 Unit* (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a), and from results of the survey, were used to construct experiment questions. Three hypotheses investigated the importance of different judges, different procedures, and different criteria in composition assessments:

**Hypothesis 1**
- **There will be no effect for different judges on grades allocated by each judge for three compositions written at a senior secondary level.**

**Hypothesis 2**
- **There will be no effect for different assessment procedures in assessing three compositions written at a level of senior secondary music students on:**
  1. judges’ scores
  2. judges’ decision-making processes.

**Hypothesis 3**
- **There will be an effect for different criteria in assessing three compositions written at senior secondary level in:**
  1. each composition
  2. all three compositions.

1.3: **Thesis structure**
The thesis is structured in six chapters. This first chapter has situated the study from observation of gradual changes since the late 1950s in the position of composition in secondary music education in NSW, in other states of Australia, and in increasingly widening
contexts of education systems where similar concerns for composition have been demonstrated. Of particular importance was the change in the position, definition, and relevance of composition mandated in *Stage 6 Music Syllabus 2 Unit (Common) 3 Unit* (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a), and again in *Music 2 and Music Extension: Stage 6* (NSW Board of Studies, 1999b). The growing importance of composition in music education in Australia and internationally, and the lack of research in composition assessments at senior secondary level similarly explained the rationale.

Chapter 2 presents a review of related literature in composition assessment. It focuses on assessments of children's compositions written primarily within a music curriculum. In literature on this topic there is a lack of clarity and consistency between assessment principles, theories, and purposes: the presentation of literature on these features forms the first part of the review. The remaining two sections of the review of related literature reflect the structural plan of the survey used in this study. The first of these explores literature about assessment strategies and criteria used by teachers and experts in student composition assessments. The third section of the review of related literature describes pedagogy used by teachers in teaching children and novice composers, and presents issues which have an impact on composing.

Methodology used in the thesis is presented in Chapter 3. That chapter describes the research design as multiple-method triangulation, identifies the subject samples used in the research protocols, and describes the data gathering instruments and procedures used in the research. Presentation of data is provided in two chapters. Chapter 4 presents, and provides a preliminary interpretation of, data from the first research protocol, a survey of NSW secondary music teachers, and responds to the two research questions. Chapter 5 presents, and provides a preliminary interpretation of, data from the second research protocol, an experiment completed by a small number of NSW secondary music teachers. Chapter 5 tests the three hypotheses, in addition to providing additional data appropriate to the first research question. In the final chapter, Chapter 6, a synopsis of the study is presented. Data from both research protocols are combined in this chapter and findings are presented from this perspective.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Introduction

Less prominent is literature about secondary school children's composition, and of this most is directed at junior secondary school level. For example, Bunting (1987, 1988), Green, (1990), Hogg (1994), Loane (1984), Peacock (1994), Preston (1994), and van Ernst (1993a), have investigated composing with non-naive students in classroom settings. A small amount of literature has been written about children's compositions at senior secondary level (Burnard, 1995; Dunn 1992; Hassler, 1991; Kennedy, 1999; Marcellino, 1995; Merrigan, 1999). Other literature has focussed on composition with students at university level (for example, Colley et al, 1992; Davidson and Welsh, 1988; Irvine et al, 2001). Again, literature about secondary children's composing is primarily concerned with examining the composition processes used by students to create new pieces. Although not the priority, in many of the above studies evaluative accounts of composing experiences and composition outcomes are presented. These are included in this review of literature.

Literature written exclusively about composition assessment is limited, and encompasses different levels of student experience and training, from primary through to university level. For example, composition assessment literature by Bunting (in Paynter, 1982), Pilsbury and

Chapter 1 provided a definition of composition as both an artistic process and a product of that artistic process. In defining the term 'composition assessment', therefore, both the process of composing and its product are considered. Judgements made of creative work at all stages of the ongoing process, whether the beginning, during, or on completion, are implicated in this review. Composition assessment refers to data collecting, interpreting, and judging of original music created by students principally as part of a school music curriculum. Judgements can be in the form of observation, verbal or written comments, marks, grades, or other forms of response. Judgements include those made by composers, teachers, composers' peers, or experts beyond the classroom. Compositions used for assessments can be in the form of sound only, sound and notation, and performance.

Although composition and its assessment is a small area of investigation in music education, groups of researchers from Australia, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America, have drawn attention to the need for gauging accurately school students' levels of learning in composing. In different countries, contrasting emphases have been made in these assessments. In Australia, ongoing research into music learning and assessment of outcomes has the potential to provide a theoretical framework for composition assessment (for example, Irving et al, 1999, 2001; Jeanneret and Cantwell, 2001; McPherson, 2001). In Canada, Durrant (1991), Freed-Garrod (1999), Hanley (1994), Hassler, (1991), and Roberts (1994) have highlighted student peer and self assessment in composing studies. Composition assessment studies in the United States of America have been concerned with accurate product appraisal (for example, Kratus, 1989, 1991, 1994b; Hickey, 1995; Webster and Hickey, 1995), and with exploring alternative ways of using assessment to support learning (Armstrong, 1994; Brandt, 1988; Gardner, 1982, 1983, 1991; Wolf, 1988). In
composition literature over two decades in the United Kingdom, many writers have focused on assessment of student compositions written as part of a school curriculum (Bunting, in Paynter, 1982; Pilsbury and Alston, 1996; Loane, 1984; Simmonds, 1988; Swanwick, 1998). While many aspects of assessment have been investigated in these studies there is no comprehensive approach which combines the purpose of composition with a theory, and an appropriate assessment method, nor is there a clear understanding of how to achieve satisfactory resolution of problems associated with the implementation of assessment in relation to the teaching of composition in secondary music classes.

Questions about the appropriateness of assessing artistic products were common in literature in the late twentieth century. Rowntree (1977) in Assessing Students, How Shall We Know Them?, and Aspin and Ross in Assessment in the Arts (1986) raised concerns about assessment of artistic products in the creative arts. The latter writers argued that creative products may be assessed artistically and rated objectively, but quantification in this does not show children's aesthetic development in a creative arts setting. According to Aspin (1986), objectivity in creative arts products is not the same as in other school subjects and requires sensitive judgement from the assessor. Although his contribution to learning in the arts and arts assessment was considerable (Ross, 1978, 1980, 1984, 1993), Ross (1986) maintained that assessing artistic products was a complex, problematic process which, when used, was frequently counter-productive to learning. In more recent music education literature, Ross (1995) considered that although music teachers have incorporated in their teaching new teaching styles and content, especially composing, music education generally fails to accommodate the unique qualities of music as a means for personal expression.

Finney (1999) places Paynter in the same philosophical position as Ross on composition assessment, as Paynter's approach to music composition values learning through the experience of composing, rather than placing value on the product of learning. Paynter was ambivalent about assessment, and considered the normative aspects of competitive music assessment inevitable, but 'odious', as assessments created unwelcome comparisons between different students (Paynter, 1982, p. 17). In a later interview, Paynter commented:

I think that assessment is not particularly difficult, but I simply think it is not very profitable. We do it all the time . . . I don't see that it tells us an awful lot or means a great deal. I have to maintain that position. It seems such a silly thing to want to do.

(Paynter, in Salaman, 1988, p. 31).
Educationists strongly opposed the view that arts subjects should be exempt from assessment. Eisner noted that monitoring student achievement in creative arts subjects in the curriculum is desirable, as it is important to know what children have learnt as a result of tuition. He recommended:

... not to evaluate children's art is to be educationally irresponsible. Education is a goal-directed activity, as teachers are concerned not simply with bringing about change, but with bringing about desirable change. If the teacher does not evaluate what children do, how can he determine if what he is doing is contributing to or hampering their growth in art


In research conducted with music teachers in England, Cartwright (1989) discovered that there was a common perception by the teachers, who considered that assessment was a valuable diagnostic tool which supported their teaching. In his interviews with music and other arts teachers, Cartwright confirmed that teachers agreed with Eisner on the desirability and necessity for assessment of student creative work. More recently, Paynter (2000), in an analytical investigation of a group composition written by three ten-year-olds, demonstrated an accommodation for the position of assessment through content analysis of a finished version of the students' composition. This reflected not only a change in attitude towards assessment, but a change in how compositions could be assessed. In this way, assessments of compositions written within a curriculum were able to confirm that change had occurred in children's work as a result of teaching.

Chapter structure
This review of related literature is structured into three broad sections. The first provides a general theoretical foundation for the study. Literature in this section presents a rationale for assessment in education, relates composition assessment to educational assessment, and presents composition assessment purposes and theories. Four purposes of assessment are identified:

1) Summative
2) Formative
3) Evaluative
4) Pedagogical

The first purpose for composition assessment is summative, and this is used to monitor student progress and achievement on completion of work, or at specified times during the progress of learning. The second purpose is formative, to support student learning processes
which are ongoing in the music curriculum. Both of these purposes focus on student achievement through the acquisition of knowledge and demonstration of skills. A third purpose for composition assessment given prominence in related literature is to evaluate the success of teaching strategies. Here attention focuses on teachers’ perceptions of the effectiveness or otherwise of their tuition. A fourth purpose for composition assessment is pedagogical, and in this purpose, attention is drawn to education systems and their influence in determining teacher behaviours. Other purposes for composition assessment are in evidence to a lesser degree and are generic to education generally. These include identifying needs and allocating resources, making promotion judgements, informing policy, and making schools accountable.

Following a description of the purposes of assessment from literature, theories of assessment are presented. Five theories of composition assessment have been identified:

1) Technology
2) Verbal protocols
3) Consensual
4) Content analysis
5) Portfolio

All five methods are strongly linked to the purpose for which compositions are written. The first four relate to completed composition products, and are ways of gauging achievement in outcomes of children's composing. Most theories have been adapted from applications in other disciplines. For example, the origin of Amabile's (1982, 1983) consensual assessment theory, was in assessment of visual arts products. As a result, theories in the first four categories are generally unrelated to teachers' pedagogy, and are demonstrated ways to place value on creative products. The final assessment theory, portfolio assessment, relates to ongoing composition assessment during music learning. Portfolio methods are directly concerned with music pedagogy, and have been formalised through extensive research (Armstrong, 1994; Brandt, 1988; Wolf, 1988).

The second section of the review of related literature reviews studies which describe composition assessment criteria and strategies. Designed to present background methods of assessment and the range of environments utilised by music educators in their assessments, this section of the review is important in establishing the parameters around which the first
research protocol is based. There are two divisions in this section. The first presents literature which describes criteria used in composition assessments: subjectivity and objectivity; craftsmanship; originality; and style. Six procedures are described from assessment literature: rubrics; task design; qualitative and quantitative measures; holistic and analytic approaches; methods of composition presentation; and teacher/student interaction. These issues re-appear later in this thesis as a survey investigates criteria and procedures used by NSW senior secondary music teachers in their assessments of senior students' work, and an experiment tests criteria and procedures used by secondary music teachers with three sample compositions written at senior secondary level.

The third section of this review of related literature presents a body of literature on composition pedagogy. This section is in six parts, the first of which presents an historical review of composition teaching pedagogy. Five other parts highlight issues which have an impact on teachers' assessments of compositions presented in literature. These are composition teacher characteristics, gender, teachers as composers, teacher training in composition, and teachers' reliability in assessments. Again, issues concerned with teachers are further investigated through the two data collecting instruments used in this study.

2.1: Assessment purposes and theories

Literature in educational assessment generally shows that assessment is an integral part of the teaching-learning process and that it has a central role in education (Airasian, 1989; Bloom et al, 1971; Hannon, 1993; Izard, 1991; Simon, 1983; Stiggins, 1997; Withers and McCurry, 1993). Many writers have commented that the most highly visible and critical role of assessment is to communicate information about students' achievements formally through reporting mechanisms. Simon (1983) claimed that assessments which only promote and select students through grading and classifying contribute little to the improvement of teaching and learning and often have negative effects on pupils' achievement. While these types of assessments were common in education systems at one time, the influence of Dewey (1960), who was concerned for the rights of the individual, Thorndike (1916), who was concerned with finding the most efficient method for instruction, and Bruner (1966), who considered students should take some responsibility for their own learning, have been influential in broadening approaches to educational assessment. According to Stiggins (1997), a positive, constructive, assessment environment involves an array of tools,
strategies, and recurring themes which influence policies, support teachers, inform instruction, and lead to student success in education.

Changes in the role of assessment during the final decades of the twentieth century show greater integration of assessment with teaching and learning, and stronger use of assessment to reinforce student learning. Broadfoot considered education assessment must be subservient to the learning process, and that:

... the interests of students should be paramount; the primary purpose of assessment is to identify strength and guide improvement; that reporting should emphasize progress and growth – not comparisons; that assessment should be fair to all; that it should involve all parties affected; that self-assessment should be the starting point for assessment; that assessment must include the more sophisticated skills now being sought.

(Broadfoot, 1992, p. 7)

It is in these changing and diverse roles in the educational environment that composition assessment is situated in this thesis. With the introduction of mandatory composition in Stage 6 Music Syllabus 2 Unit (Common) 3 Unit (NSW Board of Studies, 1994), teachers in NSW were required to provide ongoing guidance to all students in this course, and to make judgements about the success of their work. With this change, Broadfoot's 'sophisticated skills' were shown as outcomes and included: critical appraisal, experimenting with different technologies, analysis, improvisation, invention, and discipline and thoroughness in composing processes (NSW Board of Studies, 1994, p. 7).

**Purpose of assessment**

Literature currently lists four major purposes for composition assessment: summative, formative, evaluative, and pedagogical (Cartwright, 1989; Ross, 1993). Sandene (1995) affirmed that a primary aim in composition assessment, as in all educational assessment, is to find what students know and can do as a result of learning, and assessments are used to judge and report student knowledge and abilities. This writer claimed that the fundamental requirement of all educational assessment, not less so in music, was to confirm that learning had occurred and students were able to demonstrate a change in behaviour and competency as a result of learning. Even music assessment's harshest critic, Ross, considered that music teachers needed to verify the final experience of a composition, if only to corroborate that a student achieved a work which is creative, in the form of: 'Does it work? Is it honest? Does it proclaim life?' (Ross, 1980, p. 117).
Two theorists in music education, Gardner (in Armstrong, 1994) and Swanwick (1988), agree that assessment and teaching 'are the two sides to the same coin' (Gardner, in Armstrong, 1994, p. 117). While both these writers apply assessment principles differently, and have contrasting philosophical foundations on which they base their assessment theories, the perception of the reciprocity between music teaching and assessing by both writers confirms the importance of assessment in music. Swanwick's philosophy considers education is essentially a process of active criticism, enacted through encounter and instruction. In school, he suggests, teachers try to prepare students through a series of interactions by framing knowledge and experience in a systematic way so that learning is cumulative. Swanwick believed:

\[\text{. . . to teach is to assess, to weigh up, to appraise; in order more adequately to plan for and facilitate richer response, to accept that arts teaching is arts criticism.}\]

(Swanwick, 1988, p. 149)

Swanwick addressed the role of the teacher which dealing with progression and the complexity of learning in music, and likened a teacher's function to that of a music critic. Assessments from a critic's perspective acknowledge the complexity, multi-dimensional, and cumulative aspect of music learning (Swanwick, 1998). In contrast to Swanwick's approach to music, and particularly to composition assessment, Gardner recommends that teachers approach assessments as observers in naturalistic classrooms. From teachers' observations from this position, a multitude of student behaviours can be assessed (Armstrong, 1994). Rather than observing as a critic, Gardner recommended that teachers witness student learning through projects, portfolios, students' reflections on their creative work, and teacher-student interviews, so that a broad view of students' achievements can be observed (Wolf, 1988).

**Summative assessment**

The first purpose of assessing compositions is traditional in education and is used on completion of a body of work, or at times during learning, to judge overall success of students' progress and to observe student growth. This is termed summative or formal assessment (Airasian, 1989; Sandene, 1995; Swanwick, 1998; Williams, 1999). Traditionally, summative assessment has occurred when a composition is completed. Webster (1988) commented that little organized study has been conducted into student composition from this standpoint, although in more recent literature, greater attention has been given to it (for example, Kennedy, 1999; Mellor, 2000; Pilsbury and Alston, 1996;
Webster and Hickey, 1995). However, earlier studies identified that summative assessments used in a classroom environment have the ability to demonstrate student development clearly and to show that change has occurred as a result of tuition and experience. Two classroom researchers have used summative assessments of compositions in both primary and secondary composition work to observe long-term progress (Davies, 1986, 1992; Bunting, 1987, 1988). Davies observed primary-aged students' progress and processes in compositions over eighteen months (Davies, 1986) and two years (Davies, 1992). Results from her research suggested children proceed at different rates of progress from each other, and frequently individual children regress and progress with time. Davies observed that slow maturation of individual progress endemic in children's composition was most easily observed through summative assessments of compositions over a long period (Davies, 1986).

According to Bunting (1987, 1988), progress could be easily observed with secondary student compositions when compositions were viewed in retrospect and from a distance. He reported how he provided long-term summative assessment of four secondary students' pieces completed during a school year. Bunting's results were similar to Davies' in that individual students progressed at different rates from each other, and frequently appeared to show static development. Bunting found long-term summative observations of compositions manifested progress more clearly than short-term observation of processes:

By collecting sketches, discussion and finished work on tape for 'marking' at home the teacher can keep broadly in touch with the pupil's development – though extended listening to the work of twelve to fifteen pupils takes enormous amounts of time. But my experience has been that only later, looking back over a complete year's work in the calm of the summer holiday, have I become aware of the hidden patterns of development. In the busy life of the school term I found time to listen, but lacked the concentration to perceive.

(Bunting, 1988, p. 306-7)

Formative assessment

Formative evaluation, first used by Scriven (1967) in connection with curriculum improvement, was adapted to instruction and student learning for the purpose of improving pedagogy and is ongoing while learning is taking place. Duerkson (1995) described formative assessment as a way to guide instruction and support pedagogy in composing by judging the developmental phases of learning, revising instruction, and improving the effectiveness of instruction by monitoring students while the learning process is proceeding. This music educator valued formative assessments as they provided interaction between
students and teachers through formal observation, pupil questions, discussion, and written work. In interacting with children in creative work a suitable pedagogy is required, and considerable advice has been presented in literature on pedagogy appropriate to composition in secondary classes for over thirty years (especially in Maxwell Davies, 1970; Paynter, 1972, 1982, 1992; Paynter and Aston, 1970; Schafer, 1969, 1976, 1986).

Additionally, many studies of compositional processes by secondary children within the curriculum show appropriate pedagogy for learning in individual composition work and in group composing (Gammon, 1996; Harris & Hawsley, 1989; Kaschub, 1997; Loane, 1984; Preston, 1994). Two writers have provided models for learning in composition at this level (Regelsky, 1986; van Ernst, 1993b). An Australian study by van Ernst (1993a) describes loosely structured problem-solving learning activities which secondary students use in composing new pieces. Van Ernst indicated there was little predictability in individual student processes which involve the student in such diverse activities and perceptions as:

believing in the task of composing, seeking compositional ideas from different sources, calling on a range of musical skills and knowledge, exercising imagination, using problem solving strategies, such as selecting, rejecting, organising and structuring, experimenting and improvising until decisions are made, notating or memorising the selected ideas, practising or rehearsing the piece, reflecting on the process, and finally presenting the composition in performance.

(van Ernst, 1993b, p. 35)

In structuring teaching within a composition framework, which van Ernst describes as interventions, formative assessments provide stimulus, motivation, confirmation, and diagnosis in composition processes. Researchers in this music field generally agree with van Ernst that student compositions develop through a series of stages during which assessment can occur through stimuli, motivation, confirmation, and diagnosis. One writer illustrated how formative assessment integrated with pedagogy in composition through developmental stages. Bunting (1987) labelled the first stage as the 'initial impulse', and in this, he claimed that assessment parameters defined in a task create interest, stimulate activity, and motivate students throughout the writing of a composition. Harris and Hawsley (1989) recommended that confirmation by a teacher of students' composing processes is possible initially through observing student work and discussing future progress, to plan, and to explore options. Auker (1991) describes intervention with student composing processes as a delicate procedure, in which a teacher must behave with sensitivity to students' feelings. This writer considers intervention undertaken through
questioning helps students define problems or poses solutions to those problems. Other writers, such as Harris and Hawksley (1989), Regelski (1986), and Bunting (1988), reflected on the application of diagnosis of difficulties or inaccuracies in compositions, and they agreed that diagnosis of compositions on the completion of tasks may identify gaps in knowledge or locate techniques which can be developed. Discussions which are diagnostic, they suggest, are generally of greater benefit to subsequent compositions than for the composition in which the diagnoses are made.

Colwell (1995) argued that the ability of formative assessment in music to provide feedback to students during ongoing tuition was the major advantage of this form of assessment, as through class discussion the application of composition techniques could be debated. Brown (1982), and Kendall (1977) described how, in teaching composition with aspiring composers during the first half of the twentieth century, Nadia Boulanger's success as a composition teacher was attributed to her ability to guide each of her students in appropriate methods to overcome compositional problems on their own terms. In her teaching, she created an environment with adult students, where vigorous, active discussion provided a forum for them to reflect on their work. Important in her teaching was her understanding of, and empathy with, her students.

With children, Roberts (1994) discovered that immediate feedback is most important, and formative assessments provide for this. In a survey on music assessment conducted with Canadian music teachers, this researcher discovered that weekly or bi-weekly feedback was highly valued by teachers to support student learning. Respondents in the same survey also identified assessments which compared an individual student's work other examples of the same student's work were more helpful than normative assessments which compare different students' achievements. In summary, formative assessments are directly concerned with teaching and learning, and can be integrated into teachers' ongoing composition pedagogy.

**Evaluative assessment**

A third purpose of composition assessment, not directly applicable to the classroom environment, although related to curriculum design and to the role of the teacher as planner, has been identified in literature. This purpose is evaluative, and is designed to align teaching outcomes with learning objectives. Outcomes-based learning, part of a global trend in education in the 1990s (Colwell, 1995; Duerkson, 1995), was adopted in Australian
education through the development of national profiles (Eltis, 1997; Jeanneret, 1999). Cope (1996) provided a detailed account of the advantages of outcomes-based learning in music. In outcomes-based curricula, assessment drives curriculum by profiling specifications of what students are expected to learn, and sets out in sequence outcomes with broad levels, to characterise general stages of development. Rather than normative assessment, which grades students against one another, this type of assessment is criterion-based. When considering assessment in music this approach requires the identification of what students should be able to achieve as a result of instruction, and then determining and designing appropriate activities that will show attainment. Both teachers and students benefit as assessment can be aligned to ensure that what is being measured is the same as what is being taught. It also ensures a suitable assessment tool is used for each musical behaviour, and avoids a perceived problem with assessment practice in which examinations drive education.

Application of outcomes-based curricula was introduced in the 1994 music syllabus in NSW, where four sets of outcomes in composition are clearly defined as 'objectives, skills outcomes, knowledge outcomes, and values/attitudes outcomes' (NSW Board of Studies, 1994, p. 7). In structuring the curriculum to synchronize teaching outcomes with learning objectives, the teacher's function is broader than that of a tutor, as the teacher is required to plan programs through which students can achieve the stated outcomes. Although commenting earlier than the writers cited above, Oliver (1978) advocated the use of music composition outcomes to plan teaching programs, through which music teachers accept responsibility for their students' learning. This writer confirmed that in providing environments and goals for learning, evaluating students' outcomes guides teachers in decisions about future planning to address student needs. Oliver asserted that when children are set clear goals, and receive recognition for achieving them, student learning is effective, and suitable teaching is confirmed. Harris and Hawlesley (1989) corroborated Oliver's views by describing the benefits of evaluative assessments which enable teachers to gauge the success of their pedagogy by comparison of defined outcomes with their students' outcomes.

Other writers have demonstrated how synchronisation of progressive learning outcomes with teaching objectives can be achieved in composition (Bodman, 1992; Salaman, 1988b). Salaman (1988b) identified that a composition objective was both an end product and a
stimulus around which the restraints and freedoms are applied by a student to produce a composition. Assessments made on the application of objectives then function as a reliable guide for making summative judgements. Salaman recommended objectives should range from simple to more complex parameters, confined to desirable skills and concepts. Bodman (1992), provided a generic set of composition benchmarks for students in primary and secondary school, and identified appropriate knowledge of composition developmental levels and ability.

Similar to benchmarks identified by Bodman, but aimed at senior secondary level, the 1997 HSC Examination Report in Music (NSW Board of Studies, 1998) in NSW detailed a framework of learning outcomes in which different levels of accomplishment were described for compositions assessed for the HSC in that year. The framework included five ranks which ranged from the poorest efforts to those which were outstanding, and criteria on which compositions were assessed were clarified into four criteria appropriate to style, composition processes, understanding of musical concepts, and manuscript presentation. In contrasting achievement, there are clear statements which align student outcomes with the demonstration of learning in compositions. For example, in the category of understanding of concepts, outcomes at the above average level, and below average level are:

**Above average** - demonstrates an understanding of how to use the concepts of music, makes judgements about the use of concepts, some synthesis of material, simple harmonic/rhythmic vocabulary, establishes unity/contrast.

**Below average** - demonstrates a superficial understanding of how to use the concepts of music, overuses one or two concepts at the expense of others creating a composition lacking melodic/rhythmic or harmonic interest, and lacks clear harmonic sense, little unity/contrast, lacks melodic/rhythmic interest.

(NSW Board of Studies, 1998, p. 33)

Jeanneret (1999) questioned whether composition assessments in NSW which use generic guidelines are sufficiently accurate to reflect students' musical achievements in this medium, and reflected similar reservations to those stated by Ross (1986). Nevertheless, as Bodman (1992) and Salaman (1998b) showed, working within an evaluative framework, and using assessment guidelines as learning outcomes, teachers can design a composition pedagogy and assessment structure appropriate to students at senior secondary level.
Pedagogical assessment

A fourth purpose for composition assessment applies to education systems. It has been long accepted that assessment has the ability to change educational pedagogy. The link between assessment, pedagogy and teaching practice in education in general was identified by Gasking (1947), who argued that teachers will concentrate on developing student capacities which are directly measured in public examinations so as to ensure student success. Similarly, Izard (1991) held that explicit or implicit examination procedures influence course content and instructional methods. Broadfoot (1992) proposed that the fundamental role of educational assessment is to facilitate curriculum and pedagogic change, and while in the past assessments may have been the cause of perversion of the real objectives of education, changes in examination structure can be fashioned to influence teachers to reform teaching practice. It was Broadfoot's belief that the pedagogical function of assessment underpins the importance of teachers in education.

Comments by music educators reflected on how teachers are important in assessments both in both Great Britain and the United States of America. Bunting (1987) and Colwell (1995) suggested that results in public music examinations, and student levels of success, frequently reflect more about the effectiveness of a teacher's functions than judgements of pupil achievement. Swanwick (1998) presented a stronger view for the pedagogical purpose of music assessments. He considered that assessments ensured that teachers share common objectives and the same identified criteria, and they were important in their ability to facilitate reliability between teachers' assessments, and validity of the criteria on which assessments were made:

Formal assessment is but a very small part of any classroom or studio transaction but it is important to get the process as right as we can, otherwise it can badly skew the educational enterprise and divert our focus from the centre to the periphery; from musical to unmusical criteria.

(Swanwick, 1998, p. 7)

In composition, changed assessment strategies were shown to promote change in music pedagogy in the United Kingdom (Paynter, 1982, 2000; Swanwick, 1989). Gammon (1996) observed that the biggest positive influence on music education in recent years was the General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE), which introduced examination of junior secondary music students' compositions in that country. Gammon explained that mandating composition in the curriculum and examination 'made otherwise reluctant teachers face the challenges of teaching composition' (Gammon, 1996, p. 107). Swanwick
confirmed that introduction of the GCSE was considered a very positive influence in music, although some anxiety was felt by teachers who perceived they had inadequate preparation for it (Swanwick, 1989). Paynter (2000) alleged that more students were involved with composition in other countries (other than Great Britain) as a result of mandatory composition in syllabuses.

In NSW, a discrepancy was observed in music examinations at Higher School Certificate (HSC) level, and composition teaching theory (Dunbar-Hall, 1993). This writer commented on the contradiction in the senior music curriculum which advocated creativity in practice, and at the same time required students to complete exercises in harmony, melody writing, and word setting under examination conditions (see NSW Board of Senior School Studies, 1983). The practice of conducting examinations in composition through this method, which this author called a 'misnomer' (Dunbar-Hall, 1993, p. 16) was discontinued from 1995, when composition of original music was made mandatory for examination in the 2 Unit (Common) music course (NSW Board of Studies, 1994).

In two studies conducted at different NSW universities, tertiary students were asked to reflect on training they had experienced in secondary schools (Dunbar-Hall, 1999; Jeanneret, 2001). Tertiary students in both studies, who were then under-graduates in these institutions, considered that in their training in schools as secondary students, their teachers were challenged in teaching original composition. Dunbar-Hall (1999) asked pre-service music education students whether their current training, which used a creative approach to music teaching and learning, was the same, or different, from their own backgrounds in secondary schools. Results showed that a large majority of students considered they had little or no experience of creative musical experiences as school students. Comments by the students demonstrated that teaching strategies they had experienced had centred on preparation for examination formats - for example: 'creativity was left to melody writing' and 'most (work) was textbook learning' (Dunbar-Hall, 1999, p. 51). Jeanneret (2001) conducted a similar study at another NSW university with pre-service secondary music teachers, and discovered that students did not feel confident in their own ability to compose, or to teach composition in schools. Under-graduates in Jeanneret's study attributed their inadequacy in composition to an impoverished background in composition experiences at high school. Composing experiences were described as 'confusing and lacking direction', and students felt 'inadequate and uncomfortable' with prescribed composition tasks while
they were school students. Inappropriate teaching methods which neglected creative music work and problem solving activities were attributed to a lack of pre-service teachers’ confidence in composing and in their perceptions of inadequacy to teach composition. The researcher concluded:

There is a clear lack of task analysis, problem solving skills and strategic knowledge that has contributed to their disposition and self efficacy in relation to their own composing that, in turn, has coloured their beliefs about how to approach composition as a teacher.

(Seanneret, 2001, p. 107)

These studies, conducted since the implementation of change in the position of composition in the NSW senior secondary syllabus, reflect that in teaching composition in NSW schools, secondary school teachers have been challenged in their teaching. It was anticipated by McPherson (1995) that music teachers would require major pedagogic adjustments to address this syllabus change. Evidence from the above two studies suggests that some teachers, although accommodating changed syllabus requirements by complying with guidelines for student outcomes, have still to adjust composition pedagogy for the long-term benefit of student learning.

The section above presented literature which showed the purposes of composition assessment. Four purposes were identified: summative, formative, evaluative, and pedagogical. Shown in literature to be valuable in all four areas, assessment counter-balances teaching and supports student learning. Different in each purpose is the role a teacher takes: in summative assessment, a teacher is tutor and critic; in formative assessment, a teacher is mentor and guide; in evaluative assessment, a teacher is a planner and self-appraiser; and in pedagogical purposes, a teacher acts as a facilitator. Purposes of assessment are closely related to theories of composition assessment. Summative and formative assessments are most important in the identified theories which are presented in the literature below.

Composition assessment theories

Five theories on composition assessment have been identified in literature. Theories of composition assessment relate strongly to two of the purposes identified earlier in this review. Cartwright (1989) places the relationships between theories and purposes on a continuum, with formative, which is diagnostic and informal at one end, and summative, characterised by examinations, at the other. In the literature on creativity, Besemer &
O'Quinn (1993) suggested assessment design should be derived from a theoretical base to ensure that assessments of creative products serve the purpose for which they are used:

Nurturing and developing creative productivity without a sound theoretical basis, judging instruments and the process of judgement can be at best superficial, and at worst harmful. (Besemer & O'Quinn, 1993, p. 336)

Most theories in composition assessment are appropriate to summative purposes, and although there is considerable literature on formative purposes of assessment, one formal theory only has been identified in the literature to support this form of assessment – this is portfolio assessment.

**Technology**

The use of technology in composition assessment has had little attention, although a single study used data collection and analysis with this emergent facility (Coffman, 1992). Using Simonton's (1983) computer content analysis of melodic structure in compositions written by famous composers, Coffman (1992) utilized a computer program which applied information theory to pitch content of pre- and post-instruction compositions written by thirty-four Year 7 students. Effective assessment of composition using this theory was difficult, and Coffman found 'analysis via information theory was tedious and should not be considered as a substitute for human judgement' (Coffman, 1992, p. 160). However, labour was dramatically reduced by use of MIDI equipped keyboards and computers.

Music syllabus documents in NSW reflect an increasing prominence in the use of technology in student learning (New South Wales Board of Studies, 1999). Research strongly supports the use of technology in student composition as it facilitates performance and generates sounds beyond individual student's performance standard which would be otherwise difficult to achieve with acoustic sounds (Airy and Parr, 2001; Brown, 1997; Merrick, 1997; Odam, 2000). Contrary to a perception in some composition literature that a teacher is unnecessary in composition writing using technology (for example, in Folkestad, 1999; Stauffer, 1999), Webster (1998) explained that teachers are the key to quality instruction in music, and music technology is only a tool in the process. Equally, assessment using technology would require the same human judgement identified by Coffman. However, as a supportive tool for assessment by teachers, for aural and visual representations of sounds, technology has been identified as a major resource for teaching
composition (Airy and Parr, 2001; Burton, 1997; Hickey, 1997; Odam, 2000; Webster, 1998).

**Verbal protocol**

A second theory of composition assessment is verbal protocol which has developed to support summative assessments. Two different studies have utilised verbal protocols for composition assessments (Irvine et al, 1999; Mellor, 1999). Both are similar in that the theories were generated at first for other disciplines apart from music and have been adapted to music composition. In these protocols, composition assessment theories remove assessment from the composition product to assessment of verbal, descriptive protocols which describe the product. The first assessment study (Irvine et al, 1999), was developed from the Structure of Observed Learning Outcomes (SOLO) taxonomy, which was found to be a reliable method for assessing essays (Biggs & Collis, 1982). The SOLO theory was concerned with the accuracy and sophistication of thinking processes over a preference for the correctness of any final conclusion. Using the SOLO taxonomy, students' writing was assigned to one of five categories based on content and structure. These categories build in complexity from pre-structural and uni-structural to higher levels of multi-structural, relational, and extended abstract (Biggs & Collis, 1982). DeTurk (1989) adapted the SOLO taxonomy to music listening assessment, and Irvine et al (1999) used similar processes in think-aloud protocols, generated by composers to elicit criteria by which outcomes could be assessed. Later progress in this research (Irvine et al, 2001) has more strongly focussed on learning processes rather than on assessment, and used university students and adults.

A different application of verbal protocols was used by Mellor (1999) in empirical research which assessed children's compositions. Dissimilar from the study by Irvine et al (2001), in which the composers themselves generate verbal comments, Mellor used comments made by assessors in the course of composition assessment. Mellor's empirical research used Kelly's (1955) Personal Construct Theory (PCT) methodology. PCT allows each individual judge to respond and construct events independently. In reacting to a composition, each individual takes a personal viewpoint based on preferences, background and experience. A construct, in Kelly's terms, was the identification of differences and similarities between concepts. In using a construct system to assess music compositions, Kelly identified a highly complex network of interconnections, which are subjected to renewal and change for the purpose of clarifying reactions at all different levels of experience.

32
In empirical research using PCT theory, Mellor asked sixty-two student teachers to listen to six compositions written by eleven-year-old to fourteen-year-old children in the course of normal music lessons. Analysis employed two verbal techniques. 'Bi-polar' or 'odd-one-out' technique was applied by inviting participants to listen to three short extracts of music, or exemplars, and then asking participants to choose which was the 'odd-one-out', and to give a reason for their choice. From results of participant identification of features in compositions, constructs were selected as dimensions of the listener's experience, which were then labelled as 'bi-polar' constructs. Mellor used the 'bi-polar' constructs to build a 'repertory grid' which served to define assessment dimensions (Mellor, 1999, p. 150). Assessments of other compositions were then made using 'repertory grid' parameters.

Mellor identified several advantages in using this theoretical framework. The first was its usefulness in supporting teachers' perceptions on the value of students' compositions. A strong advantage in this theory is that two results are provided: numerical scores provide quantitative results; and open-ended opportunities are provided for qualitative discussion, although a disadvantage in this procedure is its complexity (Mellor, 1999).

**Consensual**

A third assessment theory is consensual assessment. Designed by Amabile (1982, 1983), this assessment theory is similar to the previous theory in that it was generated from another discipline and transferred to music. Different in application, however, Amabile's consensual assessment theory removes the focus of composition assessment from the composition product itself, which was evident in the previous two theories, to the assessor. Amabile argued that a major obstacle to success in creativity research was in defining appropriate criteria with which assessments could be made. This researcher proposed that using experts in the identified domain as assessors would generate accurate subjective measurements of creative products. Amabile believed that 'if appropriate judges independently agree that a given product is highly creative, then it can and must be accepted as such' (Amabile, 1982, p. 1002). A more detailed description of judge qualification and the linking of process to the product was provided in later literature:
A product or response is creative to the extent that appropriate observers independently agree it is creative. Appropriate observers are those familiar with the domain in which the product was created or the response articulated. Thus, creativity can be regarded as the quality of products or responses judged to be creative by appropriate observers, and it can also be regarded as a process by which something so judged is produced. (Amabile, 1983, p. 31)

Conditions regarding the utilisation of consensual assessment technique were identified which related to the task and the assessors. The task must have an observable product, must be open-ended to allow novelty, and not depend on special skills which some individuals may develop to a greater level than others. Judges should have experience in the domain, make independent assessments, and not be given specific criteria for making judgements. Other broad criteria, such as technique and aesthetic appeal, were suggested alongside creativity (Amabile, 1982, 1983).

Application of Amabile's consensual assessment technique has been transferred to music composition research (Bangs, 1992; Brinkman, 1994; Hickey, 1995; Webster & Hickey, 1995). In adapting this technique to rate the musical creativity of thirty-seven third-grade children, Bangs followed Amabile's prescriptive guidelines, using three independent judges to assess audio-taped compositions (Bangs, 1992). Brinkman's (1994) study used a modified version of the technique. Thirty-two high school music students composed two melodies in fifteen minutes. Again, three independent judges rated melodies on a 7-point scale in the categories of originality, craftsmanship and aesthetic value (Brinkman, 1994).

Hickey (1995) similarly used consensual assessment technique in rating compositions written by twenty-one ten-year-old to twelve-year-old students. Judges were experienced general music educators who had completed Masters degrees in music education. Each judge listened to and rated each composition three times using a 7-point rating scale for impression, creativity, and craftsmanship and aesthetic appeal (Hickey, 1995). In a similar study by the same researcher, four judges were asked to rate ten compositions on two sets of rating scales - one global and one specific, using consensual assessment (Webster & Hickey, 1995). Results from this study suggested 'that approaches to rating scales that use consensual assessment as outlined by Amabile (1983) and others is, in fact, a profitable avenue for music teachers and researchers interested in children's composition' (Webster & Hickey, 1995, p. 37). Results in all the above studies using Amabile's consensual
assessment, using compositions written by young children, or monophonic compositions, show a high degree of success in that judges were able to reach consensus.

Consensual methods, not associated with Amabile's design, have been traditionally used in composition assessment in the United Kingdom in compositions of greater complexity (Bunting, in Paynter, 1982; Simmonds, 1988) than in the studies conducted in the United States of America cited above. In contrast with Amabile's consensual parameters, more attention was given to appropriate criteria for awarding assessments in studies in the United Kingdom. In early research, Bunting (whose research was conducted in 1977 and reported in 1982) and Simmonds (1988) followed similar consensual procedures in assessing compositions which contrasted with those prescribed by Amabile. In Bunting's (1982) and Simmonds' (1988) experiments, judges arrived at a consensus after they had discussed experiment compositions extensively. This differed from the Amabile's prescription in which judges assessed products independently from one another. In both British experiments, judges, who were experienced music teachers, responded to five pieces written by high school students. Judges at first responded individually with a mark out of ten and afterwards worked in groups of four or five to re-assess each piece. Bunting found the composite mark showed little difference between groups, but there was some disparity between individuals within groups (Bunting, in Paynter, 1982, p. 212).

Research in composition assessment almost a decade later in the United Kingdom used consensus similarly to Amabile's application in that each judge assessed student compositions individually (Pilsbury & Alston, 1996). Eleven judges were asked to assess compositions and folios of work of twenty-nine secondary students in Pilsbury and Alston's study. In avoiding conferencing between judges, this experiment differed from Bunting and Simmonds' earlier research. In contrast with Amabile's (1983) recommendations that judges do not use prescribed criteria, however, judges were provided with criteria for composition assessments in the Pilsbury and Alston (1996) experiment. Judges also underwent training which involved listening, discussion, and advice of prior evaluations given to five exemplars which contained a contrasting range of successful and less successful pieces.

**Content analysis**
A fourth theoretical approach to composition assessment is through content analysis. In this approach, the assessor — usually an expert such as a practising composer or experienced
music teacher — examines and judges the musical characteristics of students' composition products (Webster, 1989; Webster, 1992). Considerable literature using this approach is limited to monophonic composition, using concepts of melody and rhythm (for example, Doig, 1941, 1942a, 1942b; Hickey, 1995; Kratus, 1985, 1994). A smaller quantity of literature uses content analysis assessment of compositions with more complex parameters (Bunting, 1982; Green, 1990; Pilsbury & Alston, 1996). The Bunting and Pilsbury and Alston studies conform to both a consensual assessment and a content analysis paradigm. While research literature using content has identified possibilities, models, and assumptions about composition assessment, unresolved problems have also been identified in literature in this area, despite a growing body of research.

Swanwick (1998) developed a theory of assessing music compositions through content analysis taking into account dimensions of musical understanding. Swanwick (1979, 1988; Swanwick & Tillman, 1986) investigated musical understanding using Piaget's (1951) formulated stages of development, and Moog's studies in music experiences in learning in early childhood (Moog, 1976). Swanwick and Tillman (1986) used empirical research to examine several hundred compositions written by forty-eight children over four years. From composition analyses, Swanwick and Tillman evolved the 'Sequence of musical development' consisting of a four-looped spiral representative of increasing age levels of children. Levels in this spiral are identified as: mastery (awareness and control of materials), imitation (awareness and control of expression), imaginative play (awareness and control of form), and meta-cognition (awareness of the personal and cultural value of music). Each level is split in two to accommodate the shift from subjective invention to public conventions, and from intuitive to analytical modes. Webster (1989), commented that Swanwick and Tillman's developmental spiral accommodates cumulative and cyclical experiences in music, and confirmed Swanwick's interpretation that the two modes reflected a pendulum-like swing between invention and convention within each level.

Swanwick (1998) later successfully adapted this developmental spiral for composition assessments. Two empirical studies which used Swanwick's (1998) assessment spiral show the applicability of this method to place student composition successfully at appropriate developmental levels (Kennedy, 1999; Silva, cited in Swanwick, 1998). Kennedy (1999) conducted a case-study of the compositional process of a high school student and a collegiate composer. Both were asked to set a two-stanza poem for voice and piano. Two
professional composers and the researcher analysed the final compositions by noting style, structure, tonality, harmonic use, and genre. The high school student's composition, which used an 'adolescent idiom' was placed at level 6, the 'idiomatic' phase of Swanwick's assessment spiral (Kennedy, 1999, p. 161). The second composition reached level 7, the 'symbolic' stage in which mastery serves musical communication (Kennedy, 1999, p. 163). Silva (Swanwick, 1998) observed twenty 11-13 year old Brazilian children in a study which compared performance, composition and audience-listening understanding. Four judges used Swanwick's spiral to evaluate compositions appropriately.

Swanwick and Tillman's model of developmental processes have been both challenged and confirmed in literature, and there are conflicting views on generalisations made about children's musical development in the spiral. Some researchers have questioned the appropriateness of the developmental spiral to reflect student learning in music. Kaschub (1997) argued that studies which observed children composing in groups were at odds with the model of development, while Marsh (1995) reported that children possess an overall contextual understanding earlier than that suggested in the Swanwick and Tillman model. Davies (1992) questioned the positioning of one concept, structure, in Swanwick and Tillman's developmental spiral and claimed that composition develops from more fundamental relationships of musical events in time. Research by Wiggins (1994) confirms that structural considerations are important in children about the level of fifth grade, which is appropriate to the Swanwick and Tillman theory, although this researcher additionally noted that children use holistic, structural, strategies which reflected a preconceived view of the final product from the beginning.

A developmental theory such as Swanwick and Tillman's theory of developmental learning in music, which developed on the principles of Piaget (1951), is not uncommon in music. Gardner, in The Unschooled Mind (1993) perceived music learning as cumulative and developmental. Ross, in The Aesthetic Impulse (1984), and Dacey (1989) proposed that there were identifiable periods in a child's musical development, from infancy through to young adulthood. Taking an atomistic view, Wallas (1926), observed four stages in individual composition processes: preparation, incubation, illumination and verification, while Sloboda (1985) simplified these to two stages which were inspiration and execution.
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Bloom's Taxonomy of Learning Outcomes (1956) has been the model from which educational developmental theories have evolved which are cumulative and accommodate multiple learning parameters. Bloom's theory acknowledges learning in three domains: cognitive, which includes objectives which deal with recall or recognition and the development of intellectual abilities and skills; affective, which includes changes in interests and values, and the development of appreciations and adequate adjustments; and psychomotor, which include changes in manipulative and motor skills. Bloom argued that knowledge, skills and abilities move from low order skills of comprehension, translation, and interpretation, through middle order, to high level skills of synthesis, evaluation, and judgements (Bloom, 1956). In music assessments, Aspin (1986) rejected an approach which used Bloom's taxonomy as this writer considered quantification of such criteria which suggested a normative paradigm in that students were compared to each other, was inappropriate. Taking a contradictory approach, Duerkson (1995) considered music highly suitable for assessment according to Bloom's taxonomy due to this educationist's consideration of problem solving and attention to higher order thinking.

Several studies suggest application of a taxonomy of learning outcomes in composition assessment has been an underlying feature in grading craftsmanship (Bunting, 1987; Moore, 1990; Pilsbury & Alston, 1996). Bunting (1987), in a descriptive study of student composition, suggested assessment of abilities which progressed through a series of stages similar to those proposed by Bloom. Bunting identified five stages, four of which reflect a hierarchy of abilities. These were skills and techniques, processes, style, independence from the teacher, and self appraisal (Bunting, 1987). Swanwick and Tillman's spiral (1986), and empirical studies in composition assessment by Moore (1990), and Pilsbury and Alston (1996) suggest different 'levels' of craftsmanship can be evaluated. In conjunction with five craftsmanship criteria, the latter study used three levels, the highest of which is described below. Of interest are statements which suggest attention to synthesis, application and demonstration of acquired knowledge, and creative judgement:

Compositions in this category should have a sense of wholeness. They will show clear evidence of technical knowledge of the medium used. There will be a feeling of overall form or design throughout the music. Successful attempts at adding colour to the texture by use of a variety of musical means; an imaginative range of notes and dynamics, and, where appropriate, effects such as staccato, pizzicato, glissando will be rewarded. . . . There should be variety, imagination and an exploration of sound in the music presented. The music should be convincing in communicating to the audience.

(Pilsbury and Alston, 1996, p. 245)
Contradicting music learning as suggested by Swanwick and Tillman's developmental theory, Serafina (1988) theorised that children compose using temporal and non-temporal processes, and that compositions grow through grouping events in phrases. By using successive temporal processes to chain events, short chains gradually build to longer ones. Simultaneous temporal processes add vertical sounds or superimpose one sound event on another. Non-temporal processes deal with formal properties – closure, transformation, abstraction, and hierarchy. Hargreaves and Zimmerman (1992) noted that although age-specific developments were not a strong feature in the study, Serafina's theory was important in contributing a perspective which deals with music learning processes within the identified framework of structure. Davies' (1992) research supported Serafina's ideas of musical cognition in composition, as Davies' investigation in children's compositions identified the importance of structure. While an assessment theory from Serafina's cognitive model has yet to be developed, the value of structure on which the theory is based, is in accord with Paynter's views on assessment (Paynter, 2000).

The importance of structure as the fundamental factor in composition assessment which uses content analysis was identified by Paynter (2000). In analysing the content of two pieces of music – one composed by three ten-year-old girls, and the other, 'Eusebius' by Schumann, this writer looked especially at the musical materials and the way they were extended, transformed and developed. Paynter sublimates the entirety, or wholeness of a piece, in preference to materials such as melody, rhythmic patterns or instrumentation, and uses the Golden Section as the arbiter of proportional balance. He gives examples of balance and proportion in music of various cultures, and suggests that proportion is found not only in works of the masters, but in the spontaneous music of children. In assessing the performed compositions of students, Paynter recommends:

As we listen to pupils performing a composition we should try to remember melodic and rhythmic figures and interesting combinations of voices and/or instruments, especially where these are associated with moments of change. We can also have in mind general considerations such as unifying features; whether the music makes sense as a whole; the relationship between duration and the character of the music (how long does it last, and does that seem too long or not long enough?); whether the composers attempt to expand and transform musical materials or merely go on inventing new things; and, not least, the strength and quality of the ending.

(Paynter, 2000, p. 21)

In NSW Higher School Certificate examination committee reports, melodic development and a sense of innate structure are continuously shown to be areas where students'
compositions are deficient, (NSW Board of Studies, 1995, 1996, 1997), and in these areas, the comments of Paynter are most applicable. As a theoretical base, content analysis in literature provides considerable direction for application in music composition assessment. In application, the widely differing views reflected in the literature show that further clarity can be developed to support teachers in classroom situations.

**Portfolio**

A final assessment theory has evolved through classroom practice and has been further investigated with intensive research. In this theory, appropriate to formative assessments, a composition product is viewed while it is in the process of creation, with the final version of the product often part of the process continuum. This theory is based on the maintenance of a student portfolio (Armstrong, 1994; Brandt, 1988; Davidson, 1990; Galloway, 1972; Gardner, 1982, 1983, 1991; Wolf, 1988).

In music education, formative assessment has been used to teach and assess composition over many decades, and are generally dependent on individual teachers and their personal pedagogy in composition. However, the documentation of formative assessments through portfolios was shown in early research in student composition. An example of portfolio assessment was demonstrated by Galloway (1972), who used this method with eleven-year-old students when they wrote a short opera in class. Galloway gave an account of assessment strategies which used individual student portfolios which included an up-to-date file card which listed details of theory learnt, music performed, and activities experienced. In Australian research, Burnard (1995), described a case study with eleven Year 11 students, in which each student completed four independent compositions and documented their composition processes through a process diary. The process diaries provided a window on the student's working procedures, their actions, thoughts, and feelings during production of the works, in addition to meetings with the teacher. From these accounts, the researcher was able to develop clear insights into how students relate to composition and the nature of the musical outcome (Burnard, 1995).

In the United States of America, Gardner (1982, 1983), a psychologist, conducted a longitudinal study into formative assessments. His work was significant in formalising approaches to portfolio assessments in education as research was conducted in classroom music behaviour. Gardner (1991) claimed that teachers can assess students' artistic creative
processes by examining documented evidence of progress, and considered that process portfolios were appropriate for the assessment of progress in music. In these, students were recommended to keep finished works, as well as sketches, interim drafts, critiques by themselves and others, and works they admire or dislike and which support current learning in some way. 'Arts Propel' was a project specifically developed to investigate assessment in music using Gardner's theory (Davidson, 1990; Winner, 1992). Gardner considered portfolio assessment was not simple, and involved a range of information:

the student's ability to conceptualise and carry out a project, the inclusion of historical and critical materials which are related to, or which help to explicate the student's own work, the regularity, relevance, and precision of portfolio entries, sign of development and linkage from one work to another, the student's own sensitivity to his or her development, and the ability to express personal meanings.

(Gardner, 1989, p.81)

Gardner's assessment practices similarly allow teachers to develop meaningful curricula which use assessment within the contexts of education programs. In placing an emphasis on students' strengths, assessment shows 'what they can do and what they're trying to do' and results in products that have value to students and others (Armstrong, 1994, p. 117). Using portfolios, teachers can assess students' artistic creative processes by examining evidence such as notes, audiotapes, anecdotal records, drafts, false starts, and work samples to document the way students create pieces which are assembled over a period of time (Armstrong, 1994; Brandt, 1988). Important learning is demonstrated through production and in the process of reflection. Reflection provides opportunity to assess a variety of student abilities in revision, using criticism, finding stimuli, quality and detail in presentation of the final draft, and in the ability to work independently or collaboratively (Brandt, 1988). Wolf (1988), in describing how portfolios are used to assess learning, placed emphasis on discussions between teachers and pupils. As part of the process of reflection, students develop the critical ingredient of self-awareness 'in being able to step back and think about their work' (Wolf, 1988, p. 28).

Goolsby (1995) had several criticisms of assessments through portfolios. This writer considered that in application there was a problem maintaining objectivity and accountability with portfolio assessment. He argues that if teachers depend only on their personal skills and techniques to evaluate achievement, expectations about contents of portfolios need to be clarified, so that irrelevant and unnecessary inclusions in portfolios are not considered for assessment. Goolsby recommended that teachers should negotiate with
students in developing clearly articulated goals and objectives so that portfolios have an explicit purpose.

A NSW study examined how process diaries assisted in students' thinking skills and in helping teachers to assess Year 10 students' compositions (Ralphs, 1993). Results from this study showed that process diaries gave the teacher an insight into the students' depth of understanding and methods of working. Ralphs' research reflects a growing use of process diaries and portfolio recording in music education in NSW. A composition process diary was introduced as part of the HSC requirement in composition in 1994 and became the basis of teachers' total assessment of submitted compositions from 1999 (NSW Board of Studies, 1999). In these process diaries, teachers are required to assess a range of composing features which include: 'background listening, decision-making processes, . . . (student) reflections on the composition, and their appraisals of their compositions' (NSW Board of Studies, 1994, p.36). In this way, teachers can assist in the progress of a composition, and additionally assess values which are not easily identified by assessing final composition products alone.

Summary
The first part of the review of literature related to composition assessment discussed four purposes which were prominent in this topic. These were summative, formative, evaluative, and pedagogical. Theories of composition assessment have developed to support summative and formative assessments. Most theories have evolved to explain summative assessments, such as technology, consensual, verbal protocols, and content analysis, while one theory, portfolio assessment, has formalised formative assessments. Theories have generally been adapted from other disciplines apart from music. Two theories have evolved in the context of music, and these are Swanwick and Tillman's developmental assessment theory, and Gardner's portfolio assessment theory. While different in application, both theories attempt to gauge levels of student learning in music, and particularly in composition. In practice, composition assessment studies have combined features of different theories, and are a reflection of the pedagogical practices teachers use in teaching composition to students. The next section examines literature about criteria and strategies used in assessments.
2.2: Assessment criteria and strategies

This second section of the review of related literature presents literature which identifies criteria and strategies used in teachers' assessments of compositions. This section is structured in three parts. The first of these clarifies the most prominent criteria used to assess compositions, and describes how subjectivity and objectivity are balanced in assessments, combinations of criteria used, and individual criteria of craftsmanship, originality, and style. In the second part of this section literature is described which shows different procedures used in assessments. These are rubrics, task design, grading schemes, holistic and intensive analytical procedures, and forms of presentation of assessed compositions. The final part of this section presents human and practical assessment resources identified in the literature.

According to Besemer and O'Quinn (1993), validity, or the extent to which an instrument measures what it is supposed to measure, is critical in establishing soundness of measuring instruments, and in ensuring that judgements about levels of achievement are accurate. Some researchers link content validity with high inter-judge reliability (for example, Amabile, 1982; Brandt, 1987; Duerkson, 1995; Webster, 1979). However, contrasting views are shown by Radocy (1995) who relates validity to the estimation of standards of achievement relative to a criterion. In empirical research in music assessments, criteria are the dimensions on which assessments may be made in an effort to maintain validity of comparisons between different compositions within assessment studies. In composition assessment practice, the great diversity in selection of assessment criteria for processes and products of compositions demonstrates that within this area, no single measure is used consistently, and no common combination of measures can be identified.

It is generally accepted that subjectivity plays an important part in composition assessment (Loane, 1984; Radocy, 1995; Salaman, 1988). Subjectivity was defined as 'individual feeling, an individual consciousness, an individual perception of how the world exists at the moment' (Radocy, 1995, p. 20). In making an assessment in any human achievement, not specifically musical, this writer held the viewpoint that subjective perceptions were unavoidable and could not be ignored, as the reactions of the observer, who is a learned recipient of the information, can interpret this information intuitively. This view was corroborated in a composition study of Loane (1984) who, in describing composition assessments, identified differing degrees of subjectivity in his appraisals.
This teacher described that in acting as an observer, a teacher moves through three stages of composition assessment, two of which are subjective. In viewing children's creative acts, assessment occurred at 'the intersection of skill learning and creation'. First, the teacher listens receptively as an open-minded listener, and secondly, the teacher reflects to consider what is important in the piece. These early subjective stages of assessment were important, despite emerging problems when individual teachers identified different features resulting in contrasting assessments. In two early assessment studies a first listening of compositions was designed to facilitate individual subjective reactions in assessors (Bunting, 1982; Simmonds, 1988). Assessors in both experiments were asked to mark each piece out of ten without reference to any prescribed criteria following this first reaction.

Strong reaction to subjectivity in composition assessments was registered by Salaman (1988) who suggested this type of marking, which asks 'Do I like it? Do I dislike it? Am I indifferent?' was dangerous in that it could be influenced by other personal factors not associated with the music (Salaman, 1988, p. 19). In later empirical studies, less emphasis has been afforded to subjectivity and an increase in attention to objectivity has been noted. For example, Pilsbury and Alston (1996), avoided any reference to subjectivity in assessment of secondary student compositions. In other similar studies (for example Mellor, 1999; Webster and Hickey, 1995), although subjective criteria were included, they maintained lower profile in assessments.

In contrast with subjectivity, objectivity was observed as 'an external reality, an existence upon which rational observers could agree' (Radocy, 1995, p. 20). This writer identified objectivity as contrasting to subjectivity, but not dichotomous, as objectivity functions at the other extreme of a continuum which must take both types of responses into consideration. Loane (1984) believed progress along this continuum could move back and forward in either direction. In Loane's three-stage approach to assessment, objective assessment was presented as the third stage following two subjective stages. In this stage, teachers move from a reflective to an analytical mode in an effort to identify a product's strong and weak features with a view to reporting results. A composition is subjected to a content analysis in objective assessments.
Researchers have identified, defined and applied objective criteria to compositions in a variety of ways for assessment purposes. Wide parameters have been used with a variety of contrasting terminology in identifying similar constructs. For example, Webster and Hickey (1995) categorised studies in categories of style, and content. Mellor (1999) sorted a total of two hundred and eighteen constructs which were categorised in five titles of musical elements, style, mood, evaluation of composition, and evaluation of performance, whereas Levi (1970), suggested four categories for aesthetic judgement in composition which were formal, technical, expressive and sensuous.

In other empirical studies minimal numbers of criteria, or a single criterion, in composition assessment are used (Colley et al, 1992; Davidson & Welsh, 1988; Kratus, 1991, 1994; Paynter, 2000). In assessing composition using small numbers of criteria, composition products were limited to two types: they were either monophonic, single line pieces, as those of Kratus (1992, 1994), or they were restricted in scope to individual concepts (Colley et al, 1992). In the latter study, an analysis of differences in completed compositions written by three novice university student composers and one expert composer in a research study was undertaken. Based on a single criterion of harmony, assessment between the four compositions revealed many other features which provided clear measurement of comparative skills. Similarly, Davidson and Welsh (1988) used a single criterion of melody in another composition study with university students. In other studies, complex sets of criteria have been used in composition assessment (Mellor, 1999; Pilsbury & Alston, 1996; Simmonds, 1988; Webster & Hickey, 1995). Studies which use combinations of criteria have generally, although not consistently, examined more complex compositions, especially written by students at secondary level. Bunting (1982) used ten criteria which he recommended should only be used as guidelines in familiarisation with a student composition, and warned that quantifying each element should be avoided in preference for an intuitive awareness of how 'different parameters are controlled and played off against each other to make a distinctive, unique statement' (Bunting, in Paynter, 1982, p. 223). Webster and Hickey (1995) used multiple constructs in three broader sets of criteria which were identified as craftsmanship, originality/creativity, and overall aesthetic. Aesthetic was generally interpreted in assessment as a subjective response and was used similarly by Bangs (1993) and Hickey (1995).
Craftsmanship is the single criterion, some aspect of which is common to all composition assessment literature. Craftsmanship has been used as a generic term to describe an array of loosely defined cognitive abilities, which include knowledge, skills and abilities which are transferred to, and applied in the construction of new pieces. Knowledge is generally strongly associated with the use of concepts. For example, knowledge of concepts is important in Bunting's (1982) experiment, and form, medium/instrumentation/timbre, melody, harmony, tempo/rhythm, density (texture), dynamics, articulation, and mood were used as assessment criteria. Craftsmanship similarly is concerned in studies with composition processes, application of composing techniques, and synthesis. A more recent study with young children (Burland and Davidson, 2001) used fourteen assessment criteria presented as bi-polar constructs, samples of which are – simple/ complex; rhythmically simply/ rhythmically complex; unstructured/ structured; disjointed/ flowing (articulate). Terminology such as the development of musical material similarly requires assessment through application of craftsmanship skills and these were included in assessments of university and secondary school children's compositions (Searby & Ewers, 1996; Simmonds, 1988).

Originality features less prominently as a criterion for composition assessment of students at secondary level, but is the most misunderstood of all which are used in creative aspects of music education (Bunting, 1982; Elliott, 1989). Generally considered to mean complete freedom, Bunting (1982) identified originality as a precious gift to a young composer which was possible only after assimilation of a music style, to produce spontaneity and unpredictable changes in a composition's direction (Bunting, 1982). Elliott (1989) identified originality in terms of innovation and novelty, and similarly stressed that such abilities arise in a context of an enterprise that has a history and is part of a tradition which has direction, goals and meaning. Elliott suggested originality is not discontinuous, and grows out of a tradition, particularly through technological advances, or breaks with a tradition (Elliott, 1989).

Two empirical studies demonstrate difficulties that teachers have in assessing originality in composition. Mellor's (1999) study in composition assessment supports Bunting's assertion that originality in music is generally misunderstood and interpreted as unfamiliarity with traditional practices. In discriminating qualities of a student's composition, a music education trainee in Mellor's (1999) experiment identified and defined originality: 'I is the
odd-one-out because it is an original composition, i.e. doesn't rely much on prior experience' (Mellor, 1999, p. 151).

Originality has been highly valued in other research studies (Hassler & Feil, 1986; Reese, 1992). Reese (1992) used evaluation by peers to assess computer-generated compositions written by children after a twelve week training course. Originality was one of only two criteria chosen for assessment purposes, the other being technical skill. Reese's interpretation closely resembled Bunting's ideal of originality as building new from existing knowledge (Reese, 1992). Similarly, Hassler and Feil's (1986) interpretation of originality grew out of students' experience and knowledge, and was one criterion in an experiment in which composition in written form was one of a number of tasks which were assessed.

However, another interpretation of originality is found in literature. Literature reviews which have described creativity studies (for example, Henry, 1996; McPherson, 1992; Webster, 1992), consistently interpret originality as a major component in the definition of creative individuals, behaviours, and products. Research studies in creativity which have used composition have traditionally used a small group of divergent traits from Guilford's Structure of Intellect (Guilford and Hoepfner, 1971) and the work of Torrance (1966). Divergent traits were defined as those skills that allow an individual to arrive at a number of possible answers to a given question or problem (Webster, 1977).

In these divergent traits, Webster's notion of originality as a divergent factor has been responsible for misinterpretation. Webster's divergent factors were these: fluency – the ability to generate a number of ideas in a given situation; flexibility – the ability to generate a number of different ideas in a given situation; elaboration – the ability to extend or embellish one idea; and originality – the ability to generate unique ideas (Webster, 1977, 1979). More recent literature challenged the dependence on divergent factors in assessing creative products (Bangs, 1992; Brown, 1989; Hickey, 1995). Hickey (1995) summarised how creativity research defines and differentiates between both creativity and originality. This writer observed that literature in creativity uses both convergent and divergent characteristics, and in creativity literature, originality is viewed as a divergent characteristic. Hickey's description demonstrates how originality is perceived within creativity research:
Originality or novelty alone - i.e. divergent characteristics such as fluency and flexibility - or even combined with a sense of convergence or syntax does not necessarily imply a sense of quality, or aesthetic sensitivity.

(Hickey, 1995, p. 201)

Using convergent and divergent characteristics, creativity implies a sense of value, appropriateness or aesthetic quality. Hickey asserts the difference in degrees of creativity in a composition lies in the creator's ability to apply craftsmanship, and aesthetic sensitivity (Hickey, 1995).

Assessment of children's compositions through the criterion of style has been awarded little attention in most literature. Addressed generally in literature which reflects compositions of some complexity, style has been a contentious criterion displaying considerable disparities (Green, 1990). Several writers have defined the concept of style (Bennett, 1992; Marcellino, 1995; Swanwick, 1988). Bennett identifies style as the characteristic 'fingerprints' which are recognisable in five fundamental concepts of melody, rhythm, harmony, timbre and texture. In the composer's balancing and combining of conceptual features, characteristics can be identified and defined. In recognising stylistic features in melody, as an example, characteristics such as contour/shape, range, structure, phrasing, and intervallic movement would be considered (Bennett, 1992). In assessment, Swanwick correlates style with the term 'idiom' (Swanwick, 1998). Swanwick places student application of this feature at level six of his developmental assessment spiral, describing the application of style as follows - 'makes music within a particular stylistic context and shows awareness of idiomatic devices and stylistic processes' (Swanwick, 1998, p. 5). Other writers have suggested that characteristics of style are confusing in teaching and assessing situations (Green, 1990; Marcellino, 1995). Marcellino observed that the term 'contemporary', because of the wide diversity in rock, jazz, popular, and art music, has been stripped of any meaning beyond 'music that is created in the present' (Marcellino, 1995, p. 177). A study by Green (1990) illustrated the dilemma which is faced by teachers in the classroom when arriving at stylistic validity in composition assessment. Green compared how different application of criteria would affect results of two contrasting compositions written by two Year 10 students. Dismissing assessment of both outcome or processes as inappropriate, Green suggested that aggregation of two types of criteria is generally used but does not convey adequately a full representation of student achievement (Green, 1990).
Results of empirical research in composition assessment show that consensus in assessment is easier to achieve when composition styles are similar to those experienced by assessors during their training (Bunting, 1982; Simmonds, 1988; Pilsbury & Alston, 1996). Orton, a composer involved in Bunting's (1982) experiment, noted that of five pieces in the experiment, one presented the least difficulty in assessment, and it was thought that the similarity of the piece to the personal experiences of assessors during pre-service was the reason for this common agreement (Bunting, in Paynter, 1982). Similarly, in Simmonds' (1988) experiment the piece which consistently scored the highest marks was the most conventional of all five compositions, while the piece which this researcher found alien to assessors' experience was the most difficult to assess. Pilsbury & Alston (1996) found identical problems with assessment of such pieces.

Assessment procedures

Five assessment procedures have been identified in composition assessment literature which suggest guidelines for assessment procedures. These are: rubrics, task design, qualitative and quantitative measures, holistic and analytic procedures, and presentation mode. Rubrics have been given increasing prominence, and have been used in state-wide music assessments and recommended to teachers in NSW as a support for classroom assessments (Colwell, 1995; Cope, 1996; Duerkson, 1995; Hickey, 1999; Jeannerett, 1999; New South Wales Board of Studies, 1997). Hickey (1999) described assessment guidelines and procedures used in applying rubrics to student compositions. Hickey depicted a rubric as functioning with two components — the first is a set of descriptors on which compositions will be rated, and the second is a range of qualities to describe achievement in each descriptor. Both analytic and holistic descriptors should be included in rubrics to accommodate all possible outcomes (Duerkson, 1995). Together, the descriptors serve as a 'yardstick' against which teachers can measure each student's performance (Hickey, 1999, p. 27). Colwell (1995) and Sandene (1995) further identified the need for anchors to serve as benchmarks and samples for comparative assessments. Anchors are product examples representative of all quality levels appropriate to a range of descriptors within a rubric. Hickey suggested teachers should create their own rubrics for classroom use, with students active participants in designing rubric structure. In application, educators have championed assessment through rubric procedures as efficient and practical. In NSW, the Board of Studies distributed rubrics appropriate for assessing music composition to all secondary schools (New South Wales Board of Studies, 1997). Despite clear guidelines, however,
Pilsbury and Alston (1996), commented that from their research, teachers are more likely to use their own set of criteria than those which are prescribed.

An issue on which there is some dissent in literature in assessment procedures is the use of task design to support assessments. Many researchers support assessments through task design (Burnard, 1995; Kratus, 1990; Merrigan, 1997; Salaman, 1988; Wiggins, 1994). Several researchers have suggested compositions can be assessed by using clear articulated goals defined through task design and many studies using defined goals have been constructed around practical classroom experiences (for example, Burnard, 1995; Merrigan, 1999; Wiggins, 1994). Wiggins (1994), in group composition, used task design to assess outcomes of primary students' compositions. In Australia, practical classroom researchers have found task design an effective method of assessing achievement in student composition (Burnard, 1995; Merrigan, 1999).

Despite success in classroom applications, a considerable amount of literature disputes the adherence to design parameters for assessment (Hickey, 1997; Loane, 1984; Swanwick, 1998). Loane (1984) considered restriction of pupils' musical experiences to teacher-directed work, or by composing using a framework, might result in the setting of trivial tasks. Task design contravened student development, he claimed, and he was more concerned that students find their own musical path while interacting with other students and the teacher. Hickey (1997) was equally adamant that task design crippled creative endeavour. From her research she found that student problem-finding was important to their problem solving, and Hickey was concerned that imposition of restraints and pre-determined rules in task designs interfered with artistic creation and the production of unique products. Webster (1996), in describing guidelines for assessing students' compositions, addressed the need to avoid formulas. Swanwick (1998) posed the cryptic question - 'Is task design appropriate as the main criterion for assessing students' work?' In responding, Swanwick considered teachers should take a wider view by assessing the richness of the response because 'functional specifications do not by themselves offer a broad enough criterion for all musical assessment' (Swanwick, 1998, p. 2).

There is a general consensus in literature on appropriate grading procedures for composition assessments (Bangs, 1992; Durrant, 1991). Literature on procedures used in providing assessment feedback has demonstrated a reluctance to assign quantitative grading to student
composition products, and has generally recommended qualitative comments (Simmonds, 1988). Under laboratory conditions quantitative measurements including grades, marks and rank order, have consistently been assigned in student composition assessment research. Roberts (1994) found through a survey, that Canadian music teachers were more comfortable assigning comments than quantitative grades. Teachers in this survey reported that the use of quantitative procedures was restrictive, inappropriate and one dimensional. Simmonds (1988) was also reluctant to ascribe quantitative marks or ranking of compositions. He noted, however, that in the discussions included as part of the composition assessment experiment, ranking was a commonplace and difficult to avoid practice in composition assessments.

In practical application, Hickey (1999) considered grades and allocating marks were acceptable to children when rubrics were used for assessments. Hickey suggested when students work with and are assessed according to rubrics, grades do not cause undue concern or surprise because descriptors and levels of achievement are known from the commencement of the composition process (Hickey, 1999).

Holistic and specific approaches, often identified in literature as criteria, but for purposes of this study graded as procedures, are both similarly commonly used assessment procedures (Hassler & Feil, 1986; Webster and Hickey, 1995). Assessment studies in composition generally include combinations of holistic and analytic procedures. Experiments using less descriptive detail, designed by Hassler (1991) and Hassler and Feil (1986), used holistic assessment twice, by rating compositions by primary and secondary children on 'first impression' and later in each experiment on 'general impression' (Hassler, 1991, p. 57). Webster and Hickey (1995) approached holistic assessment of compositions differently from this study. Titled 'global', holistic treatments in Webster and Hickey's experiment included many constructs, most of which were objective in quality. 'First impression' was one of many single constructs used in 'global' procedures (Webster and Hickey, 1995, p. 40). Rating scales used were derived from examination of eight studies which used rating scales to assess the quality of compositions, which have been described earlier in this review (Bangs, 1992; Hassler and Feil, 1986; Kratus, 1991, 1994; Moore, 1990; Webster, 1977, 1989).
In contrast with holistic procedures, analytic procedures were identified in this review under 'criteria' and were identified as deconstruction through intuition or detailed analysis to facilitate greater familiarity with an assessment product (Salaman, 1988). Less diversity is evident in application of analytic procedures in comparison with holistic procedures in composition assessment research. Webster and Hickey (1995) divided procedures into two categories, which were 'explicit' or 'implicit'. 'Explicit' items used more lengthy descriptions of what was to be rated while 'implicit' items carried little descriptive content, remaining purposefully vague in order for the evaluator to decide on meaning and criteria. An example of one characteristic demonstrates how 'explicit' and 'implicit' questions were used. A question on rhythm as an 'implicit' characteristic was: 'Rate......the degree to which the composition shows a pleasing use of rhythm', coupled with a 5-point Likert scale (Webster and Hickey, 1995, p. 39). As an 'explicit' characteristic, a question on rhythm was: 'Rate ............metric cohesiveness - the degree to which the durations in a composition are constructed of regularly occurring accented and unaccented beats', coupled with a 7-point Likert scale (Webster and Hickey, 1995, p. 41).

A final procedure discussed in composition assessment literature is the form of presentation, whether through sound, notation, or a combination of both sound and notation. Compositions presented for assessment in empirical research and literature have used either one of two methods of presentation. Aural evidence alone has been used in a considerable number of studies (Bunting, 1982; Green, 1990; Hickey, 1993; Kratus, 1991, 1994; Silva, 1998; Simmonds, 1988; Swanwick and Tillman, 1986; Webster and Hickey, 1995). Presentations of compositions in all the above studies were possible through tape recordings or MIDI files, which suggests less emphasis was placed on notation than on performance of compositions. A second presentation method is on aural and written evidence, which was used in one research experiment (Pilsbury and Alston, 1996).

Learning of notation skills in education over recent decades has been the subject of frequent interest (Green, 1990; Owens, 1986; Paynter, 1982; Plummeridge, 1990; Swanwick; 1979; Terry, 1994) and there is a general consensus that notation suggests a special type of relationship in listening, composing and performing which is valuable for music learning. Williams (1999) found in interviews with university composition teachers, that the reality of aural experience was paramount and although suggestions for abandonment of literary skills and theoretical knowledge in music education have been generally considered no more than
an 'anarchic, fleeting attraction' (Green, 1990, p. 195), notation of a completed composition is secondary in importance to performance and aural presentation (Terry, 1994). In summative assessment of composition, Osman (in Preston, 1994) highlighted the importance of clarifying whether the performance of a composition is assessed, or if the composition itself is the assessment purpose:

Often teacher assessments are made merely on the basis of the final piece. If it seems to be successful in performance the chances are that a positive evaluation will be given. Similarly, if the piece does not work well in performance then a negative evaluation may be given, this may be done without reference to the pupil's view of the composition itself. It is quite possible for children to have learnt a great deal about the process of composing even if the result does not always seem to succeed on the basis of performance. (in Preston, 1994, p.27)

In NSW, for Higher School Certificate purposes, both a score and a sound recording of submitted compositions are required for formal assessments. Although the quality of the recording is not taken into consideration, (NSW Board of Studies, 1999b), assessments are conducted using both the sound and score.

Assessment Resources
Resources identified in composition assessment literature are both human and practical. The most appropriate human resources are those immediately involved in the classroom situation, especially the teacher (Orton, 1982; Pilsbury and Alston, 1996; Swanwick and Tillman, 1986; Williams, 1999), the composer through self assessment (Durrant, 1991; Harris and Hawkesley, 1989; Wolf, 1989) and class members through peer assessment (Searby and Ewers, 1996). Practical resources include observation (Armstong, 1994), and written and verbal comments (Durrant, 1991; Harris and Hawkesley, 1996; Hickey, 1999).

Music teachers are considered the most appropriate assessors in composition research (Orton, 1982; Pilsbury and Alston, 1996; Swanwick and Tillman, 1986; Williams, 1999). Pilsbury and Alston (1996) identified that assessors require two characteristics, which are found in music educators. Assessor characteristics are 1) music training and 2) experience with integration of composition in music teaching processes. The importance of the assessor's training in music was demonstrated in a pilot study which was conducted in Swanwick and Tillman's research into developmental levels of children (1986). Three independent judges were asked to rank ages of children, aged from three to nine, from compositions randomly arranged on a tape. One of the judges, a teacher who was not
experienced musically, found this task almost impossible and withdrew from further involvement, while the other two judges, who were both musicians and experienced teachers, did not find the task difficult (Swanwick and Tillman, 1986). Pilsbury and Alston argued that music teachers identify with the second characteristic essential for assessment in that they are best placed to assess their own students' work because of their classroom knowledge of student development and learning in composition. They suggested teachers 'know more about it and are therefore less restricted to the single snapshot judgements which result from assessment by an examination on a single occasion' (Pilsbury and Alston, 1996, p. 248).

During the final decades of the twentieth century, interest in student self-assessment of compositions increased, with many studies advocating and implementing self-assessment (Armstrong, 1994; Bunting, 1988; Freed-Garrod, 2001; Hanley, 1994; Merrigan, 1997; Preston, 1994; Roberts, 1994; van Ernst, 1993; Webster, 1994). Practical research studies provided insights on the effectiveness of this technique in classroom composition and recommended students be encouraged to use self-assessment so they become independent learners. Hanley (1994) compared the differences between self-assessment with and without teacher guidance in a study using students in Year 6 and Year 7. Results showed that teacher guidance improved the quality of student evaluations (Hanley, 1994). Osman and McCabe (in Preston, 1994), in using self-assessment with secondary students, found students could isolate various abilities and problems, and suggest ways of improving composition performance. Merrigan (1997) combined self-evaluation with performance and discussion in practical research with a Year 11 class in a NSW secondary school:

I always ask my students to evaluate their efforts and ensure each piece or sound-scape is played to the whole class. After each sound-scape is heard by the class, discussion and evaluation take place. (This is ) one of the most worthwhile activities a teacher can use, both to find out how their students learn and to help students become independent learners.  

(Merrigan, 1997, p. 158)

However, Ross (1978) and Roberts (1994) demonstrated far less enthusiasm for this practice, and the latter writer found that Canadian teachers have difficulty in implementing this technique in their classes. Ross (1978) similarly considered the notion that children as the ultimate judges of the value of their work may be disturbing, and they would need training to be independent from the tradition of authority and validation which was expected in a classroom situation.
Providing a comparison with the above perceptions, Scarby and Ewers (1996) found that relatively reliable assessments were observed in group peer assessments of compositions at university level (Scarby and Ewers, 1996). This study was different from other cited studies in that consensus was rated against a lecturer's moderated marks and not against marks of other assessors. Criteria were specifically related to task design and the degree to which each composition fulfilled the requirements of the brief. Results showed that students' marks were very similar to those of the composition lecturer, and consequently, peer assessments were considered valuable in training students in assessment skills.

In portfolio and formative assessments, a fundamental practical resource in assessment is teacher observation (Armstrong, 1994). Armstrong identifies this technique as the first measuring instrument and a pre-requisite of all authentic assessments. Gardner (1983, 1993) pointed out the students can best be assessed by observation in naturalistic settings as they manipulate sounds through a variety of experiences, such as in playing, interacting with technology, and coping with disputes in co-operative learning situations. In composition assessment with secondary students, Harris and Hawkesley (1989) similarly reasoned that observations reveal the degrees of understanding and discrimination in student progress.

A second practical resource recommended in composition assessment literature is verbal comment (Bennett, 1975; Finney, 1999; Hughes, 1996, 1999; Kaschub, 1997; Paynter, 2000). Important in providing feedback to students, verbal comment occurs through questioning and discussion. Several writers described samples of questions appropriate for teachers to ask students during a composition (DeLorenzo, 1989) and after completion (Paynter, 2000). DeLorenzo considered that questioning students makes them think about what they are doing and in articulating answers, students are required to self-assess, justify, and evaluate composition processes. Paynter provided specific questions which enabled students to consider their composition processes:

"How do your feel about . . . ? Do we hear enough . . . ? Is it over too soon . . . ? How do you describe the character? Does it need . . . ? Do you think you've got it right? Are you sure?"

(Paynter, 2000, p. 21)

Discussions between teachers and students, and between students, are valuable in composition assessment. Hanley (1994), with younger children, considered conferencing
with individual students was very important in ensuring that the student's insights were expressed and valued by the teacher. Preston (1994), with secondary composition students, argued similarly that verbal analysis of what students had achieved was merely a starting point for a deeper discussion which confirmed the importance of students' responses, regardless of the level of insight expressed in the response. Finney (1999), in a study which considered social aspects of classroom interaction, found that discussion between pupils themselves is helpful in creating classroom climate of open communication and self-confidence.

The sensitivity of classroom teachers to students' needs is frequently a concern in composition assessment literature. Harris and Hawkesley (1989) recommended discussion should occur only after students request advice, so that students' self esteem is maintained. Hughes (1996, 1999) conducted an investigation of teacher/student discussion in composition, and suggested teachers need to be articulate and active listeners to pick up and focus on remarks made by children. In later research with eleven-year-old to fourteen-year-old students, Hughes (1999) considered teachers often lack the ability to facilitate discussion, open discussions, know when to intervene, and how to intervene. In composition, students need constant reinforcement of concepts and terminology and the teacher must affirm in positive terms (Hughes, 1999). Smith (1993) in a study which was not related to music or to education, found from his research that in a group situation the use of only slight negative reactions, such as gestures, and body language, had detrimental effects on participants' behaviour in group situations. These findings would suggest that in teaching composition, teachers need to have a pre-determined plan for interaction with students which will benefit the development of composing skills and to avoid identified pitfalls which reduce student confidence.

Written comments provided by teachers in composition assessment should be provided in positive forms to encourage students. Searby and Ewers (1996) confirmed that in higher education, comments written by peer assessors should be generally encouraging and offer constructive advice (Searby and Ewers, 1996). Hickey (1999) suggested labels in rubrics at the 'weak end' of the quality line should carry constructive rather than negative connotations. For example, terms phrased as 'rookie/pro', and apprentice/expert' remove suggestions of weakness and inability, which are found in the terms 'poor' or 'worst'. Using appropriate terms enables students to maintain self-esteem and confidence that they can improve.
Hickey does maintain numbers and percentages have no detrimental effects on students (Hickey, 1997. p. 28). In contrast, Durrant recommended comments only should accompany assessment of student compositions (Durrant, 1991).

Summary
The second section of the review of related literature presented assessment criteria, procedures and strategies used in composition assessments. The use of criteria in assessing student compositions is an accepted convention, although the diverse applications and combinations of criteria that have been applied in composition assessment research and practice show that no individual way of applying criteria has emerged from literature. Most commonly, one prominent criterion is broadly related to craftsmanship, especially through the use of concepts. Within concepts, attention to structure and development of melodic ideas is noticable. Subjectivity, objectivity, originality, and style confuse rather than clarify assessment considerations. Many different procedures and resources have been used in students' composition assessments, and this range of possibilities provides variety in possible assessment applications in senior secondary classrooms. Most prominent in literature is concern about hazards associated with composition assessment. Teachers are advised to administer feedback with extreme caution so that classroom environments promote learning and encourage enthusiasm.

Criteria, procedures, and resources used by teachers in students' composition assessments in the senior secondary school are investigated in this thesis through both data collecting instruments. In a survey, teachers are asked to respond to questions about all three issues – composition assessment criteria, procedures, and resources they use in composition assessments. In the experiment, a stronger focus is on criteria and procedures.

2.3: Teachers, composition and pedagogy
While the review of related literature up to this point has concentrated on composition assessment, the relationship between composition and composition assessment has been implied but not emphasised. In this section literature which is concerned with teachers, and the pedagogy they use in the training of students who are at secondary school level is reviewed. The first part of this section presents an historical review of pedagogical practices. Composers' views on their early training are presented, and pedagogy used in
their training is identified. This presents desirable teacher qualities and teaching techniques found in this literature. Literature which identifies appropriate pedagogy in composition in the contemporary school music curriculum is presented. The second part of this section highlights impediments which have been identified as interfering with the successful teaching of composition. These are gender, teachers' musical inventiveness, knowledge of appropriate assessment procedures, and agreement on assessments.

Little literature exists which addresses pedagogical issues in composition, or which has a focus on the role of teachers in composition learning. In descriptive or psychological writings (such as those of Christoff, 1985; Dacey, 1989; Hargreaves, 1986; Kemp, 1981, 1982; Sessions, 1950; Sloboda, 1985) an emphasis on composers from an adult perspective is presented which offers limited information on the pedagogy used by teachers and teaching traits which affect student learning.

Several pedagogical methods have been identified in histories of music education (Abeles, 1994; Fletcher, 1978; Johnstone, 1995; Rainbow, 1989). The most common form of training for composers was tuition which was private, over a long time, with a practising composer. This training, described by Rainbow (1989) as a master/apprentice model, was utilised in Europe and England from the Middle Ages. A second method of composition tuition was through a music school where there was a rich environment of musical activities in addition to composition tuition. Abeles (1984) identified institutions in Venice and Naples where, from the Middle Ages, young singers were taught composition.

A third pedagogical method was through texts which provided systematic and progressive training in composition and which were supplementary to guidance by a composer (Mann, 1990; Rieman, 1962). These had a long history, for example Guido d'Arezzo's Micrologus from 1026 greatly influenced music reading and composition (Miller, 1994), Fux's Gradus ad Parnassum (1725) and Rameau's Traite d'Harmonie (1722) were important in guiding compositional development for centuries (in Mann, 1990; Rainbow, 1989). Although when used with expert tuition the earlier texts were considered invaluable, a precedence was established in which composition was taught through a text book consisting of techniques of counterpoint and harmony. Lawrence (1978) was highly critical of later texts, as he considered that few of them gave insights into music invention. Historically however, despite the acknowledged limitations of text book practice for adequate training in
composition, a pedagogy in teaching composition in schools through text books emerged from the middle of the nineteenth century (1987). At school level, Johnstone (1995) traced this legacy of theoretical pedagogical practice in composition using publications, such as those of Kitson and Buck, by teachers who were not composers, into the late twentieth century.

There is strong evidence from many quarters that to teach composition, a teacher should be experienced as a composer. The American composer, Schuman, asserted that composers were the most appropriate of all musicians to teach music to children in schools as they understood more about music construction than did conductors, performers, or critics (Grimes, 1986b). From a perspective of a teacher in composition, Nadia Boulanger found it imperative that although they did not need to be practicing composers, she strongly recommended that teachers have a personal composition technique prior to teaching students. Brown (1982) recalled Boulanger's advice:

A teacher should be able to compose. He should have a technique of his own, a wealth of knowledge and a definite way of thinking. Have the courage to have an opinion.

(Brown, 1982, p.50)

Music educationists additionally recommend that teachers should demonstrate personal composing in classroom situations (deTurk, 1989). Through modelling composing behaviours, teachers give example to their students for the functional application of composition in their work, and the composed products give encouragement to students by showing the relationships between the composing process and the end product (Harris and Hawkesley, 1989). In a practical example, Salaman (1988) wrote a song prior to composition lessons which was used to demonstrate composing techniques, and served as a model of behaviour which students were able to emulate. In his description, the modelling of the teachers' ideas in combination with experimentation and group composition, provided confidence to two musically experienced fifteen-year-old students in the study who had previously found music invention difficult.

When considering their early learning experiences in composition, composers have revealed teacher qualities which they consider support composition learning. By studying composers' comments over four centuries prior to 1950, Lawrence (1978) identified two personality characteristics composers found desirable in a composition teacher: a teacher should be a good musician and have strong aptitude and personality for teaching. Desirable pedagogical
characteristics were that teaching should be based on sound educational principles in a context of rich, broadening musical experiences and opportunities, and that teaching should encourage students to be active, work with other students in developing revised ideas, and ultimately be directed towards independence of action.

From a post 1950 perspective, similar pedagogical recommendations were made by composers in a study by Bennett (1975, 1976). In studies in of eight composers residing in Washington DC in the 1970s, this researcher found details of how each composer viewed their own composition training. Bennett found half had strong reservations about their training because of teachers' deficiencies from an educational perspective as they failed to provide the composers with support, motivation, and understanding of how composing processes were generated. Bennett describes the best teachers as:

those who put the composers on their own and helped them develop their own style through relating to their ideas. One composer indicated that his best 'teacher' has been an extensive library of orchestral scores.

(Bennett, 1976; p. 6)

In a later review of Bennett’s writing, Jones (1986) commented that all six composers in the former studies considered their teacher was an expert, and an important part of their role as teachers was a critical appraisal of work which the novice composers had written.

From a late twentieth century perspective, interviews with eminent composers from the 1980s, which were reported in Music Educators Journal articles, provided recent composers' views of appropriate composition pedagogy. These views gave far greater prominence to the pedagogy of composition than to any other aspect of the teaching and learning situation. Composers included in the following selection, identified by Price et al (1990) as eminent in this field, were Boulez, Persichetti, and Schwantner. Important in composition pedagogy was the study of music which demonstrated composing techniques and skills, and which represented specific musical traditions. In an interview with Persichetti (Morris and Oerlick, 1992) learning composition skills involved listening and studying:

With band and orchestras if you hear something you like, you should make it your business to know how that composer got the sound. I make students do that; it saves a lot of time. They can study the orchestration and reduce it, look at it... listen to records for a special sound. You don't copy the sound, you just find out how.

(Morris, and Oerlick, 1992; p. 74-75).
This practice not only supported learning composing skills and processes, but as Boulez demonstrated, being familiar with other composers' music taught students the conventions of a musical tradition. Boulez considered a composer's work will not be properly situated unless the composer has absorbed the music of the past, which, once experienced, becomes part of the composer's subconscious, and facilitates writing in an appropriate vernacular:

A composer is a predator - he steals. Everything I find that is interesting I will steal, but I will use and transform it in such a way that it will not be recognised. At that point, it becomes part of myself.

(Polkrow, 1987; p. 21).

This pedagogical approach was identified by Schwaner as imitation, and in evolving a personal style, learning the craft of composition through this method was considered an imperative by these composers in the late twentieth century (Renshaw, 1991).

In conflict with the above pedagogy is that which was shown to be appropriate to teach children composition in the curriculum. Numerous books, articles, and research in children's composing advocate a different pedagogy as appropriate at that level, for example Composing in the Classroom (Harris and Hawkesley, 1989), and Music in the Secondary School Curriculum (Paynter, 1982), which provide pedagogical advice for teaching composition in secondary schools. Three models of pedagogy appropriate to school curricula, by Regelski (1986), Swanwick and Tillman (1986), and van Ernst (1993a), all stress a flow of processes, which consist of a synthesis of existing knowledge, application of musical skills and non-musical skills of imagination, selection, rejection, and evaluation (van Ernst, 1993a). The senior music syllabus in NSW Stage 6 Syllabus Music 2/3 Unit (NSW Board of Studies, 1994), similarly defines pedagogy teachers should use in their teaching with senior secondary students:

Composition refers to the organisation of sounds. The development of skills in composing results from continued involvement in a wide range of experiences in class activities. This includes such activities as providing tuned and untuned ostinato patterns to songs, adding a bass line to a rock song, writing a variation on an existing tune, adding a counter-melody, spontaneously adding harmony to a melody. These activities should range from the simple to the more complex and at times involve smaller tasks which can later be synthesised into the creation of whole pieces of music. This should include both group and individual work.

(NSW Board of Studies, 1994, p. 27)

In addition to problem solving used in acoustic composition, researchers have explored possibilities of computer technology for composition writing where a student operates without intervention from a teacher (Folkestad et al, 1999; Stauffer, 1999). Folkestad et al
(1999) commented that contrary to opinion that computers might lead to an escape from real objects to their abstractions, computerised tools involve a shift from representations of music to the music itself. Hickey (1997) considered the computer was an invaluable tool in motivating students who were low-achievers as the computer allowed a flexible and fun atmosphere with little external pressure (Hickey, 1997).

In musicological and educational research in composition, gender has identified as an issue of concern. The composing profession has historically been dominated by men, and considerable literature has shown that women have been provided with little encouragement and opportunity in this field (Bowers and Tick, 1986; Gates, 1992; Neuls-Bates, 1996; Pendle, 1991; Witkens and Askew, 1993). There is evidence to suggest that nowadays, however, women composers have greater opportunities than was previously experienced. For example, Ellen Taaffe Zwilich, the first woman to win a Pulitzer Prize in music in 1983, reported that she suffered no discrimination or detrimental influences in her training and in her considered opinion women were equally respected in the field (DeLorenzo, 1992).

In contrast with the growing number of women composers, in the field of music education, researchers in the United Kingdom and Canada suggested that gender characteristics can negatively effect composition learning. In an investigation in higher education, Cant (1990) found women students are more likely than men to have negative attitudes towards composition and are more inclined to question the value of studying both composition and improvisation. This researcher found that women say they:

- can't compose, undervalue the music they produce, avoid pursuing the chance to have their pieces performed, and refuse or resist performance of their work even in informal situations.

(Cant, 1990, p. 6)

This resembles the findings of Green (1997), who considered that gender impacted on behaviours and work habits in composition work in secondary music classrooms. Green observed that teachers perceived girls as hard workers and conformists, and boys indifferent workers and non-conformists (Green, 1993, 1997). In a later summary, Green directly compared boys and girls in composition and saw a strong difference between the two genders, with girls lacking confidence in composition, and boys appearing to excel at it (Green, 1999, p. 165). In replicating Green's (1993) study in British Columbia, Hanley (1998) found similar results for gender imbalance in composition learning in secondary schools. Hanley observed that when girls excelled at composition it was as a result of better
work habits, tuition in early years, and a strong piano background. Without these advantages, other girls were timid about composing, whereas boys at the same skill level were confident and demonstrated strong creative skills which were further enhanced by their ability to use technology successfully (Hanley, 1998). Hanley's connection between two negative factors was the subject of a more recent study. Airy and Parr (2001), in a study with young adults who were novice composers, found that the lack of confidence in using technology demonstrated by many females, and their comparative lack of invention in composition when compared with males of commensurate skill and training, were seen to be impediments in their learning of composition.

Demonstrated in a considerable amount of music education literature is the lack of secondary music teachers' skill in teaching creatively in composition work in comparison with the teaching of aural skills, performance and musicology. In England, Witkin (1974) observed that teachers had a fear and distrust of experiment and musical invention, and a poor record in developing individualism and self-expression in their students. This resembles similar conclusions made in the United States of America (Goodlad, 1984). In this country, creative programs which were to be implemented in schools required special teacher training for their effective functioning. For example, a change in the direction in the Contemporary Music Project (1959-1973) was attributed to teachers' lack of understanding of contemporary idioms (Abeles et al, 1984). Mark commented on similar difficulties in the Manhattanville Music Curriculum Project (1965-1966), which necessitated professional development between different stages of the program. Mark judged that:

> Teachers found it difficult to consider goals other than skill achievement and performance... many teachers had not personally experienced creative accomplishment and were therefore not secure in an atmosphere of creativity.

(Mark, 1978; p. 110)

In Australia, more recent research showed that teachers' training for secondary music teaching is grounded in traditional methods of harmony and counterpoint (Jeanneret, 1990; van Ernst, 1993) While more creative approaches to composition training at tertiary institutions are in evidence, research investigating practices in secondary schools shows that many teachers do not approach the teaching of composition using pedagogy which reflects an understanding of how to use composition as a pedagogical tool (Dunbar-Hall, 1999).
In addition to lack of training in composition, other researchers have identified the limitation of teachers in assessment procedures, which are a result of classroom environments created by teachers. Many writers have identified the special skills in communication and understanding that teachers need to support students in student centred, problem-solving experiences (Claire, 1993; Hughes, 1996, 1999). Hughes (1996, 1999) identified that music teachers, more than other teachers, use a didactic teaching mode which precludes interactive behaviours between teachers and students, and between students. This researcher found that to promote change in teaching which fosters stronger classroom interactions, language, communication and listening skills need to be understood so that intervention and support in creative work are positive. There are differences in opinion on the effectiveness of various strategies. Rohwer (1997), in a literature review of composition assessment, described negative aspects of assessment, which included teacher surveillance, excessive rewards, competition, too much control leading to reduced student autonomy, pressure of expectations, and the imposition of time limits. In contrast, DeTurk (1989) and Regelski (1986) suggested that providing a due date for a composition can act as a support for creative production.

Although little empirical research has been conducted which investigates the emotional impact on students of composition assessment, a case study with fifth grade children conducted by Claire (1994) showed that social classroom environments were a contributing factor to students' productivity. Claire observed that a positive social environment was frequently lacking in music education classrooms in the United States of America. This researcher recommended that improved social conditions in the classroom would enhance both students' creative work, and the ability of teachers to judge creative products.

Studies show that with increasing levels of achievement, the more difficult is the task of assessors to agree. With subjects of primary-age, or where the composed pieces were monophonic, inter-judge reliability between judges who were either music educators or musicians was high (for example those of Bangs, 1992; Kratus, 1991; 1994; Webster & Hickey, 1995). It was found in another study that judgements of compositions which were at the extremes of achievement scales produced higher inter-judge reliability than those in middle levels (Hickey, 1995, p. 149). Pilsbury and Alston (1996), found that assessors had least difficulty judging with folios of secondary students' work which were at the lowest and
highest ranges of achievement, while those in the middle ranges caused the greatest problems, which confirms Hickey's (1995) research.

Little investigation has been conducted into inter-judge reliability in research studies in assessment of complex, multi-concept composition products. Bunting (in Paynter, 1982) found there was group consensus on composition assessments between the five groups in the study. However, Bunting suggested there was some difference between individuals within the experimental groups:

I wish now that we had paid more attention to the work of these groups, because within a generally fair degree of consensus there were also several strong disagreements, and there was not enough time to discuss these adequately. Two people indeed found themselves unable in conscience to award marks at all.

(Bunting, 1982, p. 212)

Later experiments confirmed that consensus was difficult to achieve in assessments of compositions written by secondary music students (Simmonds, 1988). This writer, using group consensus similarly to Bunting's earlier application, asked eight groups of assessors to evaluate five compositions using a set of criteria as a general guide. Simmonds found there were considerable difficulties in achieving consensus and was pessimistic about the prospect of inter-judge reliability with composition at this level (Simmonds, 1988). Pilsbury and Alston (1996) used individual assessments in a study of twenty-nine portfolios and compositions which were assessed by eleven experienced music teachers. Results showed that judges did not reach consensus.

In research studies little attention has been paid to intra-judge reliability, or individual scorer reliability. Two studies were identified which were concerned with scorer reliability (Moore, 1990; Webster, 1979) over different times. In these results the scorers maintained a high level of agreement between the first and second scoring sessions. Results of these studies reflect that teachers and musicians reach agreement when assessing music of young children, especially when compositions are rated on limited dimensions only. With increasing complexity, levels of agreement between assessors decrease, although agreement on compositions which demonstrate high or low achievement is generally uniform. Over the longer term, assessors generally maintain the same opinion on scores.
Summary

The final section of the review of related literature presented literature on composition pedagogy appropriate to children from both an historical and a composer's perspective. Impediments which may have an effect on teaching and assessing of composition were gender, teachers' lack of training — in composition, in composition assessment techniques, and in problem-solving teaching strategies. The final part of the review of related literature examined the reliability of teachers as judges in composition assessments. Individual teachers generally are consistent in assessment of compositions over time. However, consensus between different teachers in compositions written by secondary school students is less predictable. The two data collecting instruments in this thesis, a survey and an experiment, explore these issues by examining NSW secondary music teachers' perceptions about, and behaviours in, assessments of senior student compositions. In both data collecting instruments, teachers' training in composition, training in teaching composition, and training in assessing composition, gender, and teaching experience, are examined in the first part of both research protocols.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction
The research methodology is outlined in this chapter. The chapter commences with a brief restatement of the purpose of the study, a description of the research design, and a presentation of the research questions and hypotheses. The chapter identifies subject samples, describes the data gathering instruments, and gives details of procedures used in the research. Included in the procedures section is a description of data collection, analytical strategies to answer questions and to test hypotheses, and logistical strategies implemented for the conduct of the study.

The purpose of the study is to explore how music teachers in NSW secondary schools conduct assessments of compositions written by senior secondary music students in accordance with the NSW Board of Studies 2 Unit (Common) music syllabus. A concern of the study is to investigate specific strategies that secondary music teachers use in these assessments, including the material resources utilised and personnel enlisted. A second concern in the study is to identify, and ascertain the importance of, criteria on which secondary music teachers base their judgements of senior student compositions. A fundamental purpose of the research is to determine the level of the relationship between teachers' assessments of compositions written by students at senior secondary level with teachers' pedagogy in composition.

3.1: Research design
The review of related literature was a valuable resource in the design, orientation, and content of the research. Considerable literature in music education research presented in Chapter 2 showed that surveys are a common way of finding information from teachers about their practices and perceptions (for example, Bartle, 1968; Dunbar-Hall, 1999; Roberts, 1994; Witken, 1974). In composition assessment research, experiments have become a tradition, as
was shown in the research of Bunting (1982), Pilsbury and Alston (1996), Simmonds (1988), and Webster and Hickey (1995). Both methods are used in the research design. In the first part of the research, a survey, the review of literature additionally functioned to provide an outline and a rationale. In the first section of the review of literature, the purposes of assessment were shown to be related to assessment theories, and composition assessment and pedagogy were identified as complementary in music education.

Composition purposes, methods, resources, assessment schedules, and criteria identified in the review of related literature, were then investigated through questions in the survey. Therefore, the content of survey questions explored strategies, procedures, and criteria used by NSW secondary music teachers in their composition assessments. Literature in the second section of Chapter 2 demonstrated that there were wide ranging and multiple approaches to these aspects of composition assessment. Content of survey questions also examined teachers' backgrounds and training in composition and its assessment. The third section of Chapter 2 showed that there were features of these issues which were controversial. The review of related literature consequently became the basis on which the first part of the research was constructed, and was important in the later part of the research which provided more information about aspects of NSW teachers as assessors, and the procedures and criteria they use in assessments of senior student compositions.

The research design consists of two protocols — a survey and an experiment. The function of the survey is to provide a large sample of NSW secondary music teachers with an opportunity to respond to questions on composition assessment from a practical, informal perspective, which relates to their classroom experiences in the implementation of NSW Board of Studies 2 Unit (Common) and other senior music syllabuses in the period between 1994 and 1999. The role of the survey is to reveal a range of issues, trends, and concerns appropriate to composition assessment which represent practices of the population of secondary music teachers in NSW. In contrast to the survey, the role of the experiment is to test a small sample of these teachers' assessments as they judge three research compositions written at a senior secondary level in a formal, clinical test.

The merits of the production of data from the different perspectives of a survey and an experiment were evaluated in literature (Best, 1981). An advantage of a survey is that information from a broad range of subjects is possible. A disadvantage of a survey is that
responses can reflect what people think they should answer rather than what they really do think. In contrast, an experiment identifies how participants behave with real life examples. In this research, a combination of two research methods provides several advantages in data collection and analysis. One advantage is that assessment issues identified as important in survey data can be more thoroughly investigated in an experiment. A second advantage is that it is possible to refute or corroborate data, and thus to make assumptions concerning different aspects of NSW secondary music teachers' assessments. By using a combination of both methods, it is possible to observe both what NSW secondary music teachers indicate they think, and how they behave.

This tactical approach in methodology has been described as multiple-method triangulation (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Triangulation establishes accuracy of observations and trustworthiness of interpretations of data through repeated observations. Unlike applications of triangulation which test the same hypotheses from different perspectives (Cohen and Manion, 1980), Denzin and Lincoln (2000) suggest multiple method triangulation is more than a validation mechanism, as multiple strategies attempt to secure in-depth understanding of a phenomenon by adding breadth, complexity, and depth to an investigation. The survey in this research is important in exploring a wide range of variables in the study, while the experiment tests explicit variables. Important in multiple method triangulation is the balance given to each method in research design and reporting of results. In this study, both methods share equally in the provision of data to answer research questions and to test hypotheses.

Although in design, in function, and in most other aspects, the two research methods differ, the survey and experiment maintain one common feature. This is a profile of the two teacher samples used in the conduct of the research. These survey and experiment sample profiles, described later in Chapter 3 on pp. 73-76 and p. 89 are included in the research for numerous reasons. In both research protocols, the profiles provide opportunity to show that the two samples demonstrate similar characteristics, and that they represent the population of NSW secondary music teachers. Additionally, each profile provides opportunities within protocols for cross-tabulation through variables, and supplementary data to respond to the research questions and hypotheses. While some cross-referencing is undertaken for corroborative purposes in Chapters 4 and 5, a detailed comparison between the two sample profiles is conducted in Chapter 6, so that findings from the research can be discussed in the final chapter from the combined perspective of the two protocols.
Research questions and hypotheses

In the survey, two research questions are used to investigate how NSW secondary music teachers assess senior secondary compositions, strategies and criteria they use, and connections between composition assessment and pedagogy. The two questions are:

Research Question 1

- In teaching composition to senior students in NSW secondary schools, what do secondary music teachers report are their:
  i) assessment strategies, and
  ii) assessment criteria?

Research Question 2

- What is the extent of the relationship between secondary music teachers' assessments of composition in NSW senior classes and pedagogy in composition and in music education generally?

For the subsequent experiment, three hypotheses were formulated. Formulation of hypotheses to assist in research has been described in education research methodologies by Borg and Gall (1979) and Cohen and Manion (1994). Described as tentative statements about the relationships between two or more variables, hypotheses used in this study were derived from the survey results and are used in the research to guide data collection and analysis, and to direct attention to the most important variables, and their relationships with other variables (Keeves, 1988). The three hypotheses investigate different variables: inter-judge reliability, assessment procedures, and assessment criteria. In stating hypotheses, Borg and Gall (1979), and Tuckman (1988) recommend that null hypotheses should be posed when analysis of data uses statistical testing and interpretation. In this study, therefore, two hypotheses are formulated as null hypotheses. The final hypothesis is stated as a positive hypothesis. Hittleman and Simon (1992) suggest that a positive statement of an hypothesis is suitable when a researcher has strong evidence that a relationship or effect exists. The three hypotheses are:
Hypothesis 1

- There will be no effect for different judges on grades allocated by each judge for three compositions written at a senior secondary level.

Hypothesis 2

- There will be no effect for different assessment procedures in assessing three compositions written at a level of senior secondary music students on:
  
  i) judges' scores

  ii) judges' decision-making processes.

Hypothesis 3

- There will be an effect for different criteria in assessing three compositions written at senior secondary level in:
  
  i) each composition

  ii) all three compositions.

Subjects

Subjects in this research were practising secondary music teachers in NSW at the time of the research (1998). Following a request from the researcher, the NSW Board of Studies provided a list of all schools which had submitted candidates for HSC examinations in Music in the five years prior to the research (N=562). Both research methods used this list for subject sample selection.

The survey was administered to the total population of secondary music teachers in schools which were nominated by the NSW Board of Studies. The total population was surveyed to provide for the range of demographic differences in schools. Described by Borg as a 'census' (Borg, 1981, p. 406), this technique was selected in preference to other sampling techniques such as random, stratified, or cluster sampling. The primary reason for this selection was the wide range of characteristics in NSW schools and the potential for these characteristics to influence teachers' music pedagogy and possibly assessments in composition. For example, schools can be in cities or rural environments where access to in-service opportunities, postgraduate study, and other training is limited. The presence of these widely different
environments suggests comprehensive results, which reflect the beliefs of a majority of NSW secondary music teachers, would be provided more effectively from observations from the total population than from sampling. A census was selected for a second reason. Co-operation was voluntary and anonymous and some attrition rate was predicted. Those participating would then constitute a volunteer sample (Borg, 1981).

From the five hundred and sixty-two secondary schools listed by the NSW Board of Studies, two hundred and twenty-eight music teachers completed and returned questionnaire forms, which represents a 40.6% response rate. In accordance with University of Sydney Human Ethics Committee guidelines, which are described in this chapter (p. 104), responses were confidential and anonymous.

In contrast with the subjects who participated in the survey, subjects who participated in the experiment were practising NSW secondary music teachers from a stratified sample which consisted of all three hundred and fifty Sydney metropolitan schools identified in the NSW Board of Studies list. As the experiment was to be conducted in the central business district of Sydney, this sample was selected for accessibility to the experiment venue. Twenty-four teachers volunteered to participate from the selected sample of schools. These twenty-four volunteers formed the group of subjects who attended one of seven experiment sessions. Sessions were one and a half hours in duration and were either after school hours or in a vacation period.

3.2: The survey
This section describes the data gathering instrument used in the survey, titled Identification of Music Composition Assessment Issues (IMCAI). This is followed by an outline of IMCAI pilot studies.

Survey data gathering instrument
IMCAI was designed to gather data to respond to the two research questions. The following section provides information on question content and rationales for the inclusion of each question in IMCAI. Then follows a description of wording, forms of response, sequencing, and layout, which were recommended as guidelines for questionnaire construction by Selltiz

IMCAI consists of four parts which address different variables associated with NSW secondary music teachers' assessments of senior student compositions. The first part explores the respondent sample profile by asking respondents to provide information on their personal, composing, and training backgrounds. The first two questions explore respondents' teaching experience and their gender. These two questions are included to establish that in the respondent sample there is strong representation from male and female teachers, and from teachers with contrasting levels of experience in teaching music in NSW secondary schools. The third question is included to ensure that respondents represent secondary music teachers from contrasting regions of NSW.

Categorisation of locations throughout NSW presented a dilemma in the research because of the vast size of the state, and its geographic and demographic features. For the purposes of accurate analysis, limited numbers of categories were required and it was necessary that each category be easily identifiable by respondents. These two requirements were satisfied by NSW Department of School Education (1995) documentation which divides NSW into ten regions. These are: Hunter, Metropolitan East, Metropolitan North, Metropolitan South-West, Metropolitan West, North Coast, Riverina, South Coast, and Western. Figure 1 shows NSW divided into the ten named regions used as research categories. The four metropolitan regions in Figure 1 are in Sydney. All others are in regional NSW, which includes large cities such as Newcastle and Wollongong, large county towns, and rural environments.

Even though the ten regions were superseded for administrative purposes prior to the research (NSW Department of Education and Training, 1996), and these administrative divisions were applicable to schools which were administered by the Department of Education and Training only, this categorisation was employed in the research as the demographic and/or geographic features of the regions were commonly used and were considered to be easily identifiable.
Figure 1

Ten NSW regions

:NSW Education Regions

* Regional headquarters

(NSW Departments of School Education, 1995)
In the survey, respondents were asked to provide some description of their school and school characteristics which may have some effect on teaching (such as single sex/coeducational). This question is included to confirm that respondents are not limited to one type of school and to gauge whether differences in schools influenced assessment and teaching of composition.

Respondents' experience in teaching composition in Years 11 and 12 is examined in IMCAI. The fifth question establishes that respondents have personal experience in teaching composition as required by the 1994 2 Unit (Common) course at HSC level. Respondents may have taught composition in other senior courses, either 2 Unit Course 1 or 3 Unit. In these courses, prior to 1994 and since, composition was an optional elective. Knowledge of music teachers' personal involvement with teaching composition at this level provides authenticity in later composition assessment IMCAI variables, which would have less significance if respondents answer questions from a hypothetical position. Content of the first five IMCAI questions is provided below:

1. How long have you taught music in secondary schools?
2. Your gender?
   a. male
   b. female
3. Indicate the area that best describes the location of your school:
   a. Hunter
   b. Metropolitan East
   c. Metropolitan North
   d. Metropolitan South West
   e. Metropolitan West
   f. North Coast
   g. North West
   h. Riverina
   i. South Coast
   j. Western
4. Indicate from the following the categories most appropriate to your school:
   a. single sex
   b. co-educational
   c. comprehensive
   d. selective
   e. specialist (performing arts, music, other specialist)
   f. any other category
5. Have you taught any of the following?
   a. HSC classes in 2 Unit (Common) Music - 1994 or before, 1995 or after
   b. HSC classes in 2 Unit Course 1 and/or 3 Unit Music (with students who submitted composition elective) in 1997 or before.

IMCAI Question 6 investigates respondents' composing experiences. Its purpose is to find how respondents interpreted composition as a syllabus activity, to explore their level of
experience in composition, and to find if this variable influences composition teaching and composition assessment. Cues are provided to elicit responses in this question:

6. Have you had any experiences as a composer? eg writing for a rock or church group, performing in a jazz ensemble, writing for school performance, published work, etc. If yes, please give details.

Following this, respondents' training in composition, in composition teaching, and in composition assessment is investigated. These questions are important to the study as they explore respondents' perceptions of, and the sources of training in each of the three nominated categories. In responding to these questions, teachers were provided with five options which identified different training opportunities:

7. What is your background, study and/or training?
   (none, pre-service, in-service, post-graduate, other) in:

   a. composition (please give details)
   b. teaching of composition (please give details)
   c. assessment of composition (please give details).

Three IMCAI questions investigate strategies that respondents use to assess senior student compositions. These are Questions 9, 11a and 11b, and 13. For the purpose of this study, assessment strategies are defined in terms of composition assessment schedules, procedures, and resources. While each question is included for independent purposes, general reasons for examining assessment strategies used by respondents is to find if there is calculated, systematic, and uniform planning in respondents' assessment of compositions. Assessment schedules in Question 9 examine when assessments of senior secondary compositions are conducted. Three options are provided for responses. These are: during the writing process; on completion of a composition as a final assessment; and, both during and on completion of a composition.

Composition assessment procedures which respondents use are investigated in Question 11a. Nine possible procedures are listed: raw marks; impression; ranking; checklist; skill mastery; grade; notation only; sound only; and notation and sound. This question additionally aims to identify other unlisted procedures which respondents use for this purpose by inviting them to add further procedures not already identified. This question is included to provide a comprehensive list of respondents' procedures, and gauge the frequency of their use.
Similarly to Question 11a, Question 11b investigates personnel and material resources that respondents use in the conduct of assessments of senior students' compositions. Nine possible resources are listed: teacher observation; teacher verbal comments; and teacher written comments; student verbal and written comments; student peer comments; music teachers from the same school; music teachers from other schools; and, other experts. Assessment resources are examined to find whether class teachers conduct assessments of student compositions alone, or whether they have other support for this task.

IMCAI Question 13 is designed to examine assessment of student documentation through a process diary. As teachers' assessment of process diaries is a syllabus requirement, and at that time accounted for fifty percent of teachers' assessment of the submitted compulsory composition (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, p. 36), this question was designed to find what criteria NSW teachers used, and the extent of their use by teachers. The importance of assessments of a student's composition process diary, identified from 1999 as a 'portfolio', increased with the issue of a new syllabus (NSW Board of Studies, 1999b, p. 44). In this syllabus, teachers' total ongoing school assessment of submitted compositions was to be conducted through portfolio assessment. An additional purpose for the inclusion of this question is to find other resources which respondents use when they assess senior student compositions which are not identified in the listed items.

As presentation of some questions required different amounts of space on the IMCAI form, sequencing of questions about similar variables, such as strategies, was determined by their length. Consequently, in this description of the survey, Questions 8 and 10 are presented out of numerical sequence. IMCAI Questions 9, 11a, 11b, and 13 are:

9. When do you assess a student's composition in Preliminary and HSC classes (2 Unit (Common), 3 Unit and & 2 Unit Course 1)?
   a. during the process of writing a composition
   b. on completion of a composition (final assessment)
   c. a combination of a and b.

11a. What procedures do you use in assessing composition?
   a. raw mark (eg 7/10),
   b. impression mark-overall judgement,
   c. ranking students by drawing comparisons (if 2 or more students),
   d. checklist (eg. demonstrates understanding of tonality, etc.)
e. for mastery of a specific skill eg. thematic development,
f. grading - excellent, good satisfactory, unsatisfactory,
g. notation only
h. sound only
i. combination of notation and sound
Further comment.

11b. What resources do you use in assessing composition?
   a. teacher observation
   b. teacher verbal comments
   c. teacher written comments
   d. student verbal comments
   e. student written comments
   f. comments by student peers
   g. comments by other music teachers (same school)
   h. comments by other music teachers (different school)
   i. comments by other experts (eg judge in competition)
   Further comment.

13. How important are each of the following criteria when you assess a process diary in Preliminary and HSC music classes?
   a. student effort
   b. student self-assessment
   c. student learning
   d. composition outcome

Assessment criteria used by teachers are investigated in IMCAI Question 12 by identifying, categorising, and determining the level of importance of individual criteria. Literature reviewed in Chapter 2, especially that on assessment studies, and NSW Board of Studies documentation, was important in determining response options in this question (for example Bunting, 1982; New South Wales Board of Studies, 1994, 1995b; Pilsbury and Alston, 1996; Simmonds, 1988; Webster and Hickey, 1995). Identified collective criteria in the review of literature were: subjectivity; objectivity; originality; craftsmanship; and style. From the identified sources, the following list was compiled for respondents' consideration: originality; technology; success beyond the classroom; personal response; set of criteria; synthesis; processes; techniques/skills; correct use of concepts; knowledge; modelling; and style. Respondents were provided with the opportunity to add further criteria which they use but which are not listed. This ensures that relevant criteria important to respondents in senior composition assessments are identified. IMCAI Question 12 is presented as:

12. How important are each of the following criteria when you make a final assessment of student music composition in Preliminary and HSC classes?
   a. originality
   b. ability to use technology
   c. possibility for success beyond the classroom
Two IMCAI questions explore relationships between composition assessments and pedagogy in composition, and in music education generally. Question 8 investigates changes NSW teachers may have made in pedagogical aspects of music at senior and junior secondary levels since the introduction of different assessment structures in composition in the 2 Unit (Common) music course in 1994. Literature reviewed in Chapter 2 suggests that two purposes of composition assessment are to assist curriculum reform (Gasking, 1947; Broadfoot, 1992; Izard, 1991), and to align music teaching outcomes with learning objectives (Armstrong, 1994; Bodman, 1992; Swanwick, 1988). Although a link between teaching practice and composition assessment was implied by this question, its inclusion in IMCAI is primarily to investigate if, and how, change occurred. Research methodologies emphasize that causal effects, or the equating of significant association with a causal link, cannot be proven through data collection by questionnaire (Nisbet and Entwistle, 1970).

Respondents' views on the purpose of composition assessment in Years 11 and 12 are examined in IMCAI Question 10. Literature discussed in Chapter 2 described multiple purposes for composition assessment and respondents' perceptions on this question are important in observing the extent of the relationship between the curriculum, composition teaching, student learning, and assessment strategies and criteria. IMCAI Questions 8 and 10 are shown below:

8. Have you made any adjustment to your teaching practice since mandatory original composition was introduced in 2U (Common) Music in 1995?
   a. In HSC and preliminary classes (please give details)
   b. In junior secondary classes (please give details)

10. In relation to the teaching of music composition in both 2U (Common), 3 Unit and 2 Unit Course 1, what is the purpose of assessment?

Arrangement of IMCAI contents was considered with a view to maximising co-operation from respondents so as to facilitate returns. Suggestions recommended by Hoinville and Jowell
(1978) were followed concerning questionnaire appearance and clarity, to ensure respondents would have little difficulty in completing all questions. In appearance, *IMCAI* is uncluttered with ample spacing, particularly on the first page. Formatted on four one-sided A4 pages, all questions are in bold type, prefaced by a symbol for ease of location, and identified by number. Some questions which are similar (such as sub-sections in Questions 7 and 11) are grouped together as they cover similar issues and are made smaller in appearance by clustering.

Additional information was included in the questionnaire to interpret terminology, and inform respondents of the purpose for the inclusion of questions. The introduction explains:

> This questionnaire investigates assessment of music composition. It is specifically aimed at Year 11 and Year 12 music composition in Board of Studies syllabuses and not AMEB courses. By 'assessment' is meant any form of appraisal of a student's work. By 'composition' is meant the creation of original music. Please consider all student composition in your response, including but not only submitted composition.

Prior to selected questions, a short explanatory message is inserted. For example, 'Questions 1-7 concern your background and experience', added at the beginning. Prior to Question 8, 'This concerns your teaching' is interposed, and before Question 9, 'Questions 9-13 concern your assessment of student composition', is inserted.

*IMCAI* contents are arranged to lead respondents in an increasingly focussed direction from the opening to the final questions, and conform with questionnaire sequencing recommended by Hoineville and Jowell (1978). General factual questions are positioned on the first page to allow for quick completion of that page. Questions on the second page are similarly concerned with factual information, but require increased consideration by respondents. Later questions ask respondents to give their opinions and describe their practices. Questions which required longer completion times concerned with data of stronger significance in the study are generally placed towards the end of the document.

Forms of response in question construction vary throughout *IMCAI*. Both open and closed form questions were included, described by Best (1981) as appropriate for a questionnaire designed to supply information which includes responses of two types - those which are objective, and those that require greater depth of thought. Early questions were objective and
straightforward. More provocative questions requiring some degree of deliberation were either open-ended or matched with Likert scale responses. Best identified that Likert scales are a method of inferring attitudes from expressed opinion and are used extensively in educational research. Opportunities for respondents to add extra comments to most questions were provided so that opinions not canvassed by the written questions would be included. Cues were supplied in Question 6, which asked respondents about personal composing experiences, to assist in interpretation of the question. These are: 'eg writing for a rock or church group, performing in a jazz ensemble, writing for school performance, published work etc'. In contrast, Question 10, which required information concerning the purpose of composition assessment, used no cues so responses would be completely candid. Forms of response used in the survey were:

- closed-form, where one of many listed items could be selected (eg. Q1-Q5, and Q9)
- closed-form, with provision for further details (eg Q7)
- closed-form, where responses were either positive or negative, with provision for further details (eg Q6 and Q8)
- one open-form response (eg Question 10)
- Likert scales (eg Q11, Q12 and Q13). Likert scales were both three and five point, with the larger scales required for data to accommodate a wider range of responses (eg Question 12), and the smaller scales to limit the range of responses (eg both sub-sections of Question 11).

At the conclusion of the survey respondents were invited to include any further comments on the assessment of composition. This ensured respondents had an opportunity to add any perceptions applicable to the study which they had not already presented.

Survey pilot studies
To establish that IMCAI questions could validly investigate NSW secondary music teachers' assessments of compositions written by senior secondary students, the survey was piloted. Piloting is recommended in research manuals to locate flaws and identify ambiguities in surveys. Piloting also provides an invaluable check on options in multiple-choice items, and on the feasibility of the proposed procedure for coding responses (Best, 1981; Mason and Bramble, 1978; Nisbet and Entwistle, 1970). Pilot session participants were different from questionnaire respondents.
Three piloting procedures were conducted during IMCAI's development. In its early construction, IMCAI was reviewed by six participants in a post-graduate university seminar. Participants were of two kinds. Some participants were tertiary academics in music education and education while others were students completing Master of Music or PhD studies in music education. Most participants were, or previously had been, secondary music educators in NSW schools. Strong recommendations made by seminar participants to address IMCAI ambiguities included a clarification of focus, more succinct questioning techniques, and simpler structure.

After modification to address participants' recommendations from the first seminar, the survey was again piloted by the same six academics and post-graduate music education students in a later post-graduate seminar. Further advice from participants suggested some changes to ensure conceptual clarification. Adjustments which considered these suggestions were made.

Following these adjustments, IMCAI was piloted with individuals not associated with the preceding seminar group. Five experienced music educators working in positions outside of classrooms, and two music education academics from two other universities piloted IMCAI on this third occasion. Contacted personally, most members of this pilot group were experienced in formal marking procedures conducted by the NSW Board of Studies. Recommendations (made by only three of the recipients) suggested minor amendments in question content, language and formatting. These were considered, some adjustments were made in formatting and structure, and the survey was prepared for distribution. Consideration was given to the results of the survey before the second protocol was designed.

As the first research protocol of a multiple-method triangulation study, the survey formed a generic foundation from which the second protocol was produced. IMCAI design, question content, and terminology were fundamental in structuring the later protocol. A substantial connection between the two was established with the replication in the second protocol of the first seven questions from the survey, identified in IMCAI as the respondent sample profile. Both protocols maintained a strong emphasis on assessments of compositions written by senior secondary students, especially those which were similar to submitted compositions in the 2 Unit (Common) course. In the second protocol, compositions used were designed to reflect this level. Common terminology, and its interpretation between the two protocols, was
maintained. For example, composition was interpreted as only original music. Terms which
described criteria and procedures were identified similarly. Terms consistently used were: the
ability to use musical concepts, synthesis, use of techniques/skills, knowledge of conventions,
musical style, grading, impression marking, ranking, notation, and sound.

IMCAI results additionally provided valuable information which was important in design of
the second protocol. Although survey results are reported in Chapter 4, examples of how they
affected the design are identified here to show how the two protocols are integrated. Results
identified that both the sound and notation of compositions were equally important in
teachers' assessments. In the second protocol, therefore, compositions were presented to
teachers in both forms, and questions were designed to investigate the balance of the impact
of both on their assessments. Results also showed that two different procedures were equally
important in assessing compositions. These were impression and analysis of content. In the
experiment design, procedures were given prominence to establish whether different
procedures effected teachers' assessments. The next section presents a description of the
experiment.

3.3: The experiment

The research experiment was designed to test the three hypotheses stated at the
commencement of this chapter (p. 71). Two different items of special equipment were
constructed for use in conjunction with the experiment and they are described in this section.
The following section gives details of the special equipment, gives a rationale for, and
describes content material, its construction, and piloting procedures.

Special equipment

Two items of equipment constructed for implementation with the experiment were a series of
compact discs containing recordings of three music compositions, and copies of printed scores
of the compositions. In designing the special equipment, decisions on the number of
compositions, their length, and the numbers of repetitions of compositions during the
experiment were made. These decisions were determined by responses from participants in
experiment pilot sessions (described on pp. 96-97), and precedents from similarly formatted
music education experiments, which are described below.
Experiments in music assessment suggest short samples of music, which are repeated two or three times, are suitable for experimental purposes. A major commonality among the reviewed experiments is that repetitions of compositions provide judges with sufficient familiarity with each composition from which judgements can be made. Although experiments in composition assessment have generally been conducted in circumstances which are slightly different from the present study, repetition of examples used in experiments is evident. For example, in the United States of America, Webster and Hickey (1995) conducted an experiment which used composition assessment procedures in non-laboratory settings. Judges were requested to listen to each of ten pieces at least twice. Simmonds (1988), in the United Kingdom, conducted an experiment in assessment of five compositions under laboratory conditions. In this experiment, following a first performance, participants were at liberty to re-play each composition at will.

Experiments which used aural examples and were conducted under laboratory conditions, and in fields other than composition assessment, have been conducted with compositions of differing lengths. Total length of aural stimuli varies from extremely short to long listening times. Halpern (1992) conducted an experiment with forty-five undergraduates with a thirty-five minute listening tape. Brief excerpts were recommended for subjects of varying ages, from children to elderly subjects, for example Le Blanc et al (1996). The mean time for individual sound examples in other experiments using taped examples favoured approximately half a minute (James, 1993; Price and Swanson, 1990; Sheldon and Gregory, 1997) with slightly longer examples of forty seconds acceptable (March, 1995).

To balance requirements of the experiment, to follow guidelines recommended by the pilot studies, and to conform to parameters suggested by previous experiments, three compositions were judged a suitable number. Each would be played three times. Total listening time in the experiment was 9 minutes, with three individual compositions approximately 1 minute each.

**Compact discs**

Three compact discs were produced for use in this component of the research. This equipment was developed to provide composition assessment samples, facilitate ease in the conduct of the experiment, and to ensure that on each presentation, the conduct of the experiment remained constant. Three brightly coloured compact discs (green, blue and red) which were named and labelled in accordance with their colour identification, and their
experiment session (*Impression, Global*, and *Specific* respectively), ensured precise replication of the experiment. The experiment sessions are described fully in this chapter on pp. 99-100. This section describes the development of compact disc content, provides a description of each composition included on the discs, and shows how each compact disc was formatted. Copies of three similarly formatted, coloured, and labelled compact discs are included as Appendix B (pp. 290-291).

Compositions appropriate to the conduct of the experiment were commissioned by the researcher. The composers were three post-secondary school non-professional musicians who had completed secondary music studies immediately prior to the research, and who represented students' abilities at HSC level. Each composer was contacted personally by the researcher and was identified through different channels. One composer volunteered after an invitation to beginning tertiary students who were not composition majors. A second composer was an ex-student of the researcher who had received no further training in composition since leaving secondary school. The third composer was a student of a colleague.

Consideration was given to the use of composition samples in the experiment which had been submitted to the NSW Board of Studies for HSC examination. Preliminary consultation with NSW Board of Studies personnel indicated that ethical and logistical restrictions would provide obstacles in the use of such pieces for research purposes. In addition, the length of these pieces is two minutes, and this length was not considered suitable for the experiment design.

In writing appropriate compositions, the three composers were asked to conform to listed specifications. These were required so that the experiment would function effectively, compositions would conform to HSC guidelines, and would be similar to those submitted for examination at that level. Specifications were that each composition:

- be 50" to 70" long
- represent the mandatory topic for the HSC syllabus, 'Music 1970 Onwards'
- represent an identifiable style eg rock, jazz, avant garde
- have a title
- be presented in two forms: sound recording, and computer-generated printout.

Six compositions were provided in all by the three composers. One composition from each composer was selected to provide stylistic contrast from the other pieces. Members of the
seminar group who piloted the experiment confirmed that each composition was written at the level appropriate to the research. The three pieces selected for use in the experiment were *Funny Feeling*, *Les Moustiques*, and *Test Tube Song*.

*Funny Feeling* is a 44 bar piece in contemporary jazz/funk style. It is scored for a small combination of synthesized keyboards, saxophones, bass guitar and percussion. *Funny Feeling* has a strong rhythmic drive and sense of momentum. It demonstrates a synthesis of elements using appropriate compositional techniques, the most interesting of which is the syncopation which dominates all forty-four bars. Development of musical material is derived from repetition of melodic, rhythmic and harmonic ostinato patterns. The printed score shows some inaccuracies, for example, the arrangement of instruments on the score, with the keyboard above the saxophone.

*Les Moustiques* is a 48 bar art music piece reminiscent of early twentieth compositions of Debussy, Satie or Bartok. Scored for a chamber combination of violin, oboe, vibraphone, and piano, it is structured in ternary form with a quick opening, slow middle section and a return of opening ideas at the end. *Les Moustiques* explores challenging musical processes and techniques, for example, augmentation, changing rhythmic patterns, contrasting articulation, and pedal point. The score contains all performance directions and the sound and printed manuscript are complementary to each other.

*Test Tube Song* is a 34 bar composition in soft rock/pop style. The guitar is untraditional in this style and has a strumming flamenco accompaniment. *Test Tube Song* is scored for three vocal parts, guitar, and percussion (Turkish tabla, conga, rice shaker and marimba). It is structured in three sections, with the first and last similar. The printed score shows some inappropriate writing, eg unrealistic percussion rhythms.

Sound recordings of the three compositions were all generated differently. *Funny Feeling* is synthesized, *Les Moustiques* is acoustic, and *Test Tube Song* uses a combination of both synthesized and acoustic sounds. Appropriate presentation of compositions was discussed with a university lecturer in composition prior to the experiment. Although similarity of presentation to avoid bias was important, the lecturer advised that acoustic sounds were most appropriate for art music compositions and synthesized presentation for jazz and rock styles. This was considered suitable when compared with HSC composition submissions to the NSW
Board of Studies. Both methods of presentation have been used for compositions submitted for examination and commented on in NSW Board of Studies documentation especially in examination committee reports (for example, NSW Board of Studies, 1997).

In preparing for the experiment, each piece was recorded on to three compact discs. The order of presentation of the pieces on each disc was rotated, with all three pieces being presented at one time either first, second or third. Composition rotation was incorporated into the experiment to avoid a 'halo' effect. A 'halo' effect was found in an earlier composition assessment study by Simmonds (1988), in which the first of five pieces consistently attracted the highest marks. Discs were coloured and incorporated into the name of the middle experiment sessions for easy identification. Rotations and the sequence of compositions on the three coloured compact discs are shown in Table 1.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compact disc identification</th>
<th>First piece</th>
<th>Second piece</th>
<th>Third piece</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Impression (Green)</td>
<td>Test Tube Song</td>
<td>Les Moustiques</td>
<td>Funny Feeling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global (Blue)</td>
<td>Les Moustiques</td>
<td>Funny Feeling</td>
<td>Test Tube Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific (Red)</td>
<td>Funny Feeling</td>
<td>Test Tube Song</td>
<td>Les Moustiques</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each disc was designed for ease of use in conjunction with different experiment sessions. Different timed silences in three compact discs were interspersed between the presentations of the three pieces. Silences were included to enable judges adequate time to complete written answers. No verbal instructions were required for experiment implementation, as instructions were written out and disc presentations were calculated in conjunction with the written instructions. In addition to allowing time for answers, sound cues in the form of beep tones were distributed during timed silences to alert judges to lapsed time and pending performances. Compact disc presentation, sequencing, subject activity during presentation, and timing is shown below:
**Impression (Green) Disc**

*Total time - Six minutes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (in minutes)</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Judge Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Beep tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10</td>
<td><em>Test Tube Song</em></td>
<td>Listen/observe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:20</td>
<td>Beep tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:30</td>
<td><em>Les Moustiques</em></td>
<td>Listen/observe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:40</td>
<td>Beep tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:50</td>
<td><em>Funny Feeling</em></td>
<td>Listen/observe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00</td>
<td>Beep tone</td>
<td>Complete Questions 1 &amp; 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00</td>
<td>Three beep tones</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Global (Blue) Disc**

*Total time - Twenty-two minutes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (in minutes)</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Judge Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Beep tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10</td>
<td><em>Les Moustiques</em></td>
<td>Listen/observe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10</td>
<td>Beep tone</td>
<td>Q1 &amp; 2 (for <em>Les Moustiques</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:10</td>
<td>Two beep tones</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:10</td>
<td>Three beep tones</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:30</td>
<td>Beep tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:40</td>
<td><em>Funny Feeling</em></td>
<td>Listen/observe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:40</td>
<td>Repetition of events 3-5</td>
<td>(for <em>Funny Feeling</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>Beep tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:10</td>
<td><em>Test Tube Song</em></td>
<td>Listen/observe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:10</td>
<td>Repetition of events 3-5</td>
<td>(for <em>Test Tube Song</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22:10</td>
<td>Three beep tones</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Specific (Red) Disc**

*Total time - Forty-one minutes and thirty seconds*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time (in minutes)</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Judge Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>Beep tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0:10</td>
<td><em>Funny Feeling</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:40</td>
<td>Silence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:40</td>
<td>Beep tone</td>
<td>Q 1-4 (for <em>Funny Feeling</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:40</td>
<td>Two beep tones</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:40</td>
<td>Three beep tones</td>
<td>As above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00</td>
<td>Beep tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:10</td>
<td><em>Test Tube Song</em></td>
<td>Complete performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:10</td>
<td>Repetition of events 3-7</td>
<td>(for <em>Test Tube Song</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:00</td>
<td>Beep tone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28:10</td>
<td><em>Les Moustiques</em></td>
<td>Complete performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29:10</td>
<td>Repetition of events 3-7</td>
<td>(for <em>Les Moustiques</em>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41:30</td>
<td>Three beep tones</td>
<td>End</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Miniature scores**

Computer-generated manuscripts of each composition were provided by their composers. They were similarly produced to avoid bias from unnecessary comparison with free-hand copies. Manuscripts were miniaturised so they could be presented in landscape layout with
four manuscript systems per page. They were then duplicated, collated, and stapled in three separate A4 size booklets. Titles – *Funny Feeling*, *Les Moustiques* and *Test Tube Song* – were printed on their title pages for identification. Individual copies of each composition were distributed to all judges during the experiment so that assessments of compositions could be made by either and/or both sound and manuscript. Manuscript copies of all three compositions appear in Appendix C (pp. 292-303).

**Experiment data gathering instrument**

A form *Assessment of Composition Experiment Rating Form (ACERF)* was constructed to generate data in the experiment. *ACERF* is constructed of five separate parts, each contrasting in content and purpose. A copy of *ACERF* is located in Appendix D (pp. 304-322). The first part of this form is designed to provide a profile of the teachers who participated in the experiment and who are identified in the research as 'judges'. The purposes for the inclusion of a judge sample profile in the experiment were the same as those for the survey, which were described earlier in Chapter 3 (p. 69), and were to explore teachers' backgrounds, composing experience, and training in composition, composition pedagogy, and composition assessment. An additional purpose for the inclusion of a judge sample profile in the experiment is to verify that judges are appropriate for experimental tasks. While judges' appropriateness is generally guaranteed from the selection process, as the experiment targets only teachers in secondary schools, further details provide clearer insights into their individual suitability. Comparisons between the profiles in the survey and the experiment, which are shown in Chapter 6, establish the comparability of the samples and their representation of NSW music teachers. For this reason the first seven questions in both research methods cover the same information.

*ACERF* Question 3, however, is slightly different from the earlier *IMCAI* Question 3. Judges in the experiment were from the Sydney metropolitan area, and only four regions are shown for judges' responses. These are Metropolitan East, Metropolitan North, Metropolitan South West, and Metropolitan West.

The second, third and fourth parts of *ACERF* are designed to test the three research hypotheses. Each part was administered in conjunction with the presentation of the same three compositions in both aural and printed forms. Each part (2, 3, and 4) of *ACERF* rates compositions according to different sets of criteria and from contrasting procedures identified
in previous composition assessment research. Part 2 rates compositions by 'impression'. This
term has a wide range of interpretations in literature on composition assessment.
Interpretation of 'impression' marking for some writers means high subjectivity (Salaman,
1988b; Simmonds, 1988), while for others 'impression' marking is the first step in a three-
stage process which can be re-visited at a later stage (Loane, 1984). The next stage in Loane's
marking scheme was subjective, and the final stage was objective. Most often impression
assessment is a holistic reaction to a music stimulus taken at different times, as 'first
impression' or 'general impression' (Hassler, 1991, p. 57). For the purposes of this
experiment, interpretation of assessment through an 'impression' procedure encompasses the
latter two views, and implies a reaction to the total piece as an entity, irrespective of
subjective or objective viewpoints.

ACERF Parts 3 and 4 use 'global' and 'specific' procedures respectively. 'Global' and 'specific'
procedures have been used and were identified in a composition assessment study by Webster
and Hickey (1995). Both 'global' and 'specific' procedures view a student composition from
an analytical, objective viewpoint but are marginally different from one another. 'Global'
procedures view components of a composition as part of the whole, while 'specific'
procedures detach individual components from the perception of the whole. Differences
between the three experiment sessions were: the amount of time allocated to each procedure
in the experiment; contrasting technical approaches of questions in each procedure, and
whether each piece is viewed singly or collectively with other compositions.

As explained earlier, compact discs designed for use with the experiment, were integrated
with the middle sessions. For this reason, the naming of the three middle sessions in the
experiment combined features from both the compact discs and printed matter. ACERF Part
2 is identified in the research as Impression (Green). ACERF Part 3 is identified in the
research as Global (Blue), and ACERF Part 4 is identified as Specific (Red).

ACERF Impression (Green) questions are designed to provide data which considered
responses to questions holistically. Questions 1(a) and 2(b) provide data which tests
Hypothesis 1, which investigates inter-judge reliability. Questions 1(b) and 2 (a) provide data
which tests Hypotheses 2 and 3. Using printed scores, and listening to three compositions in
quick succession, questions in ACERF Part 2 ask judges to rank, allocate a score using a range
of 0-10, and grade each of the three experiment pieces using a 5 point alphabetical scale. The content of questions used in ACERF Impression (Green) is provided below:

1  a  Please rank the pieces in order of merit from the highest to the lowest, in the space below. Please avoid equal values. Please rank in order of success of each piece as a piece of music.
  b  Please write a brief comment explaining why you ranked the pieces in the above order.

2  a  Please provide an appropriate score for each of the 3 pieces on the ranges of scores printed below. Each piece should be considered on its success as a piece of music. (Range 1-10. Half marks are acceptable).
  b  Please provide an indication of the grades you would select for each piece by circling the relevant letters printed below.
    A = well above average  (top 10%)
    B = above average      (next 20%)
    C = average            (middle 40%)
    D = below average      (next 20%)
    E = well below average (lowest 10%)

Compatibility between judges when faced with music assessments has been identified as an important, and frequently omitted, component of assessment research (Swanwick, 1998). Equal in meaning and application with 'inter-judge reliability' in assessment research (Hickey, 1995; Swanwick, 1998), compatibility between judges is often a single arbiter of a product's value (Bangs, 1992; Brinkman, 1994). Generally, in composition experiment research, a five tier range of marks has been recommended as generally conducive to facilitate common agreement (Pilsbury and Alston, 1996; Simmonds, 1988). The purpose of Hypothesis 1 is to examine reliability of judges in assessing the three experiment compositions using a five tier range of marks, which are provided in responses in the Impression (Green) procedure to show how similar or different judges are.

ACERF Global (Blue) questions are designed to provide data using holistic procedures. Data is used to test Hypotheses 2 and 3, which were concerned with the effect of different assessment procedures, and the effect of assessment criteria on assessment scores. ACERF Global (Blue) was administered in conjunction with a sound recording and printed scores of the same three compositions which were presented in ACERF Impression (Green). The two questions in this procedure were reproduced three times to enable judges to respond to each of the three compositions individually.
The first question in ACERF Global (Blue) consists of fifteen items. Items are holistic in design and conform to 'global' usage established in composition assessment literature (Webster and Hickey, 1995), as both an analytic and holistic procedure. Two items from the fifteen in Question 1 are subjective: a) 'This piece does not sustain my interest throughout', and m) 'My personal response to the music – I like it'. All other items are objective and identifiable as variables appropriate to either style, craftsmanship, originality, or task design. Survey results contributed to the generation of questions in this session, for example, c) 'This piece meets the requirements of the task – 'music since 1970'. Other literature described in Chapter 2, identified in assessment studies and in NSW Board of Studies publications, similarly influenced question content (for example Bunting, 1982; NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, 1995b; Pilsbury and Alston, 1996; Simmonds, 1988). Following the fifteen global items in Question 1, ACERF Global (Blue) Question 2 asks judges to re-assess each composition, provide a numerical score on a scale of 1-10, and to explain why each mark is chosen. The content of questions in ACERF Global (Blue) is presented below:

1

   a  This piece has a sense of cohesion it its development of ideas.
   b  This piece demonstrates a convincing sense of style.
   c  Musical ideas are highly appropriate for the selected performing media.
   d  This piece is original and uses unique ideas.
   e  The piece meets the requirements of the task 'music since 1970'.
   f  In my opinion this piece has no artistic merit.
   g  This piece is successful in using compositional techniques.
   h  The composer's intention is clearly communicated.
   i  This piece does not sustain my interest throughout.
   j  This piece derives its ideas from pre-existing music.
   k  This piece has no variety.
   l  This piece demonstrates a high level of musical discrimination.
   m  My personal response to the music - I like it.
   n  This piece fails to demonstrate expertise in the manipulation of musical materials.
   o  This piece is creative.

2

   a  Please provide a mark out of ten to indicate your impression of (name of composition) as a successful piece of music.
   b  Please write a comment explaining why you chose the above mark.

ACERF Specific (Red) questions are designed to provide data using analytical procedures. Data is used to test Hypotheses 2 and 3 which are concerned with the effect of different assessment procedures, and the effect of different assessment criteria on assessment scores. ACERF Specific (Red) was administered in conjunction with a sound recording and printed scores of the same three compositions which were presented in ACERF Impression (Green) and Global (Blue). ACERF Specific (Red) comprises four questions which are reproduced three times to enable subjects to respond to each of the three compositions individually.
There are twenty-one items in the first ACERF Specific (Red) question. Questions in this section were analytical and compartmentalised characteristics which were to be found in the three pieces. These items conform to usage established in composition assessment literature (Webster and Hickey, 1995) which used the term 'specific' to define analytical assessments. Items used in this question were generated from different sources. Survey results contributed to the generation of questions in this session, for example, p) 'This piece meets the requirements of the task - music since 1970'. Literature described in Chapter 2, similarly provided ideas for items in this question (especially those of Bunting, 1982; NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, 1995b; Pilsbury and Alston, 1996; Simmonds, 1988). Two items from the twenty-one in Question 1 are subjective: e) 'I would prefer to view a score written free hand rather than computer-generated', and g) 'I enjoy the melodic ideas in this piece'. A second item (item o) asked subjects to comment on the quality of the sound recording. All other items in Question 1 are objective and identifiable as variables appropriate to either style, craftsmanship, originality, task design, or presentation of the composition by sound notation.

The purpose of Hypothesis 2 was to explore if there was any difference in assessment scores when judges use three contrasting assessment procedures. This hypothesis tests if the amount of time spent on assessment of a composition, the orientation of questions, and whether the presentation of compositions, individually or collectively, have an influence on assessment scores. A second purpose is to show how each procedure affects assessment. Procedures, and reasons for their use, were identified earlier in Chapter 3 in Impression (Green), Global (Blue), and Specific (Red) descriptions. Data to test Hypothesis 2(i) are generated by judges' assessment numerical scores allocated to each of the three compositions during the three middle sessions, and were derived from Impression (Green) - Q1a, Global (Blue) - Q2a, and Specific (Red) - Q4a.

Hypothesis 2(ii) is designed to explain reasons for assessment score decisions made during each of the three assessment procedures and provides insights into how different assessment procedures influence judges' perceptions. Questions in the middle experiment sessions (Impression (Green) - Q1a and b; Global (Blue) - Q2a and b; and Specific (Red) - Q4a and b) ask judges to provide assessment scores, and justify them for each composition during each procedure in the experiment. A range of 0-10 is available for assessment scores. The question is presented as:
Please provide a mark out of ten to indicate your impression of (name of composition) as a successful piece of music. Please place a circle around the appropriate number on the following range of scores (10 is high, 6 and 5 the middle, and 1 is low. Half marks are acceptable.

Throughout the experiment the term 'success' is therefore similarly reiterated as the basis for the assessment of the three experiment compositions. As it is important to determine how subjects view the terminology used in the experiment, and to establish validity of composition assessment within it, each judge is asked later (in ACERF Part 5, Question 1) to explain the terminology:

This experiment asked you to consider each composition on its success as a piece of music. How did you interpret this statement?

Three further questions complete ACERF Specific (Red). Questions 2 and 3 are dedicated to two criteria. Identical in design, both questions are included to highlight, and provide more focussed information on genre and style as criteria in assessment. The content of questions in ACERF Specific (Red) is:

1  
   a  Rhythmic features are used skillfully in this piece.
   b  Dynamics are sensitively applied throughout this piece.
   c  Melodic fragments are repetitive and overused.
   d  This piece is novel in its use of one or more concepts.
   e  I would prefer to view a score written free hand rather than computer-generated.
   f  Harmonic features, including chord choice, chord progressions, modulation and cadences suggest a high level of expertise.
   g  I enjoy the melodic ideas in this piece.
   h  There is a logical flow through a series of structural events.
   i  This piece is proficient in its selection and manipulation of textural treatments.
   j  There is rhythmic cohesion in this piece.
   k  This piece is proficient in handling musical processes eg development, variation.
   l  The treatment of instruments and/or voices demonstrates knowledge of conventions.
   m  There are errors in instrumental and/or vocal use, eg register/range/appropriateness of role.
   n  This piece demonstrates comprehension of timbral qualities in its vocal/instrumental scoring.
   o  The recording impairs an accurate appreciation of this piece.
   p  This piece satisfies requirements of the task - 'Music since 1970'.
   q  There is a cliché use of one or more concepts in this piece.
   r  Melodically there is sufficient balance between unity and variety.
   s  The score is accurate giving sufficient attention to detail.
   t  The harmonic language is simplistic.
   u  The standard of composition is not consistent throughout this piece.

2  
   a  Is the piece identifiable as an example of a conventional combination of instruments/voices? If yes, please identify the combination.
   b  Please rate the success of this piece in the use of the chosen combination instruments/voices.
   c  Please provide a comment explaining why you chose the above rating.
The purpose of Hypothesis 3 (i) is to explore criteria judges use in assessing compositions written at a senior student level. Data which respond to Hypothesis 3(i) are derived from Likert style responses to questions in Global (Blue) and Specific (Red) procedures. In addition, Impression (Green) Question 1(b), and ACERF Part 5 Question 2(b), provide data about criteria which respond to Hypothesis 3(i). The main purpose of Hypothesis 3(ii) is to evaluate the comparative effects of identified criteria on the experiment compositions collectively. Data from Global (Blue) and Specific (Red) procedures respond to Hypothesis 3(ii).

Questions in ACERF Part 5 are designed to confirm and summarise earlier data. Information in Question 1 and Question 3, which offer extra opportunities to discuss experiment compositions, is used to test research Hypothesis 3. As a conclusion, Part 5 provides an opportunity for judges to compare personal assessment perceptions and procedures with those used in the experiment. Data respond to the first research question from a post-experiment perspective. Questions in Part 5 are more general than questions which are presented earlier in the experiment. These are designed to encourage judges to provide information which is personally valuable and not previously identified in the experiment. An example which demonstrates this feature is Question 2c, which invites subjects to comment on procedures which are important to them - 'Are there other procedures which are important in your own assessment not included in this experiment?'. ACERF Part 5 is similar to the first part of the experiment, in that it was administered without other stimuli. The content of questions in Part 5 is provided below:
2 a How long would you normally spend on the final appraisal of a composition?
   b Please comment on similarities and differences between the procedures and/or
      strategies used in this experiment and those you would normally use in
      assessing student compositions at Higher School Certificate level.
   c Are there other procedures which are important in your own assessment not
      included in this experiment?

3 a Please comment on how you use the following in the final assessment of student
      composition for senior secondary classes - sound only, notation only, and
      combination of sound and notation.
   b Please comment on the use of computer-generated scores in your assessment in
      contrast with a student's own hand-writing.
   c Please comment on the effects of the use of synthesized sound of music on your
      assessment.

4 a Are there any comments you wish to make concerning assessment of
    composition for the Higher School Certificate, or in senior secondary classes?

Three forms of response are used in ACERF question construction. Questions are: closed
form, open ended, or matched with Likert style responses. Closed form questions in Part 1,
Questions 1-5 are used to provide data which is analysed quantitatively. Open ended
questions occur in all ACERF sections and provide data which are analysed qualitatively.
Likert scales are used in Impression; (Green), Global (Blue), and Specific (Red) procedures
and are analysed quantitatively. Each question with Likert scales reverse a small number of
statements from positive to negative form to ensure that subjects considered responses
equally.

Experiment pilot studies
Two pilot studies were conducted to ensure the applicability and validity of ACERF to test the
research hypotheses. The first pilot study was conducted with eight participants from a post-
graduate seminar. Participants were either tertiary academics in music education or education,
or students completing Masters of Music or PhD studies in music education. Although all
pilot participants were not at the time secondary music educators, their familiarity with the
domain was considered consistent with the judges who would participate in the research
experiment.

In conducting the first pilot study, one composition only was used so that pilot participants
would have time for discussion of ACERF construction. A composition different from the
three selected for inclusion in the experiment was chosen so that ACERF compositions would
remain confidential. The composition selected for the first pilot was entitled 'Dance of the
Hags', and was chosen from a compact disc distributed commercially by the NSW Board of Studies in conjunction with radio station 2MBS-FM (ENCORE 96CD). This compact disc featured selected compositions which the NSW Board of Studies considered exemplary from candidates of the 1996 HSC examination. The composer, who was contacted by the researcher, gave permission for the use of the composition in the study and supplied a copy of the notated score, which was then duplicated for use by participants during the pilot session.

Certain problems became apparent in the pilot study and adjustments were made to overcome these. The sample composition, 'Dance of the Hags' was three minutes long and during the session was performed three times. Participants considered this listening time for one composition too long for experiment purposes, and advised a reduction in length. Copies of the score were unmanageable and bulky, and participants recommended each score would be better viewed in miniature for ease of handling. Adjustments to questions were recommended, especially to simplify the five sections of the experiment, and to refine formatting.

After modification and further development, the experiment was again piloted for the purpose of setting suitable time allocations for listening, reviewing printed scores and writing responses. The second pilot session used Sculthorpe's Left Bank Waltz, from Four Little Pieces (1979). The score and sound recording of Left Bank Waltz were commercially available, and the piece was appropriate time limitation in the experiment. A practising secondary school teacher with many years of experience in senior secondary music education piloted the second pilot session. Listening and answering times were confirmed as appropriate for the completion of all questions, and the one minute composition provided sufficient listening time for assessment. A strong recommendation was to include a short break at some time during the experiment.

3.4: Procedures

Procedures used in this research are described in this section. This section provides a description of procedures used in research under the titles: Collection of data, and Research design.
Collection of data

Data collection of IMCAI and ACERF was conducted differently. Subject selection was described earlier in Chapter 3 (pp. 71-72). A copy of the letter sent to the NSW Board of Studies which requested a list of all schools which had submitted students for formal music examinations is included in Appendix E (pp. 323-324). For the purposes of the survey, a package was sent to principals of schools on this list. The survey distribution package contained:

- A letter to school principals explaining the research, its purpose and a request to invite music teachers in the school to participate (Appendix F, p. 325)
- A letter to music teachers explaining the research, its purpose and an invitation to participate (Appendix G, p. 327)
- A copy of the approval for research (applicable to Department of Education and Training schools only) - (Appendix H, p. 329)
- A reply paid envelope for return of completed forms
- A copy of the survey (Appendix A, pp 282-289).

Although anonymous, each IMCAI copy was coded for identification to enable a second distribution to be made if enough completed forms were not returned. Each code was placed in a conspicuous position on the last page to ensure respondents were aware of its use. Survey packages were mailed to each school in February, 1998. After six weeks (April, 1998) a second copy of the survey was sent to schools from which no teacher had responded (N=398). The identification code was omitted from the second distribution to provide respondents with anonymity, and as it was not intended to distribute surveys a third time. Most survey responses were received following the first distribution (N=164). Fewer responses were received following the second distribution of surveys (N=64). The last response was received twenty weeks after the first distribution.

Secondary music teachers in schools throughout the Sydney metropolitan area were invited to participate in the experiment (ACERF). Using the list provided by the NSW Board of Studies for the earlier survey, all three hundred and fifty city schools in the Sydney metropolitan area were selected. Using this sample, an invitation to participate in the experiment was sent to music teachers from every alternate school. The invitation took the form of a cover letter which was accompanied by a participation application and a reply paid envelope (see Appendix I, p. 331-334). The consent form asked teachers to provide name, contact number and address, and nominate a preferred session time from a list of times supplied on the form.
Fifteen teachers responded to the invitation. As this was considered insufficient for the requirements of the experiment, music teachers from all other schools in metropolitan regions were then invited to participate. Nine additional teachers responded to this second invitation. Each of the twenty-four teachers was then personally invited by letter to attend one of the experiment sessions.

The experiment was conducted at the Pitt St campus of the Sydney Conservatorium of Music, University of Sydney. Appropriate rooms with compact disc players were reserved, and contact with all participants was made over the following weeks. Experiment times were scheduled over a five week period in September and October, 1998, which was prior to, during, and immediately following, a school vacation period - a time when teachers were considered likely to have available time. Experiment times and venues were confirmed with all twenty-four respondents who volunteered.

The teachers who participated in the experiment, identified throughout the thesis as judges, \((N=24)\) were placed in one of three groups. Each group \((1, 2\) or \(3)\) had equal numbers of judges \((N=8)\). Due to the unavailability of all eight judges in any group at one time, it was necessary to conduct several experiment sessions for each group. Subject experiment allocations, including dates, allotted group, time, venues, and subject codes are shown in Table 2.

**Table 2**

*Judge experiment groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judges</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Venue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21A, B, C, D</td>
<td>21/9/98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.30-6.00pm</td>
<td>Rm 225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23A, B</td>
<td>23/9/98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.30-6.00pm</td>
<td>Rm 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29A, B</td>
<td>29/10/98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.30-6.00pm</td>
<td>Rm 426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A, B, C, D, E, F</td>
<td>7/10/98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.30-11.00am</td>
<td>Rm 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28A, B</td>
<td>28/10/98</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.30-6.00pm</td>
<td>Rm 426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7W, X, Y, Z</td>
<td>7/10/98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.00-3.30pm</td>
<td>Rm 427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8A, B, C, D</td>
<td>8/10/98</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.30-4.00pm</td>
<td>Rm 426</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2 shows that judges completed the experiment in seven sessions scheduled over a five week period. Judges were provided with a code which was used to maintain anonymity, and
to ensure that all responses were identified clearly for analysis purposes. Eight Group 1
judges (21A, B, C, D; 23A, B; and 29A and B) completed the experiment in one of three
sessions. Eight Group 2 judges (7A, B, C, D, E, F; and 28A and B) completed the experiment
in one of two sessions. Similarly, eight Group 3 judges (7V, W, X, and Z; and 8A, B, C, and
D) completed the experiment in one of two sessions.

In the conduct of ACERF, each group proceeded through all five parts, commencing with Part
1 and finishing with Part 5. Different for each group, however, was the sequencing of ACERF
middle parts, which were – Impression (Green), Global (Blue), and Specific (Red). These
procedures were rotated within the experiment to avoid bias towards one treatment. Rotation
of experiment treatments conformed to similar practice by Webster and Hickey (1995), in
which two judges were asked to respond to questions using global and specific procedures in
reverse order from another two judges. The rotation sequence of each judge group is shown
below in Table 3. This shows how the experiment was conducted with the three judge
groups. Following Part 1, Group 1 completed inner parts with the sequence – Global (Blue),
Specific (Red), and Impression (Green) – before finishing with Part 5. Each of the other
groups, 2 and 3, similarly completed the inner parts using two different sequences of
procedures.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judge Group</th>
<th>First Session</th>
<th>Second Session</th>
<th>Third Session</th>
<th>Fourth Session</th>
<th>Fifth Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>Global (Blue)</td>
<td>Specific (Red)</td>
<td>Impression (Green)</td>
<td>Part 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>Specific (Red)</td>
<td>Impression (Green)</td>
<td>Global (Blue)</td>
<td>Part 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Part 1</td>
<td>Impression (Green)</td>
<td>Global (Blue)</td>
<td>Specific (Red)</td>
<td>Part 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conduct of distribution and collection of rating forms, and other administrative procedures for
ACERF, were the same for each experimental session. A manuscript copy of each
composition was distributed to each judge after completion of Section 1. Manuscripts were
collected before Part 5 as this section did not require score observation for judges to complete
their responses. Instructions for the conduct, and descriptions of each of the five parts of
ACERF, were printed on an introductory page in all five ACERF parts. Verbal
communication during each session between the researcher and judges was restricted to formalities only, and each session proceeded in silence apart from music and cues included on the three experimental compact discs. Judges were requested to refrain from discussing the conduct of the experiment during or after each session, to avoid possible bias. A fifteen minute refreshment break was included at an appropriate point in all experiment sessions. The total time for the experiment, including the refreshment break, was ninety minutes.

To ensure that anonymity was guaranteed, that all experiments were conducted in the same way, and that all ethical regulations were adhered to, the same independent staff member of the Sydney Conservatorium of Music, University of Sydney, attended all experiment sessions.

3.5: Data analysis

This section first describes all data analyses in the research. Following descriptions of analytical methods, descriptions of the applications of analyses in the respondent and judge sample profiles, the two research questions, and hypotheses are presented.

Both research methods utilise quantitative and qualitative data. There were two reasons for this. The first emanates from literature in composition and composition assessment. Swanwick (1998) observed that research in music assessments which used only qualitative data was inappropriate, as inter-judge reliability was not adequately reported. Literature further showed a precedence for use of both types of data in composition assessment research. Hickey (1995) combined both objective measurements with naturalistic inquiry in research in which composition assessment featured prominently. In Hickey's study, quantitative and qualitative data are reported in separate chapters of the research. The second reason for including both types of data is to allow for a broad response to research questions and hypotheses. Fetterman (1988) described how merging quantitative and qualitative perspectives has been successfully achieved in research, despite perceptions of difficulty when doubts are raised or conflicts emerge. Fetterman provided positive examples that qualitative data can support quantitative findings, while quantitative data can broaden qualitative interpretations. In the present research, in Chapters 4 and 5, quantitative data from responses to questions is reported first, and is followed by qualitative data, when applicable.
Qualitative analysis is used for numerous text items in both research protocols. Text material was produced when subjects in both methods described, elaborated on, or responded to individual questions. Content analysis procedures, as described by Ryan and Bernard (2000), were used in analysis of each individual item of text material. All text material was transcribed so all responses for each question were collectively assembled, and possible bias was eliminated by association with original documents. The researcher examined a sample of texts and identified themes, which were coded and classified. Codes were then applied to each response to produce lists, counts, and descriptions of each classification. In reporting results, use of direct quotes from respondents has been utilised as exemplars of concepts and ideas, or of negative cases. In addition, comparative frequencies are shown to provide comparisons and interpretation of data. Although descriptions of qualitative analyses are presented in this chapter, minor analytical references are made in later chapters to clarify results.

Quantitative methods are used to analyse data in the research. These are:

- Summary tables to describe frequencies and percentages of variables.
- Chi-square statistics to test independence between variables in the survey. Post hoc cell contributions indicate which cells provide information about the combinations of groups of variables whose occurrence is different from those expected under the hypothesis of independence (Statview Reference, 1998).
- One sample chi-square statistics to test inter-judge agreement in the experiment.
- A Friedman two-way analysis of variance by ranks for matched samples, which is used to test the difference of the effects of Impression (Green), Global (Blue) and Specific (Red) assessment procedures. This is a nonparametric test for each of several groups, in which there are numbers of observations, each representing the response for that group to a particular treatment.
- Factor analysis to examine patterns and interrelationships between composition assessment variables. Factor extraction is conducted through a principal component analysis. This is a classic technique appropriate to data sets which present a random sample of observations in which the variables are a fairly complete collection. Oblique solution reference structure is used. Factors are selected with eigenvalue magnitude which aggregates to 70% of the total. Factors are defined in terms of those variables with a factor loading <or =0.50, or
higher, to show greater discrimination. Factor analysis is conducted for three experiment compositions using variables from Likert scale lists in both the Global (Blue) and Specific (Red) sessions.

- Unpaired t-tests to show gender, teaching experience and composition numerical score correlation in the experiment.

Computer software used in analysis of qualitative data is Statview SAS (1998). Descriptions of the applications of analyses in the respondent and judge sample profiles, the two research questions, and hypotheses follow.

Analysis of the respondent sample profile in the survey and the judge sample profile in the experiment is conducted in the same way. All questions are analysed through summary tables (for Questions 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7), which show frequency distributions and percentages, or numerical descriptions of data (Question 4). In addition, content analyses are conducted on descriptive comments in these questions.

Analyses of data which respond to both parts of the first research question investigating assessment strategies and criteria are similar to the analysis described above. Question 9 is analysed through a summary table only, and Questions 11 and 13 additionally include content analyses. Results of questions with Likert scale responses, in Questions 11, 12 and 13, show variables in rank order. Five point Likert scale responses in Question 12 are reduced to three levels for clearer interpretation. Additional data provided in the experiment which address the first research question use content analysis similarly to the above.

Summary tables and content analyses are used in analysis of data which respond to the second research question and investigate the extent of the relationship between composition assessment and pedagogy. Cross-tabulations test correlation between IMCAL variables, and respondent consistency. Results of respondents' gender, teaching experience, school location, teaching experience at HSC level, self-acknowledged composing experience, and training, are cross-tabulated with other variables to investigate if each has an influence on composition assessment. Cross-tabulations are conducted between procedures in Question 11a and criteria in Question 12 to investigate if assessment procedure variables relate to individual criteria.

Hypothesis 1 was designed to test inter-judge reliability. Data for this purpose were collected from ACERF Impression (Green) session in which judges listened to the three compositions.
in the following order: Test Tube Song, Funny Feeling, and Les Moustiques. Each piece was presented in quick succession and the session was completed in four minutes. Judges' rank order of merit is shown as a preliminary indication of inter-judge reliability. Judges' composition grades are compared and shown graphically. Chi-square statistics were conducted for the summary of cross-tabulations of judges' agreement on the grades for the three compositions.

Analysis to test Hypothesis 2 (i) for the effect of different assessment procedures on judges' scores, requires a preliminary description of terminology prior to the presentation of data. Content analysis of data from ACERF Part 5, Question 1 defines what judges consider is the meaning of the term 'success' as applied to assessment of compositions in the experiment. Following this, summary statistics of scores for three compositions during the three procedures are calculated. A Friedman rank test for the effects of the three procedures on composition scores is conducted. A content analysis of data is used to test Hypothesis 2(ii).

Analysis of data to test Hypothesis 3(i) uses factor analysis and content analysis to test the effects of criteria on individual composition assessments. In reporting, qualitative data is presented first, and followed by quantitative analysis. This is a change from other data presentation in the thesis, and is used to support interpretation. In content analyses, assessment criteria are identified, comparative frequencies are shown, and perceptions of how effective is each composition in meeting criteria are described. Quotations taken from subjects' responses are used to illustrate prominent criteria, and to provide exemplars of the range of perceptions judges held towards the three compositions. The second analysis uses a factor analysis of only twenty-one Specific (Red) items, as these further corroborate qualitative results.

In testing Hypothesis 3(ii) the mean value of Likert responses in Global (Blue) and Specific (Red) procedures are compared to show the effect of different criteria on assessments of the three compositions collectively. Analysis is presented in graph form in Figure 5 (p. 223) and Figure 6, (p. 224).

Data from the two research methods in the study, the survey and the experiment, are analysed in isolation to maintain the integrity of each. Chapter 4 reports and provides preliminary interpretation of survey data, and Chapter 5 reports and provides preliminary interpretation of
experiment data. Chapter 6 compares the two sample profiles and reports findings from the combined perspectives of the two research methods.

3.6: Ethical considerations

In the administration of research, it was necessary to obtain permission from several authorities to ensure compliance with regulations and ethical standards. Ethics approval for the conduct of the research protocols was sought, and provided from the Human Ethics Committee of the University of Sydney. A copy of this approval is provided as Appendix J (pp. 335-337). Authority from the NSW Department Education and Training was required to conduct a project in departmental schools in NSW. A copy of the approval letter is provided as Appendix H (pp. 329-330). Access to a confidential list of schools which were to be surveyed was requested and supplied from the Board of Studies. Formal approval was given with the list of schools. A copy of the approval letter is provided in Appendix K (p. 338-339).
CHAPTER 4

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF SURVEY DATA

Introduction
In Chapter 3, the reliance of the research methodology on the use of two research protocols was explained. The data presented and interpreted in this chapter are provided by the first protocol, the survey, Identification of Music Composition Assessment Issues (IMCAI). IMCAI design, purposes, and administration were described in Chapter 3. Chapter 4 reports and interprets results of IMCAI data in four sections. These are:

4.1: Respondent sample profile
4.2: Research question 1(i)
4.3: Research question 1(ii)
4.4: Research question 2.

The first section provides a profile of survey respondents by reporting their personal details, composing background, and training experiences. The second section of Chapter 4 responds to Research Question 1(i). This second section reports IMCAI respondents' strategies in senior secondary students' composition assessments in terms of agendas, procedures, and resources. The third section of Chapter 4 responds to Research Question 1(ii) and reports criteria that IMCAI respondents identified they use in assessing compositions written by students at this level. The final section of Chapter 4 responds to Research Question 2 and presents IMCAI respondents' views on their teaching practices since 1994, and on the purposes of composition assessment as a part of the music curriculum. The latter part of this section reports significant IMCAI variable cross-tabulations. Each of the four sections in Chapter 4 is followed by a short discussion. These discussions review their sections, integrate qualitative and quantitative data, and offer some preliminary interpretation of results.

4.1: Respondent sample profile
Data from the first five IMCAI questions provided information about respondents' personal backgrounds. This report collates respondents' personal backgrounds in secondary music
teaching experience in years, gender, school location, school characteristics, and experience in teaching composition at HSC level.

Personal background data show respondents' secondary music teaching experience in years, and their gender. All two hundred and twenty-eight respondents identified the number of years each had taught music in NSW secondary schools, and completed responses to the question on gender. Data are presented in Table 4 in three categories to represent levels of teaching experience: 1-5 years; 6-15 years; and 16+ years. Categories within these levels were selected as they were appropriate to syllabus documents from the time of the survey. The first category was appropriate to the 1994 syllabus (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a), and the second category was appropriate to the 1983 (NSW Board of Senior School Studies, 1983). Table 4 data are used later in the research to explore cross-tabulations between respondents' years of teaching experience with other variables in IMCAI to determine if these variables influence respondents' opinions and practices in composition assessments.

Table 4
Respondents grouped by gender and by music teaching experience in NSW secondary schools (IMCAI, Q.1 and Q.2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents' teaching experience in NSW secondary schools</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 Years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ Years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4 shows that a small number of respondents had taught music in NSW secondary schools for less than five years (N=38; 17%). Ninety-nine respondents had taught between six and fifteen years (43%) and ninety-one had taught sixteen years or more (40%). Significant results were found for cross-tabulations conducted between results for the number of years respondents had taught music in NSW secondary schools with some later IMCAI
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variables, particularly courses they had taught, and assessment procedures. Cross-tabulation results show that teachers' levels of experience has an effect on assessments of senior student compositions.

One hundred and forty-four females (63%) and eighty-four males (37%) responded to the survey. While gender figures on the music teacher population of NSW are not available, figures for teacher gender in secondary schools administered by the Department of Education and Training (DET) show that 55% of the teacher population is female, and 45% is male (NSW Department of Education and Training, 2000, p. 45). In comparison with DET census information, slightly more females than males were IMCAI respondents than in the total teacher population. However, this imbalance may also reflect that the gender balance in music education may have a larger proportion of females than in secondary education generally. Gender balance in the three teaching experience categories was proportionally maintained in Table 4. This proportional consistency between gender and years of teaching suggests that the sample is representative of the NSW secondary music teacher population.

The third variable in respondents' personal backgrounds is the location of the school in which they taught. Figure 2 shows NSW divided into the ten geographic and demographic regions which were used as research categories. Figure 2 additionally shows the number of IMCAI respondents grouped by region. Table 5 collates this information statistically.

**Table 5**

_Respondents grouped by region in NSW (IMCAI, Q.3)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Location</th>
<th>Numbers</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan North</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan West</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan South West</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan East</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Coast</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Coast</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riverina</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>228</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 2
Respondents grouped by region in NSW (IMCAI, Q.3)
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Both Figure 2 and Table 5 demonstrate that respondents came from all of the ten identified areas in NSW. Respondents were equally from both city and country regions, with 52% from four Sydney metropolitan regions, and 48% from the six country regions. The importance of this variable in the study was to demonstrate that the respondent group was representative of secondary music teachers throughout the state. Cross-tabulations between this variable and other IMCAI variables were conducted but no significant results were found. This lack of significance suggests that the location of a music teacher's schools is not important in secondary music teachers' composition assessments and teaching at senior secondary level.

Respondents reported descriptive data of schools at which they were teaching at the time of the survey (IMCAI, Q4). A majority of them identified that their schools were co-educational (N=172; 75%) and less identified that they taught at single sex schools (N=56; 25%). Some respondents reported that their schools were either comprehensive or selective. Almost all of those who did respond to this indicated that their school was comprehensive (N=78; 35%) and the remaining eight (3%) indicated that their school was selective.

Some respondents identified their current schools as 'other specialist'. Of these, six respondents (3%) taught at specialist secondary performing arts schools and six (3%) taught at specialist music schools. Other respondents (N=37; 16%) taught at schools with special designated characteristics which were: central schools (N=4), isolated schools (N=1), technology high schools (N=4) and schools with students in Years 11 and 12 only (N=2). Results in this variable showed that respondents taught at schools with a variety of characteristics. In general, results showed that schools at which respondents taught were varied and further suggested that they represented a wide range of school characteristics.

The final IMCAI question (Question 5) in the personal background examines respondents' experience in teaching composition as part of senior music courses. The question asked respondents to consider all teaching of senior students in which composition was a component. Results shown in Table 6 indicate that a large majority of respondents (N=206; 90%) had taught composition in Higher School Certificate (HSC) courses, and few had not had experience with composition at this level (N=22; 10%).
Table 6

Respondents' HSC composition teaching experience (IMCAI, Q.5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2Unit (Common)</th>
<th>2U1&amp;3U</th>
<th>All Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neither</td>
<td>To '94</td>
<td>'95+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents Number</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents %</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Approximately half the respondents \((N=122; 53\%)\) had taught 2 Unit (Common) Music at HSC level since changes to the syllabus had been implemented at that level in 1994, for implementation with HSC classes in 1995. This figure totals responses in the columns labelled '1995 and since', and 'both'. The remaining respondents were those who had taught composition 'neither before nor after 1994' \((N=57; 25\%)\), and prior 'to 1994' \((N=49; 22\%)\). In the latter category, composition does not conform to the definition of 'composition' as described for IMCAI purposes as the creation of original music and consisted of a demonstration of skills in melody writing and harmony completed under examination conditions. A majority of respondents had taught composition in other music courses, either 2 Unit Course 1 or 3 Unit \((N=188; 82\%)\).

A large majority of respondents had experience in teaching composition at HSC level and only a small number of respondents to the IMCAI survey had not taught composition in any HSC course \((N=22; 10\%)\). Of these respondents there were some who also indicated they were teachers in the early years of their careers. Other respondents without experience in HSC composition teaching frequently explained their schools had small student populations where music was not at that time offered as a subject at HSC level.

Some significant cross-tabulations between this variable and other IMCAI variables suggest that experience in teaching music at HSC level may have some consequence on assessment practices. Cross-tabulations will be further discussed in the final section of Chapter 4. Implications from the data generated by this question are that respondents' answers would be a true reflection of the composition assessment issues from respondents' school experiences.
This variable was the final question which investigated IMCAI respondents' personal backgrounds. A summary concludes this part of Chapter 4.

The above information was the first of three in the respondent group profile. Data from five IMCAI questions were reported. These five questions investigated respondents' personal backgrounds in secondary music teaching experience in years, gender, school region, school characteristics, and experience in teaching composition at HSC level. In summary the data have shown that respondents were proportionally represented in their years of teaching and gender. They taught at a variety of schools throughout NSW. A large majority of them had first hand experience in teaching composition at HSC level. The section to follow presents the second part of the respondent group profile, and reports respondents' composing experiences.

**Composing experiences**

One IMCAI question, Question 6, investigated whether respondents had experience in composing music and explored details of this. This is the first IMCAI question which in reporting relies on both quantitative and qualitative data. All two hundred and twenty-eight IMCAI respondents answered this question. Results showed a majority of one hundred and sixty respondents (70%) considered they had composing experiences, while sixty-eight (30%) considered they did not.

In responding to the qualitative part of this question, respondents provided considerable information. While some had pre-service experiences required for completion of training courses, a large majority composed in schools to supplement resources for class and extra-curricular activities. A considerable number extended composing into community areas, where their compositions were used for church, social and personal activities. A small but significant group of respondents had professional experience in composing. Each experience was highly individual and demonstrated a strong commitment to the art of composition. Different categories of composing were identified in responses, with arranging and composing frequently described synonymously as the same, and otherwise described as separate aptitudes. Some respondents mentioned improvising as a form of composing, although this was not common. Results generally showed that a small majority of respondents had personally created original music.
In reporting results, the diversity of responses produced challenges in analysis. Some responses consisted of a single comment related to a particular event or style, for example - 'musical (short) for primary school', and 'rock and jazz'. Comments were frequently generalised and brief, for example - 'in a small way', while other comments were specific and detailed, for example - 'composing theatre music scores for community theatre company; composer in residence'. To ensure accurate reporting of the range of responses, two processes were used. In the first, data were analysed by identifying four contexts for which respondents identified they had written compositions. These were for pre-service studies, for educational applications, for community events, or for publication. In the second process, data were analysed by identifying three categories of composition in which respondents identified they had written music. These were arranging only, creating only, and a combination of both arranging and creating. Table 7 shows the two hundred and twenty-eight respondents identified by their self-acknowledgement as composers, the contexts, and the categories of music in which they had composed.

Table 7
Respondents grouped by composing experience, context, and category (IMCAI, Q.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composing experience</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composing context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-service</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composing category</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging only</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating only</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arranging and Creating</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Composing contexts are the environments in which compositions by respondents were written and performed. Analysis by context is validated in one response which suggests motivation to compose is generated by personal and/or professional necessity:

- I don't feel a personal need to compose and only do it when it fills a practical need.

Context titles reflect respondents' continuing composing chronological application, from composing when they were students, to school, community, and professional composing experiences. Contexts are cumulative rather than exclusive. In addition to different features, each successive context includes characteristics identified in preceding contexts.

Table 7 shows that many respondents identified that they had composing experience in an 'education' context ($N=76; 33\%$), and fewer identified they had similar experiences in a 'community' context ($N=52; 23\%$). A small number were in the 'publication' context ($N=22; 10\%$), and very few in 'pre-service' ($N=9; 4\%$). Subjects who identified they did not compose are included in the 'nil' column ($N=68; 30\%$).

The first composition experience context in Table 7 is 'pre-service'. A small number of teachers ($N=9; 4\%$) indicated they had composition experiences only during their pre-service training when they had composed pieces as assignments in courses at tertiary institutions. Respondents ($N=2; 1\%$) had written and arranged pieces for performance by university vocal ensembles and instrumental groups in jazz, rock, electronic, and other contemporary styles. Some of these responses were:

- University assignments - for example 20th century composition, many activities - short non-notated composition with a variety of focuses.
- Composed a musical at university (unpublished), wrote and arranged several songs for jazz/rock bands.

When correlated with teaching age, eight of these respondents affirmed that they were teachers in the first five years of teaching. This suggests that training institutions may have increased attention to composition in pre-service training in recent years.

The second composition context identified in Table 7 is 'education'. Almost half the respondents who indicated they had composing experiences ($N=76; 33\%$) wrote for education contexts. These were either classroom or extra-curricular activities. Only two respondents commented that they wrote exclusively for classroom use. Two respondents described how they used composition in their classrooms:
• I always create melodies for class work to demonstrate a particular composition technique where appropriate.
• Composing for school to demonstrate concepts and ideas.

Another respondent had written computer music resources for use with school classes.

While few respondents identified that they composed for classroom performance only, most respondents targeted extra-curricular work as the focus of their composing endeavours (N=74, 32%). Respondents identified that they wrote music for a wide range of instrumental ensembles: band, beginner instrumental group, blues band, chamber ensembles 'duets, trios and quartets', chamber orchestra, concert band, jazz band, marching band, orchestra, pop/rock group, and string orchestra. Respondents also identified that they wrote for many different vocal combinations: a cappella, barber shop quartet, SATB choir, school choirs (both primary and secondary), and SSA choir. Specific genres and events identified by respondents in composing for extra-curricular contexts were: a cappella/rock pieces, accompaniments, antiphonal fanfares, cantatas, incidental music for plays, integrated arts tour, melodrama, musicals, rock musicals, school plays, school songs, and songs for soloists. The large amount of detail provided in respondents' descriptions showed how composing filled practical needs associated with their roles as directors of school music ensembles.

Fewer respondents indicated they composed for the third composing context. Fifty-three respondents (23%) composed for community activities. Many of these respondents (N=27; 12%) composed for services and a variety of music groups associated with a church. Compositions for church and religious services were: anthems, choruses, hymns, liturgical music, masses, psalm responses, string music, and wedding music. Respondents who composed for church groups frequently wrote for unusual combinations. A typical response was:

• Arranging and writing for a church group with all kinds of instrumentation.

Respondents in the 'community' category also cited a wide assortment of other community composing experiences unrelated to church music. Some respondents composed as a hobby (N=4; 1.5%) and described their experiences, for example: 'writing for myself'; 'personal interest/hobby'; and 'MIDI based pieces for my own enjoyment'. Other respondents composed through performance (N=9; 3.5%) and often in professional blues bands, jazz ensembles or rock groups. One respondent explained:

• Songs and band pieces in jazz, rock and pop styles for a small classic ensemble.
The remaining respondents in this category \((N=13; 6\%)\) wrote for a variety of community contexts including competitions, youth workshops, and ensembles (some of which were identified as professional).

The fourth and final composition context described by respondents was publication and/or professional recording of compositions. Respondents \((N=22; 10\%)\) in this category wrote for professional or semi-professional performance in addition to school and community contexts. All identified they had either published scores \((N=13; 6\%)\), recorded CDs of their own material \((N=7; 3\%)\), or written scores for film or video \((N=2; 1\%)\). Most remarkable within this group was the individuality of responses, the quantity of composed works cited, and the diversity of composing experiences consistently demonstrated within each response. Two responses identified the status of the respondents, with one a 'professional freelance composer' and the other a 'composer in residence'. Four responses quoted below demonstrate the singularity of composition experiences of respondents in this context. The final comment provides a summary of the composing experiences identified in this category:

- Works performed at ISCM Concerts, on Polish radio. Have written music for school productions.
- Created 11 song albums (MIDI, guitar and vocal).
- Rock music when young - you name it, I've done it.

The diversity in responses which described the above four contexts of respondents' composing experiences demonstrate that many had written large amounts of music. Table 7 shows responses grouped by composing experience category. The largest numbers of respondents identified they had composing experience through 'arranging and creating' \((N=76; 33\%)\). Similar numbers of respondents had composing experience in either 'arranging only' \((N=36; 16\%)\) or 'creating only' \((N=48; 21\%)\).

There were conflicting opinions on the status of arrangement in relation to composition. Many respondents did not categorise arrangement as a branch of composition. Five respondents who ticked 'no' to the initial question about composing continued with descriptions of personal arranging experiences. A further six respondents, when discussing arranging, qualified the term with 'only'. 'But only arranging.....', suggests that arrangement of pre-existing music may not share equal status with original composition for these teachers.
The remaining respondents clearly identified this activity and perceived arranging as a distinct branch of the domain. An explanation for this confusion may be found in changes in the 2 Unit (Common) music syllabus (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a). In this syllabus, students were required to submit only original works for HSC examination, whereas earlier examinations had allowed the arrangement of pre-existing music for examination (NSW Board of Studies, 1983).

The first category in Table 7 identifies that a small number of respondents indicated that they arranged music only ($N=36; 16\%$). Compositions in the 'arranging' category were: arrangements, orchestrations, re-arrangements, and transcriptions of pre-existing music. Arrangements were often substantial, and for a wide variety of performing groups. The response:

- As an arranger for school band and choir, also for a school musical, rewriting for band.

was typical of many responses.

The second composition category in Table 7 identifies a similar number of respondents who write original music exclusively ($N=39; 17\%$). Compositions cited in this category were original pieces, ranged from ballads to symphonic works, and were in many styles. Some were digital but most of those identified suggested compositions were written for acoustic instruments. With one exception, which was an Indonesian gamelan, all music cited was Western in origin. A small number of respondents in this category ($N=9; 4\%$) indicated they composed through improvising. One respondent, who played professionally, explained the skills involved in improvising:

- musician in bands for 30 years - arranging, writing, improvising, soloing and harmonizing.

Others respondents similarly improvised at the piano, but these suggested they utilised these skills for personal pleasure.

The third category in Table 7 included responses which identified respondents who compose original music as well as arrange pre-existing music. A third of the respondents indicated they had written both types of music ($N=76; 33\%$). The response:

- I write or arrange most of my choir music, plus I've written musicals, anthems for church choirs and string music.

exemplifies comments in this composing category.
The purpose of investigating different categories of composing experiences with which respondents identified was to discover if respondents wrote original music, and therefore to find if this might influence teachers in their composition assessments. When categories appropriate to original music are combined, about half of all respondents \((N=122; 54\%)\) demonstrated they wrote what they perceived to be original music.

Information from IMCAI Question 6 reported details of composing experiences, which was the second of three sections in the respondent group profile. This section showed that approximately half of all respondents had composed original music. The purpose of investigating different categories of composing experiences was to discover if respondents wrote original music, and therefore to find if this might influence teachers in their pedagogy in composition and their composition assessments. Significant cross-tabulations were found between this variable and gender. For example, male respondents were strongly represented as self acknowledged composers, and female respondents were equally identified as non-composers. Additionally, greater numbers of male respondents were represented in 'publication' and 'community' composing contexts, whereas female respondents had greater representation in 'education and 'pre-service' contexts. Cross-tabulations with composition assessment variables, which were resources, schedules and criteria, showed no significant trends with this variable. Further discussion of significant cross-tabulations is presented in the final section of this chapter. The following section explores the third part of the respondent sample profile by examining respondents' training.

Respondents' training

This section reports responses to IMCAI Question 7a, 7b, and 7c, which describe IMCAI respondents' training in three areas: composition, composition teaching, and composition assessment. All three parts of Question 7 are formatted similarly, with five options presented as sources of training: nil, pre-service, in-service, post-graduate, and other.

Table 8 shows the frequency of comments for IMCAI respondents' sources of training in composition. Given five options, a majority of respondents \((N=158; 69\%)\) selected one response. Fewer respondents selected two responses \((N=64; 28\%)\), and a small number of respondents selected multiple responses \((N=5; 2.5\%)\). One respondent \((0.5\%)\) did not respond to this question. Data in Table 8, by accommodating multiple responses, show larger comment numbers than respondents to the survey.
Table 8

*Frequency of comments for sources of training in composition (IMCAI, Q.7a)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Nil</th>
<th>Pre-service</th>
<th>In-service</th>
<th>Post-graduate</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major training source was 'pre-service' study \((N=156; 52\%)\). 'In-service' training was identified less frequently \((N=65; 22\%)\). Respondents selected two other sources of training in composition. These are: 'post-graduate' \((N=25; 8\%)\), and 'other' \((N=20; 7\%)\). Some respondents \((N=33; 11\%)\) considered they had no training in composition.

Respondents added further comments to explain their answers in this question. These revealed several common points of view about training in composition. These were concerned with composition training from music training institutions, formal training not associated with academic institutions, mentoring by composers, and informal training. Most training was provided by pre-service institutions, with other features in the above list contributing some support to respondents. All features are reported below with examples of statements to illustrate responses. Responses additionally presented contrasting descriptions of the term 'composition', which demonstrated ambiguity.

Responses showed that IMCAI respondents had two different interpretations of 'composition', which might suggest that changes in syllabus requirements may have affected the way teachers define composition, or that there is confusion about its definition. Many respondents used the term synonymously with harmony and counterpoint. In contrast, the opposite view presented composition as an accomplishment achieved through artistic expression. While many gave viewpoints from the extremes of both perspectives, there was a large number of respondents who showed appreciation for the differences between the two approaches.

Many respondents doubted composition training through harmony and counterpoint courses was appropriate for current syllabus requirements. These respondents saw a clear distinction between study which was skill-based (such as harmony, counterpoint, melodic invention, and
theory), with training in composition. These respondents suggested that a background in such skills was highly inadequate and out of date. Reasons for this opinion were that such courses were oriented to traditional Western music, and they did not address styles of music such as rock and jazz. Conversely, other respondents had successfully transferred knowledge gained in such courses from theory to practice in the teaching of composition. Multiple practical experiences were evident in all such responses, an example of which shows how composition skills were developed:

- **Member of Arranging Guild of Australia (MAGA), have done extensive work in recording studios working with various composers - little formal training apart from the Conservatorium.**

This example demonstrates that practical experience supplemented and followed theoretically based. The respondent considered this had provided sufficient training in composition to meet personal needs.

Respondent training in composition was mainly undertaken in formal courses. Many respondents identified these in the following undergraduate qualifications as part of pre-service training: Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Creative Arts, Bachelor of Music Education, Diploma in Music Education, and Diploma of the State Conservatorium of Music. Respondents also identified institutions and statutory boards through which this had occurred: Australian Music Examinations Board, Newcastle Conservatorium of Music, Queensland University, Sydney Conservatorium of Music, Sydney University, and University of New England. Courses studied at the above included counterpoint, harmony, musicianship, orchestration, original composition, and theory.

Respondents identified as valuable, training in composition at in-service courses not associated with tertiary institutions. These were formal courses, lectures, and workshops. In-service training was identified as provided by the Association of Independent Schools (AIS), regional committees associated with the DET, and the Orff-Schulwerk Association.

Respondents frequently identified study with a mentor as composition training. Composers identified at specific institutions were Colin Brumby at Queensland University, Nigel Butterley at Newcastle Conservatorium of Music, and Raymond Hanson at Sydney Conservatorium of Music. Other Australian composers identified as teachers or instructors were Don Banks, Anne Boyd, Anne Carr-Boyd, George Dreyfus, Richard Meale, Peter Sculthorpe, and Martin Wesley-Smith. Composers in other countries were identified: Jack
Body, Phil Mattson, and Ed Van Ness from the United States of America, and unidentified composers-in-residence in Berne, Switzerland.

Respondents demonstrated training was undertaken informally from alternative sources, identified under the 'other' category. These included discussions with other educators or composers, reading publications and textbooks, and analysis of contemporary music. 'Other' training was usually through individual experience. Respondents cited composing experiences from secondary school, student years at universities or conservatoria of music, and competitions as 'other' training. Several respondents \((N=14; 6\%)\) commented that they were self-taught or learnt 'on the job'. Respondents \((N=3; 1.5\%)\) described how they gained valuable training in composition, which was through:

- Extensive work in recording studios working with various composers.
- Performance with professional musicians in rock and classical styles.

In summary, the sources of training which respondents identified they had in composition show that formal pre-service study was the most valuable source of training, but not exclusive in composition training, as other sources were also identified. The next section reports data on respondents' sources of training in teaching composition, which was investigated in IMCAI Question 7b. Noticeable differences are evident between results for Question 7a and 7b.

Table 9 shows the frequency of IMCAI comments which identified sources of training in teaching composition. A majority of respondents selected one response only \((N=125; 54\%)\). Fewer respondents selected two responses \((N=55; 24\%)\) and a minority of respondents selected three or four responses \((N=19; 8\%)\). Some respondents \((N=29; 10\%)\) failed to respond to this question. While 'nil', 'pre-service', 'in-service' and 'post-graduate' categories in Table 9 are self-explanatory, the final category, 'other', accommodated training or study not appropriate to any of the previously nominated categories. This category was included to encourage respondents to include all pragmatic training methods which were utilised as training to teach composition.
### Table 9
*Frequency of comments for sources of training to teach composition (IMCAI, Q.7b)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Nil</th>
<th>Pre-Service</th>
<th>In-Service</th>
<th>Post-Graduate</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In contrast to results for the previous section in which training in composition was attributed to pre-service institutions, the major source of training in teaching composition identified by respondents was 'other' training ($N=88$; 30%). A second source of training selected at nearly the same rate was 'in-service' training ($N=81$; 28%). 'Pre-service' training was selected by approximately one quarter of respondents ($N=64$; 22%). 'Post-graduate' training responses were infrequent ($N=11$; 4%). A number of respondents ($N=47$; 16%) considered they had no training in teaching composition.

Training institutions were less important in learning to teach composition than they were in training in learning composition. Other institutions which were not training institutions were responsible for providing opportunities which respondents accessed to learn teaching skills in composition. More important in training to teach composition were informal and personal experiences which music teachers had with individual composers and/or colleagues. All features which supported respondents in learning composition teaching skills are reported below individually with examples to illustrate.

'Other' training was designed personally by respondents and did not centre on formal training provided by institutions or education authorities. For purposes of this study this training has been identified as 'informal'. Strategies used to acquire informal training in teaching composition were pragmatic, resourceful, often incidental to other activities, and sometimes innovative. Fundamental to all aspects of 'informal training' was respondents' use of personal connections and interactions with both composers and colleagues in learning composition...
teaching skills. Many respondents provided examples of personal connections with composers and colleagues, which are shown in Table 10.

Table 10
Informal training in composition teaching by contact with composers and colleagues (IMCAI, Q.7b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Numbers of respondents</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Composers</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lecture</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attended composer interviews prior to 'Meet the Music' concerts (as part of the Sydney Symphony Orchestra education program).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultation</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sought composition teaching advice from composers - Michael Barkl, Gérard Brophy, Rosalind Carlsson, Rafaello Marcellino, Chris Neal and James Penberthy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observed colleagues (who were composers) while they were teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepared and directed/perform new works for professional and school performances in liaison with composers - Anne Boyd, Andrew Ford, Richard Gill, Elliott Gyger, Gordon Kerry, Stephen Leek, Miloslav Penicka, Carl Vine and Martin Wesley-Smith.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Colleagues**         |         |
| Networks               | 16      |
|                        | Attended conferences, discussed, compared strategies and exchanged views. |
| Consultation           | 2       |
|                        | Discussed strategies with colleagues who were NSW Board of Studies music examiners. |

| **Research**           |         |
| Writing                | 2       |
|                        | Wrote Sydney Symphony Orchestra 'Meet the Music' kits. |

Table 10 shows personal contacts with composers were in different contexts. Most frequently mentioned were consultations, lectures, and observations of other teachers who were identified as composers. Two respondents identified integration of rehearsal and performance of new works in school and professional performance, as opportunities to learn composition teaching skills. A member of the Sydney Philharmonic Motet Choir, one respondent commented that in presenting new works, Australian composers frequently discussed composition decisions with performers.
Respondents identified colleagues as important sources of composition pedagogy. Personal contact was primarily through music teacher networks which provided opportunities for respondents to meet colleagues, discuss, compare and exchange ideas on composition teaching. Less common, but also mentioned, were formal consultations and research opportunities in contemporary Australian music.

In-service opportunities were frequently cited as training to teach composition. Content of training courses was contemporary Australian music, and training centred on teaching strategies in that medium. Two exceptions were courses in film music and technology. Respondents provided data which described three types of activities which were conferences, courses associated with concerts, and workshops. These were facilitated by many different educational, commercial, or professional organisations. Table 11 shows providers of identified in-service training in composition teaching grouped by educational, commercial, or professional status.

Table 11
Organisations providing identified in-service training in composition teaching (IMCAI, Q.7b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organisation</th>
<th>Numbers of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 Sydney Symphony Orchestra (SSO) - Education Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Musica Viva</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bennelong Program, Sydney Opera House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Australian Society for Music Education (ASME)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Catholic Music Teachers Association (CMTA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Regional Music Committees - (North Sydney, and Western NSW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Association of Independent Schools (AIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Music Educators in Schools (MEIS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Orff Schulwerk Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Board of Studies (NSW)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Catholic Education Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Department of Education and Training (DEE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Most notable among in-service opportunities identified in Table 11 was the Sydney Symphony Orchestra Education Program. This program was on-going and had a broad approach which introduced contemporary Australian compositions to respondents through a series of strategies, which including workshops, conferences, published study guides, recorded excerpts, and lectures to students and teachers at a series of concerts entitled *Meet the Music*. This program was based in Sydney through its focus on concerts at the Sydney Opera House. Materials and opportunities provided by this program were restricted to schools which participated in *Meet the Music* concerts.

Interpretation of the data provided by respondents in Table 11 suggests that respondents have broadened the perception of the term 'in-service' to any experience (rather than simply that provided by educational authorities) which adds to teachers' understanding and knowledge in composition when complying with syllabus guidelines. HSC submitted compositions from 1994 were required to meet guidelines that submitted compositions represent the 'Mandatory Topic: Music 1970 Onwards (Australian Focus)' (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, p. 18). More recently, Board of Studies guidelines have attempted to ensure that the study of recently written compositions is maintained by restricting the mandatory topic to: 'Music of the last 25 Years' (NSW Board of Studies, 1999, p.32). 'In-service' by commercial providers supported learning in composition by integrating aural development, musicology, and performance with composition. In addition, this type of support was possibly attractive to respondents, as 'in-service' from these providers offered access to, and examples of new compositions appropriate to prescribed syllabus guidelines, and materials for classroom use. The Sydney symphony experience therefore provides learning materials and experiences which fulfil the pedagogical needs of teachers required by the changes in the 1994 2 Unit (Common) music syllabus.

Several respondents criticised a lack of in-service training opportunities (*N*=9; 3.5%). While there were opportunities for training, some respondents situated outside the Sydney metropolitan area found that these were inaccessible. A respondent lamented a perceived lack of adequate training in composition teaching with:

- In-services? Where and when? They'd be great! (for senior, advanced composition). More!

Pre-service training was less frequently identified as preparation for teaching composition than 'other' and 'in-service' training. Several respondents (*N*=8; 3%) considered training in
teaching composition was not adequate for application to the current requirements of the secondary curriculum.

The above data showed the sources of training, and the amount of support provided by different sources in composition pedagogy. Results contrasted with those from training in composition, which were presented earlier on pp. 118-121. In the section to follow, training in the assessment of composition is reported. The next section concludes the respondent sample profile.

This section reports sources of training respondents identified in composition assessment and is presented similarly to the previous two sections. Table 12 shows the frequency of comments from IMCAI respondents which described the derivation of their sources of training in composition assessment. Provided with five options, most respondents used one response only (N=177; 78%) and a smaller number (N=42; 18%) selected two or more responses. Some respondents did not answer this question (N=9; 4%). However, response numbers are greater than the numbers of respondents due to the multiplicity of options in this question. The largest number of comments were allocated to the category entitled 'other' (N=82; 31%). A number of respondents selected 'nil' in training in assessment of composition (N=70; 26%). Approximately one quarter of all respondents considered they had 'in-service' or 'pre-service' training (N=57; 21% and N=53; 20% respectively). Few respondents indicated they had 'post-graduate' training in assessment of composition (N=6; 2%).

**Table 12**

*Frequency of comments for sources of training in assessing composition (IMCAI, Q.7c)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Nil</th>
<th>Pre-service</th>
<th>In-service</th>
<th>Post-graduate</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents added further comments which described their sources of training in assessing composition. A large majority identified they had either no training, or their training was not associated with a training institution. Training not associated with a training institution had
two major features which respondents consistently discussed. The first feature was the NSW Board of Studies and its influence in supporting teachers in composition assessment issues. The second feature was that, without formal assessment training, respondents had devised personally structured assessment strategies to address current classroom requisites derived from a wide variety of resources. Details of these two features are provided below.

Data showed that the NSW Board of Studies has a profound influence on training in the assessment of composition. Respondents valued all opportunities to interact with the Board of Studies through HSC examination marking experiences, and through documentation provided by the Board of Studies. Of greatest value to training in assessment were opportunities to mark HSC submitted compositions. Respondents indicated that knowledge gained from any marking experience, whether in composition or other areas of music, was disseminated to others through in-service opportunities, where it was highly prized.

Respondents considered some training in composition assessment was oriented towards procedures for submitted works and marking processes, rather than criteria to assess compositions. These were of less value than personal interaction with examiners. The following statement expresses the perceptions of several respondents:

- I've been to a course to two, but I've learnt more through discussion with experienced HSC markers.

All comments related to assessing composition in this section of the survey focussed exclusively on the HSC examination. This might imply the importance which was placed on the HSC examination by respondents. Courses in assessment which were specifically related to the HSC and which were presented by teachers who were examiners at the HSC examination had the most influence on respondents. Three respondents identified a single course in Armidale in 1997, which was presented by the Association of Independent Schools as in-service to teachers. The event used 'HSC examiners presenting recent work along with evaluation'. The NSW Board of Studies, and other associations, were identified as providing courses, and opportunities for learning composition assessment methods.

Table 13 illustrates the amount of training for assessment of composition which respondents identified from 'in-service' and 'other' sources. Results shown in Table 13 confirm the importance of the NSW Board of Studies in this. The first four items, and item six in 'other
contexts' in Table 13 are all opportunities which are provided by this statutory body. Most important were opportunities to mark HSC papers, and many respondents commented on the value of vicariously experiencing HSC marking by contact with HSC markers. Equally valued were printed documents which were distributed by the Board of Studies, or attendance at an Encore concert at which exemplary submitted compositions were performed.

Table 13

'In-service' and 'other' training in assessing composition (IMCAI, Q.7c)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Numbers of Comments</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contexts</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Other'</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC Examination</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>HSC examination marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC Examination</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>HSC composition marking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>New South Wales Board of Studies documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>With HSC composition markers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contests</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>As juror and participant in composition competitions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encore Concerts</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Exemplary HSC compositions performed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>'In-service'</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courses</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Prescribing HSC composition requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussions</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>With other teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Despite an apparent availability of opportunities, many respondents were alarmed by their perceived lack of assessment training opportunities. A comment from one respondent demonstrates this concern:

- Frightening to consider this one! No In-Service. Much needed! Only small scale discussions with other teachers.

Respondents who considered there was a lack of training opportunities in composition assessment provided insights into how they devised personal composition assessment strategies. The respondents' comments presented below reflect ideas on assessment of composition prevalent in literature and research. The first suggests a global approach. The second suggests appraisal through stylistic and technical criteria. The third implies stylistic and technical criteria. The fourth comment refers to ranking, analysis, and a balance between subjective and objective judgements. The final comment considers notation and sound, and similar to the first comments, some internal valuation on a composition's effectiveness:
- Assessment in the form of does it work?
- I have technical knowledge of styles and the experience outlined (in training in composition, and in training to teach composition), so I am happy with my own criteria.
- Common sense and logic prevail, (I) draw on my own creative sense
- Assessment are comparative and sometimes subjective, but after objective analysis I assess on the basis of 1) how it sounds and 2) if it's written, I check if it works.

The above section on respondents' training in composition assessment completes the IMCAI respondent sample profile. A short summary which briefly reviews contents in the Respondent Sample Profile report follows prior to the presentation and interpretation of results for Research Question 1(i).

Discussion
This first section of Chapter 4 presented and provided preliminary interpretation of data from the Respondent Sample Profile. Data from early questions of the survey show there was proportional consistency in gender and experience in secondary music teaching in the respondent sample. Respondents represent a wide range of experience, and teach in all regions of NSW, with country and city regions equally represented. Schools at which respondents teach are diverse in character. Half of the respondents consider that they have personal experience in composing, which is frequently used to facilitate extra-curricular musical activities in schools. It is important to consider that there is confusion in defining composition, with contrary opinions on what constitutes the domain, although this appears not to influence other factors, such as assessment, in the thesis. The inclusion of arranging suggests that there is a wide definition of composition in the secondary music curriculum. There was an almost total neglect of improvisation in teachers' comments about their composing experiences.

Respondents consider their formal training in composition undertaken at tertiary institutions is generally adequate, but much less training was provided by institutions in composition pedagogy. In this, respondents glean information from a variety of sources, including colleagues and composers, and their own personal experiences in developing appropriate pedagogy in this domain. The NSW Board of Studies, although unwittingly, is a major provider of advice to teachers in the matter of composition assessments. In the 1999 NSW Board of Studies Annual Report (2000), the Board's curricular responsibilities were outlined as developing curriculum as well as curriculum support materials, and developing and conducting examinations. Data were both quantitative and qualitative in the respondent
sample profile, and one type of data corroborated and complemented results from the other. This implies that results are an accurate reflection of respondents' opinions. The respondent group profile was the first of four sections which report and interpret results of IMCAI. The second section, which reports results to Research Question 1(i) follows.

4.2: Research question 1(i)

Research Question 1

- In teaching composition to senior students in NSW secondary schools, what do secondary music teachers report are their:
  
  i) assessment strategies, and
  
  ii) assessment criteria?

This second section reports and interprets data which respond to Research Question 1(i). This concerns respondents' composition assessment strategies, identified for the purpose of this study as schedules, procedures, and resources. IMCAI data to address Research Question 1(i) are presented in three parts. A brief summary of results precedes a detailed analytical description of data. Following the summary, information from IMCAI Questions 9 and 11(i) report data on composition assessment schedules and assessment procedures respectively. The final part of this section reports data from two IMCAI questions: Question 11(ii) about assessment resources and Question 13 on student documentation through a process diary.

A summary of results synthesises procedures which respondents indicated they use in senior composition assessments. Assessment of composition processes, and not only a final product, was important in responses. A large majority of respondents identified they assessed senior compositions both during and after their completion. A preference for the use of formative assessment was further evident in quantitative results for process diary assessment.

In assessing composition process diaries, respondents rated composition outcomes of less importance than student learning and student effort. Respondents equally favoured two contrasting assessment procedures, which were by impression marking and by analysis of contents. Results for holistic, or impression judgements, were similar to checklist assessments, which were specific to composition characteristics. Cross-tabulations with these procedures and assessment criteria conducted in the final part of this chapter suggest these
two assessment procedures may be important in composition assessments. In making assessments, respondents indicated that they preferred a combination of observation of both manuscript and sound presentation when they assessed senior secondary compositions.

In developing appropriate assessments, respondents identified that they utilised a range of procedures which were guided by NSW Board of Studies advice and their own personal initiatives. Important resources in assessment were primarily the teacher and student, with less support provided by non-participants in the learning process, such as other teachers or experts outside the school. In general, respondents showed that they used both formative and summative assessments, and there was some uniformity in procedures and resources used. In the report to follow, detailed results to all three sections which respond to Research Question 1(i) are presented.

**Schedules**

Schedules are defined in this thesis as the timetables used by teachers for composition assessment. In reporting, Table 14 shows composition schedule data which respondents identified they use in their responses to IMCAI Question 9. This question asked respondents when they scheduled the assessment of student compositions in 2 Unit (Common), 3 Unit or 2 Unit 1 senior music courses. Three options were provided for respondents' answers to this question: during the writing process; on completion of a composition as a final assessment; and both during and on completion of the composition. The purpose of this categorisation was to find if respondents used on-going, formative assessment, summative assessment, or a combination of both. Table 14 shows when respondents scheduled assessments of compositions in senior music classes.

**Table 14**

*Respondents' assessment schedules for senior student compositions (IMCAI, Q.9)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents</th>
<th>During only</th>
<th>After completion</th>
<th>During &amp; after</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A large majority of respondents indicated they assessed composition both during writing of a composition, and after its completion. There were some respondents who indicated they made only final assessments of compositions (N=29; 13%), and one respondent (N=1; 0.5%) assessed only during the process of writing the composition. Results suggested that in assessing senior compositions, respondents most generally preferred to use a combination of formative and summative assessment. Some respondents, however, only used summative assessment. The next section reports on procedures respondents used in assessing senior student compositions.

**Procedures**

This section investigates procedures used by respondents in composition assessments and reports data from IMCAI Question 11a. Question 11a presented nine variables appropriate to a wide range of procedures to which respondents were asked to respond using a three-point Likert scale which represented their frequency of use. The three frequencies were identified as: 'always', 'sometimes', and 'never'. Table 15 shows the frequencies, and nil responses for the nine variables which IMCAI respondents indicated they use in senior composition assessments. Results for variables are shown in descending order of preference. Procedure variables in ranked order of identified use are: 'Notation and Sound'; 'Checklist'; 'Impression'; 'Raw Mark' 'Skill mastery'; 'Rank'; 'Grade'; 'Sound only'; and 'Notation only'.

**Table 15**

*Frequencies of procedures used by respondents in composition assessment (IMCAI, Q.11a)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Procedures</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Nil Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notation &amp; Sound</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw Mark</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skill mastery</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound only</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notation only</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outstanding in preferred procedural variables used by respondents to assess compositions, was a combination of notation and sound. In contrast, 'notation only', and 'sound only' were assessment procedures variables which were rated as least used. Table 15 shows that using a checklist, impression marking, using a raw mark, and ranking, are common procedures used by IMCAI respondents in assessing senior student compositions. Procedures which respondents generally do not use are assessing for the mastery of a specific skill, and composition grading.

At this point in the survey, respondents added further qualitative information for procedures used in assessing senior compositions. Thirty-one respondents commented on variables used in Table 15. Twenty-one others added information on other assessment procedures not identified in the table. Comments were provided to all individual items. Three features were evident in comments. These features, and the numbers of comments made about each, were: respondents' preference for descriptive comments in assessments (N=15); relationships between a composition task and assessment (N=5), and descriptive comments about notation and sound (N=11).

The most prominent opinion raised by qualitative data on procedures used by respondents to conduct senior composition assessments, was the preference to use narrative descriptions rather than numerical indicators of a composition's success (N=15). Five comments regretted the need to value student compositions through raw marks and by an impression. For example:

- I would like to not use raw scores—but at the moment the school and HSC marking do not accommodate it.
- The marks are only because you have to assess the students. The mark is based not on creativity but following what is requested - eg fit the topic!

Similarly, comments identified respondents' reluctance to use ranking procedures. One respondent doubted any need for ranking compositions which were written as examples of different topics, and another explained that the writer never ranked students against each other, even if they were stylistically similar. Ranking, when used by some respondents, was administered only through necessity:

- It would be lovely if we could judge compositions on their individual merit without having to rank them!
Comments made about the use of checklists, and the allocation of grades for a composition reiterated respondents' preference for generalised reflection rather than numerical accreditation. Two comments demonstrate this opinion:

- I am not in favour of assessing composition as an aggregate of good use of concepts - this makes for very artificial music. Clearly however, good and appropriate control of these details within a style is essential.
- Obviously a balanced form, textural variety etc play a part but I don't have a conscious checklist.

The second opinion in comments on assessment procedures indicated that assessment was strongly related to task descriptors \( (N=5) \). Using task descriptors involved both teachers and students in the total learning environment. The following comments describe how task descriptors are important to the design of a composition, guide teaching in composition, and form assessment parameters:

- Assessment procedure is always governed by negotiated criteria established between the teacher and the student ie how successfully has the student achieved the concept.
- These procedures depend on the task set, whether it was a free composition task or whether particular features/skills were asked for.

A third feature important to respondents in qualitative results which detailed respondents' concerns for assessment procedures was the mode of composition presentation \( (N=11) \). Comments concerning the sound, manuscript presentation, and a combination of both modes, showed respondents required students to present compositions in a variety of ways which were dependent on the development of each student, task description and music course. Five respondents provided comments concerning 'notation only'. One of these described procedures with students who had little skill in notation. A second response indicated that 'notation only' was required for specific exercises, while another was concerned with 'notation' and technology. Specific comments are presented below:

- My students put composition onto audio tape because most of them can compose but cannot write down what they compose. I teach mostly vocal classes. Those who can notate do so if they want to do so.
- Technology has created a problem with notation as notational results are often dependent on the student's skills in quantising etc.

The latter comment suggests that using notation software requires a different set of skills with which a student must become familiar for effective delivery of a composition. In addition, using technology requires musical knowledge in manuscript and instrumental conventions.
Respondents suggested that 'notation only' provided them with opportunities for greater feedback to students, and was used as a procedure at specific stages in assessment. Two respondents commented:

- I think the more written comments the better. I often photocopy their work and hand it back with my scrawl all over it
- I always give extensive comments on compositions - one page for Year 11 and up to three pages for 3 Unit.

The above comments show how respondents support student learning by examining manuscripts of compositions, by reflecting on the manuscripts, and by commenting on notated copies.

In contrast to comments which preferred to use manuscript to provide feedback, three respondents provided comments which applied to 'sound only' procedures. The first two examples below show the importance of sound in composition processes and for performances of completed works. In contrast, the fourth example suggests using variety in composition presentation for assessment is desirable:

- Sound only for 2 Unit Preliminary and non-assessment task combinations.
- Although its only the score that counts, with 2 Unit 1 the sound is what they (students) mostly relate to.
- Some composition will be assessed when performed under performance in music, therefore sound is important without judgement of written work.
- Not all tasks are assessment - in Preliminary Course I may use process then sound then notation etc, and how much students have moved outside their comfort/style zones.

Generally, when presenting completed compositions, respondents preferred a combination of aural and visual representation of each composition for assessment purposes. A combination of different modes of presentation provided a balanced understanding of a composition and was practical and efficient in determining the success of senior student composition.

In the paragraphs above, qualitative data to Question 11a commented on three features concerned with individual composition assessment procedure variables presented in Table 15. Qualitative data to Question 11a also identified other procedures not individually listed in this table. Respondents also identified general procedures which they used to assess student composition. Comments related to three features. These features, and the numbers of comments made about each, were combinations of itemised procedures (N=9), NSW Board
of Studies guidelines \(N=4\), and personal perspectives on assessment \(N=9\). These extra variables not identified individually in the Table 15 list are discussed below.

In describing procedures used, respondents \(N=9\) asserted that assessment was often not based on an individual procedure, but a combination of those identified items listed in Table 15. Two comments show how different assessment procedures are used at different stages of the composition process:

- All the above are valid - some more applicable to particular circumstances and student age/development
- Assessment procedures tend to vary according to the type of composition eg representing a topic or whether it is the elective component.

A second procedure not identified in the Table 15 list of variables was to find advice from NSW Board of Studies guidelines for assessment procedures \(N=4\). Two were printed guidelines distributed to schools in 1995 which 'provided . . . a system of grading for assessment marks' (New South Wales Board of Studies, 1995b). Two respondents mentioned they used HSC experience for procedural advice in assessment.

The third and final group of comments \(N=11\) expressed some concerns with procedures used to assess senior student compositions. Stylistic differences between student composition, eg 'heavy metal', 'techno', and 'technology' presented difficulties when there was a perception that Western art music was more appropriate for student submission. An example presents this:

- Of course, the bias towards Western Art Music (in HSC works) means you try to 'steer' them towards it.

Of concern to another respondent was the implication that a student who studied composition outside the school through technology (MIDI) had scored better in the HSC than other students who had only school experiences.

This is the second section which responded to Research Question 1(i) and reported and made a preliminary interpretation of data which described procedures IMCAI respondents use in assessing senior student compositions. A combination of sound and notation were outstanding as important in composition assessment, but diverse numbers of other procedures were commonly used by respondents, such as using impression marking, a raw mark, ranking,
and for skill mastery. The third part of the response to Research Question (i) presents data on composition assessment resources.

**Resources**

Earlier results reported senior composition assessment schedules and procedures. This final part of the response to Research Question 1(i) reports data from *IMCAI* Question 11b, and Question 13. Data from Question 11b are reported first.

Question 11b presented nine variables, which described various human and material assessment resources to respondents who were asked to respond using a three-point Likert scale which represented their frequency of use. Resources were observations, verbal, and written comments, by teachers, students, students' peers, and other experts. The three responses frequencies were: 'always', 'sometimes', and 'never'. Table 16 shows the frequencies and nil responses for nine resource variables which *IMCAI* respondents indicated they used in senior composition assessments.

**Table 16**

*Frequencies of resources used by respondents in composition assessment (IMCAI, Q.11b)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Resources</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher observation</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher verbal comments</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher written comments</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student verbal comments</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student written comments</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teachers same school</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student peer comments</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teachers other schools</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other experts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 shows comparative frequencies of responses for the nine variables which describe human and material assessment resources respondents identified they use in assessing senior student compositions. Most highly favoured were the first three variables identified in Table
16: 'teacher observation'; 'teacher verbal comments'; 'teacher written comments'. Used less frequently, but also identified by rank as next in importance, were variables which concerned student involvement in assessment. These were: 'student verbal comments', and 'student written comments'. Other personnel were used infrequently. Results show that respondents accept responsibility for assessing their students' compositions. Assessment resources relied heavily on teachers in collaboration with their students, the protagonists in the teaching/learning process.

In addition to providing data in Table 16, respondents added comments (N=46) which further described resources utilised in assessment. Features of comments, and the numbers of references made about each, were other teachers and experts (N=31), teacher/student communication (N=10), and NSW Board of Studies guidelines (N=5).

The largest numbers of comments (N=31) which provided qualitative data to Question 11b were concerned with the final two variables in Table 16. Respondents commented they sought advice from other teachers in the same school whenever possible and especially when they were assessing senior student compositions. Some of these respondents (N=11), who were the only music teachers in their respective schools, explained this support was not available and consequently not used. Some of the above respondents (N=6) offered comments concerning assessment support from teachers in another school. Two respondents considered that presenting compositions for assessment by other teachers did not guarantee accuracy in assessment. This suggested that agreement between teachers does not necessarily mean that assessments present an accurate estimation of a composition's value:

- I have not as yet found an adequate method of ensuring that we all use similar criteria - nor for that matter is it appropriate.

While the above qualitative data addressed support in assessment from other teachers, the latter comment, and others, shows that respondents consider that those most closely involved in the teaching and learning process, the teacher and the students, are most appropriate resources in senior composition assessment. These results also comply with statutory board requirements which have mandated since 1985 that on-going assessment of student work in Year 12 is a responsibility of all teachers (NSW Board of Senior School Studies, 1985).
Composers and student teachers were cited \( (N=9) \) as other experts who provided assistance to music teachers in assessing student compositions. One respondent considered student work not sufficiently developed to warrant assessment support at this level, and another indicated that a composer assisted with assessments of senior student compositions.

The second group of comments \( (N=10) \), which provided qualitative information concerning resources used in assessing senior student compositions, described the positive and negative impact of communication on students. Comments reinforced the value of feedback in composition, and differences between the effects of verbal and written comments. Student reflection of composition was seen as a vital aspect of composition writing \( (N=6) \). The following examples demonstrate these opinions:

- Ongoing communication between teacher and student (is) very important in the composition process.
- If the comments are negative, I try to keep them verbal. If they're positive, I'll often write them down.
- A process diary is quite useful for helping students structure and refine their work.

The final group of comments \( (N=5) \) which provided qualitative details of resources used in senior composition assessments recommended resources which respondents use which had not been identified in the survey. Both were NSW Board of Studies publications. Guidelines from the 1996 HSC examination report, and a compact disc of Higher School Certificate exemplary composition were identified (New South Wales Board of Studies, 1996, 1997). In the section to follow, a process diary used to support composition development is examined for its capacity to support teachers' assessments of senior compositions.

**Process diary assessment**

This the final section of the response to Research Question 1(i). Earlier sections presented results for schedules, procedures, and other resources, used by respondents in assessing senior student compositions. This final section reports data from IMCAI Question 13 on criteria used to assess process diaries. Responses were registered on a five-point Likert scale where values represented: 1=extremely important; 2=very important; 3=of some importance; 4=of little importance; and 5=of no importance. The four criteria were: student effort, student self-assessment, student learning, and composition outcome. Table 17 shows the frequencies of criteria used by respondents to assess senior students' composition process diaries. Seven
respondents did not complete the first three items in this section, and thirteen respondents did not respond to the final items.

Table 17

Frequency of assessment criteria used by respondents to assess senior students' composition process diaries (IMCAI, Q.13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 (N)</th>
<th>2 (N)</th>
<th>3 (N)</th>
<th>4 (N)</th>
<th>5 (N)</th>
<th>Nil Res. (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Criteria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student effort</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student self-assessment</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition outcome</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents (N=39) added further comments which elaborated on assessment of process diaries. It was expected that respondents would provide additional criteria which they used to assess process diaries other than those already identified. No additional criteria were provided. Two features were equally evident in comments. These features, and the numbers of comments made about each, were: positive attitudes to process diaries (N=17); and perceived anomalies between process diaries and composition (N=22).

The feature of many comments (N=17) made concerning the importance of criteria in assessing process diaries, was that respondents were positive about the capacity for a process diary to reflect expertise in composition. Comments described how diaries mapped student development and supported student learning:

- I think the point of the process diary is to show they HAVE (sic) used a process and can look back self-critically and assess their own work, with input from the teacher
- Accountability is paramount and discipline in the process will produce worthy results. Craft is more important than stunning originality to the vast majority of high school musicians.
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Several comments itemised diary contents which were valued. These included lists of models for compositions, musicology analyses, criteria checklists, examples of scores, computer printouts, and the considerations of reflections on compositions. Other comments provided further reflection on individual criteria identified in Table 18, which considered the diary showed what students had learned. 'Student effort' was awarded merit through composition process diaries:

- If a student has made an outstanding effort and shown evidence of learning this is more important than producing a masterpiece.

This comment reinforces results from Table 17, in which student effort was highly valued and was awarded higher ratings for assessment than the composition itself. This result appears as unusual in an educational setting.

A feature of a second group of comments (N=22) was that respondents perceived anomalies between assessment of process diaries and compositions. These respondents doubted the capacity of a process diary to reflect accurately student abilities in composition. Comments suggested different skills were utilised in writing diaries and compositions, which resulted in confusion when assessing diaries. Other respondents saw the diary as an opportunity to give credit to students with less successful compositions. The comments below substantiate these views:

- Assessment of diary is quite difficult. Some very capable students depend less on the diary process and produce some wonderful compositions. On the other hand, some who "wax lyrical" in their diaries and appear to be following a sound process, produce composition of less quality.
- I allow students with excellent diaries to get credit despite their less satisfactory end products ie it's possible to produce an excellent piece and poor diary and vice versa.

The latter comment explains how 'student effort' is viewed in comparison with the composition outcome, and the reason for respondents' use of this criterion in practical classroom applications. Other respondents considered assessments of diaries inappropriate as they distorted the real situation in classrooms. Some respondents compared student composers, and their use of composition process diaries, with professional composers.

- Diaries are most successful when used by a student as a tool but not all students (or composers) compose this way (with sketched ideas etc).
- I am of a spontaneous bent and I feel the composition process diary does not reflect the student of similar style.

The variety of attitudes reflected in comments suggests there may be fragmented approaches to process diary assessment because of confusion about which criteria should be valued in the assessment of process diaries.
Other responses also critical of process diary assessment described how senior students use skills in composing which are different from skills used in process diaries, as these describe composing. Discrepancies between skills demonstrated in process diaries and in compositions were described as follows:

- Many students fail to use the concept of the process diary adequately - compositions rarely emanate from this process in schools.
- The process diary and the final product may have little to do with each other for many students.
- I find students have a real problem with composition process diary writing - verbally noting their musical perceptions. I do realise that's what we should be teaching but as it is not emphasized in junior years I can see my teaching downfall and therefore their struggle.
- The process diary is irrelevant and becomes a central focus (assessed) rather than creativity!

In general, the dispute in qualitative results about criteria used to assess senior composition process diaries would suggest that the utilisation of this resource for assessment of composition purposes is not sufficiently understood to offer accuracy in the task. When combined with quantitative results, which showed that respondents preferred to use the diary to reward effort rather than reward for the composition itself, greater confusion is generated. Results suggest that while process diaries are important to support learning in composition, other resources not associated with process diaries might offer greater assistance in senior composition assessments. Correlations conducted with this variable and other variables in the survey produced no significant results.

**Discussion**

In this second part of Chapter 4, data responded to Research Question 1(i). IMCALI questions used to provide data were Questions 9, 11, and 13. Data show that many respondents have organised systematic approaches to assessment of senior student compositions which incorporate scheduled procedures, even though these change as required by the stage of development of a composition, and may include a variety of different procedures. Teachers consider that they are accountable personally for undertaking assessment, and the task of composition assessment depends on an interaction between each student and his or her teacher. This suggests that relationships between the curriculum, the student, and the teacher are important in this area of music education. Strong preference for assessments which encourage students in composition enterprises is evident, with positive feedback preferred. Respondents consider a process diary offers opportunity for teachers to reward effort, regardless of the outcome of a composition. Contradictory opinions on the effectiveness of a
process diary to provide accurate assessments for composition outcomes, however, were
evident. Data in the previous section were both quantitative and qualitative and results from
one data type were corroborated and confirmed by the other. This suggests that results reflect
respondents' opinions accurately. The third section of Chapter 4, which reports results which
respond to Research Question 1(ii), follows.

4.3: Research question 1(ii)

Research Question 1

- In teaching composition to senior students in NSW secondary schools, what do
  secondary music teachers report are their:
    i) assessment strategies, and
    ii) assessment criteria?

This section reports and interprets IMCAI data which responds to Research Question 1(ii) in
which criteria respondents used to assess compositions are investigated. In this response,
data from only one IMCAI Question 12 are used. Question 12 comprised twelve criteria
identified as prominent in literature, and described earlier in Chapter 3, pp. 78-79, to
respondents for their consideration. These are: originality; ability to use technology;
possibility for success beyond the classroom; success of the piece as a composition judged on
a personal response; success of the piece as a composition judged on a set of criteria;
synthesis of musical concepts; confidence in handling musical processes eg. development,
variation; use of techniques/skills eg appropriate rhythmic treatment; ability to use music
concepts correctly eg idiomatic writing for instruments; knowledge of conventions eg correct
vocal and instrument range, notation; modelling an existing piece of music; and authentic use
of a musical style.

Respondents were asked to nominate how important each criterion was for composition
assessment by responding to them using a five-point Likert scale. Categories in the scale
represent the following: 1=extremely important; 2=very important; 3=of some importance;
4=of little importance; and 5=of no importance. Table 18 shows the comparative importance
of each of the twelve criteria presented for respondents' consideration in the final assessment
of senior student compositions. Variables are presented in order of magnitude from the most
important to the least important. To facilitate interpretation of Table 18, the five preferences have been contracted to three columns.

Table 18

*Frequencies, percentages, and ranking of criteria used in composition assessment (IMCAI, Q.12)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Criteria</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Of some importance</th>
<th>Of little importance</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Concepts</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conventions</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set of criteria</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal response</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of a template</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Success beyond c/r</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ranking of criteria in Table 18 shows the comparative importance which respondents placed on each individual criterion. Craftsmanship criteria were shown to be important in respondents’ assessments, and were placed in the top ranks. Originality is the single divergent criterion in the first six preferred by respondents for composition assessments. The other five criteria in the first six suggested that respondents indicated they value demonstration of the following as the most important in assessing compositions at the senior secondary level: the use of techniques and skills, for example appropriate rhythmic treatment; confidence in handling musical processes, for example development, variation; synthesis of music concepts; ability to use musical concepts correctly, for example idiomatic writing for instruments; and knowledge of conventions, for example correct vocal and instrument range, and correct notation. Using a ‘set of criteria’ and ‘style’ appear less valuable than craftsmanship variables, but these criteria are of some importance in assessment. The latter four criteria are of little importance in respondents’ answers.
Respondents added further comments \((N=51)\) to assessment criteria. There were two groups of comments. Features of these comments were the discussion of identified criteria in Table 18 list \((N=32)\), and identification of other criteria not included in the list \((N=19)\). Each group of comments will be described separately, commencing with listed criteria.

In discussing criteria listed in Table 18, respondents \((N=32)\) explained why they considered some criteria were more important than others. No comments were made about 'techniques' and 'processes'. Three comments each discussed 'originality', 'use of a template', and 'style'. Originality was considered difficult to achieve at secondary school level where imitation often results from learning opportunities. Respondents indicated that as considerable learning in composition is generated from study of pre-existing music, some imitation of stylistic characteristics is to be expected. As a consequence, student compositions which reflect characteristics perceived as derivative from other music, suffer little penalty in their assessments. Using a template, or modelling, was considered appropriate in assessment of certain composition tasks (especially those in Year 11), and was dependent on the initial task setting. There was diversity in comments appropriate to 'style'. Generally, style was identified as specific to a course, topic, or task. Consistency of the style within a composed piece was expected.

Three comments described how 'technology', 'success beyond the classroom', and 'synthesis' were each used as assessment criteria. 'Technology' and 'success beyond the classroom' were criteria which were of little support to respondents in composition assessment. Strong relationships were reported between technology and style, but no extra merit was awarded to students who used technology in composing. 'Success beyond the classroom' was of little consequence in assessment at secondary school level. Comments which described 'synthesis' as an assessment criterion reflected confusion in the interpretation of this term with regard to composing. For example, one comment suggested that 'synthesis' implied different criteria were used at different stages of the developmental process, and another that criteria were the results of negotiations between the teacher and the individual student or class. Single comments described all other listed criteria. Sample comments are provided below to exemplify the above summary:

- Ability to use music concepts etc is important if the student is a serious composer for HSC. Otherwise mine mostly write songs because most are vocal students. They understand their own vocal range because they mostly tape the results.
In composition, it is essential that the score contain all musical details necessary for the adequate preparation of a performance according to the accepted convention of media and style.

What is original with the child is not necessarily original with the culture.

As long as their style is consistent throughout the piece.

Depends on the nature of the task. I give a variety of tasks, some are exercises to develop a particular skill, ranging to completely free.

HSC has nothing to do with the hereafter. I can rarely predict the future - particularly for composers.

Comments which elaborated on the criteria presented in Table 18 were described above. Other comments (N=19) provided additional criteria not identified in the survey. Additional criteria which respondents identified and which they considered important in assessments of senior student composition were: intuition, process, and compliance with task descriptors.

The first comment below discusses intuition. Three other respondents strongly suggested process must be considered in assessment of a final assessment of student music composition. The second comment describes this concern. Assessment through compliance with task requirements was identified in thirteen responses. The third excerpt below describes a strong link between the creative impulse, composition design, and assessment criteria:

- All of this is also judged on intuition. I have seen several unique HSC compositions do poorly due to lack of creativity in examiners.
- Again process must be served so that the integrity of the whole has a traceable, logical continuum. The pupil's arrival is planned, deliberate and not accidental or technologically created.
- Presentation of score, sound recording, time length, fitting the piece to the style/topic suggested.

Other comments in this category discussed the relationship between assessment and task description and indicated that a number of variables inherent in task descriptors determined which criteria were used in assessment of composition. Task descriptors were dependent on course of study, student ability, style, topic, and on the purpose of the task.

Comments indicated respondents use assessment criteria differently for the different music courses students undertake in senior school music. The first three comments below suggest 2 Unit Course 1 candidates are assessed differently due to student ability levels. Two supplementary comments quoted below similarly indicated that composition assessment often differed according to the topic studied within a course:

- Most students aren't at this standard in the Course 1 class, but the principles are important.
- Most composition work is a very elementary level.
- Having mainly 2 Unit 1 candidates, their level of sophistication is generally limited although occasionally experienced highly trained musicians do come through the course.
- If 2 Unit Elective as opposed to mandatory topic would answer the questions differently.
- I can't really answer for all composition exercises. If I have asked for a scherzo in the style of Beethoven, then originality and ability to use technology are of much use in assessment.
whereas the last four criteria are of enormous importance. Criteria vary greatly depending on the nature of the task.

Quantitative and qualitative data in the third section of Chapter 4 above reported on criteria used by respondents in assessing senior student compositions. The report identified, and evaluated the importance of all criteria which respondents use in final assessments of compositions written by senior secondary students. In interpreting results, the most important criteria are those which relate to demonstration of musical knowledge and skill acquisition. Respondents attempt to avoid reacting subjectively, and prefer to assess pieces by examination of individual musical features. Non-original ideas are tolerated, and respondents generally accept that students will imitate musical features of other composers. Assessment criteria change in keeping with the purpose of prescribed tasks, and with student ability.

Comments which addressed extra criteria not included in the Table 18 list suggested there was a strong link between assessment and a systematic approach to composition through methodical classroom instruction. Results from this section were used to structure the research experiment, which is reported in Chapter 5. Cross-tabulations, presented in the final section of this chapter, between Table 19 variables with 'impression' and 'checklist' variables in Question 11 suggest that these two procedures are important in composition assessments at the senior secondary level. These cross-tabulations further imply that respondents use a variety of ways to assess senior student compositions. These are further discussed in the final part of Chapter 4. The following discussion concludes this section of Chapter 4.

Discussion
The above section presented, and provided preliminary interpretation of data which responded to Research Question 1(ii). IMCAI Question 12 provided data for this. Data show the criteria which respondents indicate are important in assessing senior student compositions, and the comparative importance of each. Craftsmanship criteria were concerned with a variety of abilities which could demonstrate knowledge, skills, techniques and conventions in music through composition. Originality was equally valued with these craftsmanship criteria, although it was generally accepted that musicians at the senior secondary level would incorporate ideas learnt from observing other composers' writing in their pieces. Style, according to respondents, although not the highest priority, should be consistent within a composition. Additional criteria recommended as valuable in composition assessments were
integration of assessment with task design, process assessment, and a teacher's intuition. Criteria identified here as important are further investigated in the experiment which is reported in Chapter 5. The section to follow responds to Research Question 2.

4.4: Research question 2

Research Question 2

- What is the extent of the relationship between secondary music teachers' pedagogy in composition and their assessments of composition in NSW senior secondary classes?

Earlier sections of this chapter reported and interpreted data in the Respondent Sample Profile and data which investigated respondents' assessment strategies and criteria. This section reports data from two IMCAI questions which respond to Research Question 2, concerned with the extent of the relationship between assessment, composition pedagogy, and music education in general. In addition, cross-tabulations show IMCAI variables which may have some influence on teachers in their senior composition assessments. Data from Question 8, Question 10, and results from cross-tabulations are reported in response to Research Question 2.

Influence of assessment changes on pedagogy

Question 8 investigated if respondents had adjusted their teaching practices in secondary music classes (Years 7 to 12) since 1994 when mandatory composition was introduced in the 2 Unit (Common) Music course (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a). Data from this question show if and how changes had occurred in senior classes and junior classes. Table 29 shows if respondents had made adjustments to their teaching practices, the frequencies of identified adjustments, and the secondary school level at which adjustments were made for senior secondary classes (Years 11 and 12) and junior secondary classes (Years 7 to 10).

Results for senior secondary classes showed over half ($N=129; 57\%$) the respondents had made adjustments to teaching practice since 1994. There were some respondents ($N=48; 21\%$) who indicated they had made no changes to teaching practices since 1994. While a small number of respondents failed to answer ($N=9; 4\%$), there were other respondents who
were ineligible to respond. Many of these explained they were in the early years of teaching and/or had not taught classes at that level in the prescribed period.

Table 19
Frequency of respondents' adjustments to music pedagogy in secondary music classes (IMCAI, Q.8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classes</th>
<th>Yes (N)</th>
<th>No (N)</th>
<th>Not Applicable (N)</th>
<th>No Response (N)</th>
<th>Total (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior secondary</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior secondary</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results for junior secondary classes showed similar responses to those found in senior secondary classes, with similar numbers of respondents adjusting teaching practices since 1994 (N=129; 57%). Slightly more respondents had not made any changes in their junior secondary teaching practice than were found in senior secondary classes, and a similar number of respondents found they were ineligible to respond (N=12; 5%). Those respondents for whom the question was inapplicable explained they had not taught in secondary schools in NSW before 1994 and so comparisons with events prior to that time were not possible. A small number explained they had not been allocated classes in the junior secondary school.

The one hundred and twenty-nine respondents who indicated they had made adjustments in teaching practice since 1994 in Table 19, and others who had not made adjustments, were compared to ascertain whether the two totals consisted of the same respondents. Results showed that while a majority of respondents (N=135; 59%) answered similarly for both the 'Senior Secondary' and 'Junior Secondary' categories with either 'yes' or 'no' in both categories, a number of respondents (N=55; 24%) answered differently in both 'Senior Secondary' and 'Junior Secondary' categories.

Many respondents added further details to explain what changes they had made to teaching practices in senior secondary and junior secondary classes since mandatory composition was
introduced in the 2 Unit (Common) syllabus (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a). There were some comments (N=9), however, which explained no adjustments to teaching practices were necessary as composition strategies were already in place prior to 1994. One respondent, who indicated no adjustments had been made in recent years, commented that her students had always composed. Others noted that changes were wide ranging and applied to many elements of the teaching environment including teaching strategies, resources, programmes, composition skills, classroom techniques, and assessment. Although changes were identified in all elements in both senior secondary and junior secondary classes, there was a difference in the degree of importance placed on different elements by respondents in the two categories.

Some trends, problems, and issues emerge in the details which are described below. Evident in trends is an awareness of the importance of composition, and a need to support composition teaching with appropriate strategies. Initiatives had been implemented by some respondents to ensure that students have adequate access to composition learning opportunities. In addressing composition issues, the greatest focus was in senior classes, which reflects syllabus changes introduced in the senior secondary school in 1994 (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a). Changes in the senior curriculum appeared to influence pedagogy which respondents used in the junior curriculum. In Mandatory classes (Years 7 and 8), and Additional courses (Years 9 and 10), a broad approach to many styles and genres was utilised in composition by experimentation and a broad listening repertoire. At senior level, the predominant musicological focus was on art music, especially Australian art music, which reflected the mandatory topic in the syllabus. A strong relationship between composition and musicology was evident in pedagogy in senior and junior curricula. Of less importance was a relationship between composition and performance, particularly in the senior school. While an overarching strategy for teaching, learning, and assessing in composition could be discerned from responses, implementation by many individual teachers was fragmentary. Additionally, the emphasis on the relationship between musicology and composition would suggest that this strategy does not offer the full potential for composition as a pedagogical tool as suggested in literature in children's composing (especially in the writings of Gill, 1970; and van Ernst, 1993a) discussed in Chapter 1 and 2.

The following analysis provides details of comments which report how respondents have changed teaching practices. Most respondents provided more than one detail, and numerical
and percentage identification of comments shows the comparative significance of each component. Reporting of senior and junior teaching adjustments is conducted separately.

**Changes in senior music education**

In senior music classes since 1994 changes are grouped in different categories: awareness, resources, programming, content, classroom practices, assessment practices, and assessment strategies. Numerical indicators, and descriptions of comments in each category, assist in determining the value that NSW secondary music teachers place on composition assessment in the senior school.

In reporting how respondents have made changes to pedagogy in senior classes in 1994, respondents \(N=20; 8\%\) provided statements which acknowledged an increased awareness of composition since the advent of the 1994 syllabus (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a). Some respondents stated they simply conformed with syllabus requirements in the final year of school, as described by:

- Only in relationship to the differing requirements of teaching post 1970 music composition topic.

There were many contrasting comments which implied that composition had been accorded greater status in all senior school music classes and one respondent commented that innovations in syllabus requirements reflected a 'continuous evolution' of music teaching. Others suggested a shift in thinking on the role of composition, as shown in:

- I place greater emphasis on the need to compose as part of all courses.
- A heightened awareness of composition in my teaching.
- I used to avoid (composition) but now begin early.

Three respondents had been motivated to explore practices which facilitated teaching composition in music classes. They had experimented with or:

- Read up on strategies for teaching composition and discussed and sought advice.

A small number of teachers \(N=6; 3\%\) indicated that teaching composition was challenging. Three made reference to extra support required to teach less able students. One respondent found that more students deliberately chose 2 Unit Course 1 since the introduction of mandatory original composition in the 2 Unit (Common) course. The position of composition in the 2 Unit Course 1 course was optional, and was unlike 2 Unit (Common) music, where a submitted composition was mandatory from 1995. In 2 Unit Course 1 music, although
students were required to compose in class work to comply with mandatory guidelines, the onus for teachers to implement a pedagogical approach to composition was less of an imperative than in the former course. Two other comments provide the diversity of concerns some teachers have in teaching composition:

- I find it quite a bit more difficult as the possibilities are limitless giving students too much choice. Most teachers have not trained in teaching composition that demonstrates music 1970 onwards.
- Yes. One to one involvement. Greater workload for the teacher. Difficulty instructing non-AMEB students.

The relative merits of Board of Studies and the AMEB, which offered an alternative in music at HSC level until 1998 (NSW Board of Studies, 1996, p. 2) have been debated in literature over many decades (see for example, Bartle, 1968; Bridges, 1970; Comte, 1988; Covell, 1970). Covell wrote of the approach to harmony used in this system:

> When it (the AMEB) approaches composition (or at least the manipulation of notes on paper) it is through the shabbier, more stereotyped dodges of hymnbook harmony . . . it equips the student with little more than the equipment to add a shaky footnote to the superannuated idiom of Hymns Ancient and Modern.

(Covell, 1970, p. 144)

The respondent comment relating to the AMEB system above suggests that the pedagogical approach to composition by this respondent may have changed little from that which was used prior to the 1994 change in the 2 Unit (Common) music course.

Respondents ($N=28$; 11%) provided details of resources which they had acquired since 1994 for use in senior secondary music classes, which included employing specialist staff for teaching composition. Eight of these had made changes to staffing and timetabling allocations to meet new requirements in senior classes. This showed that in some cases syllabus change had influenced school organisation. One respondent taught at a school which had introduced a new position in 1995 as Director of Composition, who 'teaches a coordinated senior composition class'. Four respondents taught in schools which employed composers to act as tutors to students and provide support to music staff. Three respondents had time-tabled special composition classes into the senior program, which were 'usually topic or concept based'.

Respondents ($N=17$; 7%) identified an increase in technology and other resources as adjustments which had been made to teaching practice. Most respondents answered briefly with 'technology important', 'use of computer' and 'synthesizer' while others qualified their
statements simply with the word 'more'. Software packages which teachers identified were Cubase, Finale, Music Time and Notator Logic. Two comments provided descriptions identifying the use of MIDI, sequencing, and multi-track recording. Four respondents identified an increased use of audio, audio visual and printed material. Materials were audio (2MBS FM 'Encore' performances), audio visual ('Australian Women Composers' from the Australian Film Institute), and print (Distance Education resources, Music Industry Skills resources, Sydney Symphony Orchestra 'Meet the Music' kits). This demonstrated that syllabus change had encouraged the acquisition of teaching resources.

Respondents (N=56; 25%) demonstrated in their responses that they had made changes to programming in senior classes. Programming comments centred on changes in content. Respondents generally were 'more involved with twentieth century work', and many respondents showed an interest in recently composed pieces. The approach taken in studying twentieth century music emphasized stylistic understanding, as demonstrated in 'now focus on characteristics of style'. The main focus was directed towards 'art' music, although a few comments hinted that some respondents had broadened the area of study and styles. The following response suggests an attempt to approach composition from the student's ability:

- (I) changed content of musicology listening to include works that were accessible and related to students and their experience to lead onto composition.

Nine of the above subjects, however, were more focussed on Australian music. In these comments, integration between composition and musicology was a high priority. Nineteen other respondents suggested they had increased integration between composition and musicology. Two examples show analysis of techniques in pre-existing compositions is used to teach composition skills:

- I have focused a lot more on compositional analysis to understand the ways in which composers use musical concepts and why.
- Compositional techniques become more linked to musicology activities - study music from the viewpoint of the composer.

These latter examples suggest modelling was used to acquire and master composition skills. In modelling, relationships grow from analysis of pieces to develop an understanding of techniques, leading to transference of skills through practical exercises. While modelling was inferred in many responses, only one response acknowledged the practice explicitly.
Respondents provided details of changes they had made in teaching of skills which were required to facilitate student composition. Comments \((N=9; 4\%)\) described decreased training in harmony in senior classes. With the limited time available, respondents considered some rationalisation of previously taught harmony courses was necessary to allow for greater flexibility and a broader application than was previously required. Comments indicated that some respondents no longer taught four part harmony at all and now, 'focused on what kids needed.' Another respondent described the solution to difficulties with limited time and acquisition of skills in harmony:

- Well, four part writing went out the window. Students learn a wide variety of composition styles, but I don't think there's time for them to learn the basics of harmonic technique any more.

Few respondents \((N=6; 2\%)\) commented on notation in senior classes. Comments indicated that notation was now of more importance in their teaching and two suggested that more time was spent on this area.

Respondents provided details of changes made in classroom practice \((N=24; 10\%)\) since introduction of the 1994 syllabus change in the senior school. Practices reflect a diversity in personal teaching styles. Both heuristic and algorithmic practices were identified. Some teachers have more formal structure in lessons, and structure step by step tasks for composition processes. Other respondents indicated that they give senior secondary music students more opportunity to experiment or use open-ended assignments as part of the preparation for a final composition. Two comments identified the value of having students play their own work, by writing for instruments they play. Comments identified similar diversity in composition learning processes. 'Much more developmental tasks rather than short exercises', and 'more exercises in the development of ideas' contradicted other comments such as 'shorter exercises emulating a style which has been previously studied'. One respondent described the whole composition teaching process using integration with musicology and performance, modelling, and skill development:

- We begin by improvising, arranging etc. Focus on concepts of music-brief analyses and music listening of music with specific focus on concepts. Set various composition tasks eg. 8 bars long, 3 instruments, pentatonic (gradually progress from this). Experimentation with composition and synthesizer.
Contrasting classroom teaching methods showed that respondents understood the need to address composition issues, and individually were developing their own strategies to address these issues.

Changes to assessment practices were identified by a number of teachers ($N=25; 10\%$). Many comments were concerned with process diaries. Examinations requirements at the time of the research specify that a process diary must be kept as a record of work completed and that teachers were required to allocate marks to the process diary at HSC level (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, p. 36). Comments indicated that introduction of student process diaries had altered respondents' teaching practices. Respondents found a process diary assisted them in monitoring student progress and composition processes. Some respondents saw it as a way of encouraging students to develop thoughts and ideas, through regular updating. One teacher, whose students had always composed original composition, found that the process diary was the only change that had been made in senior teaching practice:

- (I have) developed an awareness of the need for collecting material for the process diary.

Two respondents had introduced process diaries in the Preliminary Course (Year 11). This approach to assessment diaries reinforces their role in learning, as suggested earlier in this chapter (pp. 139-142). It is interesting to note that the above comments omitted reference to the use of process diaries in supporting assessment.

Some respondents had changed formative assessment strategies ($N=6; 2\%$). Formative assessment strategies included class evaluation and self monitoring of work, with one teacher using 'constant reappraisal'. A different respondent suggested 'more effective' writing could be achieved through on-going assessment, and another had developed a broader program across all classes:

- I run a school composition competition for whole school, Year 7 through to Year 12 and employ professional composers to adjudicate. Each school year provides us with a full concert – 25 performances (25 entrants).

This innovative program showed how performance and composition can be effectively integrated.

Descriptions of qualitative data above, show that half of all IMCAI respondents had made adjustments to music teaching practices in all aspects of their senior secondary classes in
response to the change in syllabus in 1994. Also evident in responses was that the same changes influenced classroom practices earlier in the secondary school. Descriptions of qualitative data below show what changes IMCAI respondents had made, and the frequency of identified changes.

Changes in junior music education

Even though the change which occurred in 1994 was mandatory only in the senior curriculum, results which follow show that implications of change had an impact on the total secondary curriculum. It was explained by several respondents that by implementing composition practices in junior classes which aligned with the senior curriculum, students would be better prepared, have greater experience and understanding, and therefore achieve greater success in their compositions when they progressed to the senior school. The following section reports and interprets data which shows changes which respondents indicated they had made in pedagogy in junior music classes since 1994. Areas in which change had been made by respondents are awareness of composition in the curriculum, programming, notation, content, classroom practices, and assessment strategies. Differences and similarities between the changes in senior school music and the junior school are identified. Numerical indicators, and descriptions of comments in each category, assist in determining the value that NSW secondary music teachers place on composition assessment throughout the secondary curriculum.

Many respondents \((N=52; 20\%)\) confirmed they had a stronger awareness of composition in junior secondary classes since 1994. More than half these comments were brief, abstract and offered a comparison with previous practice. These use quantitative comparisons such as 'more' to preface one of the following: 'composition', 'emphasis on composition', 'encouragement to compose', 'focus on composition', and 'freedom to compose'. A single comment claimed student needs in composition at HSC level as the reason for including composition in junior classes. Although this comment was not directly concerned with the influence of 2U (Common) music, it does show how the respondent identified the importance of early training in composition for later success:

- I have introduced changes because of problems students have undertaking original composition in 2 Unit Course 1.
An increase in the use of technology was identified in junior classes since 1994. Fewer respondents \((N=10; 4\%)\) referred to increasing use of technology in comparison with senior classes. Although the use of technology is not mandatory in syllabus documents (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, 1995b) the use of technology in music classes is strongly recommended. Respondents commented on 'using computer software' or an increase in the amount of both hardware and software available for use. Two respondents had installed keyboard laboratories in music departments to expand composition opportunities for all students.

Respondents \((N=38; 12\%)\) demonstrated that adjustments had been made in programming in junior classes since 1994, especially in content and integration of dimensions of the music curriculum. Programming again centred on content which some respondents had expanded to include a wider variety of musical styles. Identified styles, or categories, were - African, popular, rock, jazz and Australian music.

Integration, and changes in programs to accommodate its use, were not identified in junior music classes as frequently as in senior classes. Some evidence of inter-dependence between composition and musicology was demonstrated and to a lesser degree between composition, musicology and performance. For example, one respondent used composition as an extension of aural, instrumental and musicology activities while a second respondent stated that each lesson contained some aspect of composition. In contrast, many respondents taught composition as a separate entity. An example demonstrates this:

- I use composition as a learning tool for elementary skills more and more.

Respondents commented that changes to the teaching of composing skills in junior music classes were focussed on notation. Notation and music literacy were more important in junior classes than respondents stated in senior classes, with a greater number \((N=11; 5\%)\) expressing a renewed dedication to notation. Graphic notation \((N=4)\), notating computer scores \((N=1)\), conventional notation \((N=4)\), scoring, and sketching and mapping of composed and listening pieces, were mentioned. To some respondents the issue of notation was paramount:

- I still insist on rudiments otherwise students can complete HSC still unable to notate or read.

This respondent continued with the opinion that computer generated scores were a 'farce'. Three different comments suggest a strong music literacy commitment:
I introduce melody, rhythmic dictation earlier.
Gradually raising academic standard of junior classes.
I follow AMEB grades 1-4 for years 7-10.

Similar attitudes to harmony skills were reflected in junior music and senior music classes. Two responses show how a relaxation in harmony has been implemented in junior years:

- Less work on basic techniques of harmony (voicing, doubling etc have deteriorated in the new system) — time is a problem.
- I have virtually thrown out grammatical correctness. As long as they are writing something they can perform, I let them do it.

While both quotations do not denigrate the value of harmonic knowledge, a lower priority was given to traditional harmonic conventions.

Many respondents (N=36; 16%) indicated they had made adjustments in their junior classroom practices. Comments showed how respondents had implemented practical composition teaching activities. The diverse activities consisted of aleatoric composition, body percussion, chord structures, experimentation, improvisation, jingle writing, pop songs, set tasks, simple melodies and accompaniments, twelve bar blues patterns, and melody writing using chord patterns. Other details related to the frequency of activities. These details suggested composition activities were regularly used in all junior secondary classes in all Mandatory and Additional courses, and from the first lesson, or from Year 9. One respondent included composition work in all styles and topics covered in musicology studies.

Seven of the above comments provided in depth information on programming and methodical treatment of composition. One teacher had designed a sequential program from Year 7 to Year 10 and another aimed at developing individuality in student style in the Additional course (Years 9-10). One respondent set three composition tasks for students each term while one teacher gave a longer time span in the development of compositions. The opportunity for students to perform and hear their own work was identified as a recent innovation. A development of a more autonomous classroom was evident in one response:

- If they have a fresh idea we run with it. Some interesting results ensue.

Respondents (N=19; 8%) had adjusted assessment practices in junior classes. Most comments indicated that the introduction of process diaries in junior years was a recent innovation.
Some respondents ($N=6; 2\%$) provided information on assessment strategies they used in junior secondary classes. Two teachers reinforced syllabus guidelines where composition made up one third of assessment and others described submission of compositions related to topic areas, and peer assessment. A single comment demonstrates a relationship between composition process, teaching and assessment strategies:

- Over time I have consciously been making an effort to add more composition to my classes (to teach acceptable levels) . . . with Mandatory composition. I have begun to develop process diaries (in Year 9 and Year 10) and teaching them and myself how to compose, instead of just setting tasks and letting them go all the time.

Discussion

The above section described quantitative and qualitative data which indicated if respondents had made adjustments to senior secondary music curricula since changes in the 1994 syllabus had been mandated. Data showed that a only a minority had not been influenced by these changes. Influences on senior school pedagogy were to some extent predictable. However, the influences on junior music pedagogy showed an increasing awareness of developing skills in composition with students in early years of the curriculum. Changes respondents make encompass numerous aspects of pedagogy. Some are dramatic, and impact on school organisation. Most are concerned with classroom implementation. Common among all responses to this question was an awareness of, and a need to accommodate change for the benefit of student learning. Whether a conscious or intuitive reaction to curricular change, respondents' pedagogical adjustments suggest that assessment in the form of final examination influences the way secondary music teachers approach teaching and learning in composition. The section to follow examines respondents' views on the purposes of assessing senior compositions.

The purpose of assessment

This section reports and provides a preliminary interpretation of data from Question 10, which asked respondents to indicate what they considered was the purpose of assessing compositions at senior secondary level. Responses had a wide spectrum of viewpoints, and many of them provided comments which showed that they considered there were many purposes for assessing compositions at this level. Comments which address more than one
purpose were divided into separate components for reporting. Table 20 shows the frequency of comments by purposes of composition assessment in respondents' senior secondary classes.

Data in Table 20 show three classes of responses. These are formative assessment, summative assessment, and evaluative assessment. Formative assessments are those identified as on-going throughout composition processes, and were described in Chapter 2, in the review of related literature (pp. 23-25). Summative are those identified after completion of compositions, or for allocating grades at times during assessment processes, and were similarly described earlier in this thesis (pp. 22-23). Evaluative assessments are those which illuminated teaching and learning from composition results, and were described on pages 25-27.

Table 20

*Frequency of comments for purposes of composition assessment (IMCAI, Q.10)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes of Composition Assessment</th>
<th>Numbers of Comments</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Formative Purposes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incubate</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set goals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self evaluate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summative Purposes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm authenticity</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet requirements</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluative Purposes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate student learning</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate teaching</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>376</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Comments in the first assessment class, formative assessment, indicated that assessment was
directed at supporting students throughout the composition process. Different types of
formative assessment targeted a number of purposes. These were to: develop compositions
(N=80; 21%), motivate students (N=20; 5%), incubate ideas (N=15; 4%), refine completed
compositions (N=11; 3%), set goals (N=7; 2%), and encourage students in self-evaluation
(N=7; 2%).

The first purpose of composition assessment, described by a large number of respondents, was
to help students in the development of a composition (N=80; 21%). The section to follow
describes different ways compositions were developed through assessment and provides clues
to the link between assessment and pedagogy. In the following descriptions, titles nominated
in Table 20 are presented with percentages, and numerically, while sub-components of these
titles are listed numerically only. Strong teacher support to students was evident in responses,
with commendation provided for success, and careful diagnosis of perceived flaws and
suggestions for progress. Positive feedback in environments which implied a confident and
sensitive relationship between students and teachers were commonly described. Terms used
by respondents to describe assessment purposes in the developmental stages of composition,
showed that assessment gave support to composition learning. Terms, listed in descending
order of their occurrence in responses, were: give feedback (N=18); guide (N=18); develop
(N=13); improve (N=12); assist (N=4); identify strengths/weaknesses (N=4); direct (N=3);
and advise (N=2).

Providing feedback was an important purpose of composition assessment. Feedback required
communication from teacher to student after observation of a progressing product. Feedback
reinforced positive aspects related to the product in the following: 'compositional skills and
processes', 'creative process', 'progress', 'to expand/develop on ideas', and 'to the student'.
Respondents stated feedback was always important and ongoing. A typical comment was:

* The purpose of assessment is to give feedback to the student on how they are progressing.

Feedback was used together with other formative responses, with many suggesting that
nurturing the student during the process would assist with continuity as compositions
progress. The following examples both mention the terms 'feedback' and 'develop' similarly:

* Give students feedback on strength/weaknesses of composing techniques. Suggest ways of
developing a piece.
• Provide the student with feedback and guidelines for developing their compositional skills.

Assessment practices supported development of compositions by guiding students. The term 'guide' was used to preface these comments: 'accepted practice - what works and doesn't work', 'compositional devices', 'composition development', 'compositional process', 'composition skills', 'instrument ranges', 'levels of achievement', 'mastery of skills', 'new avenues for development', 'originality', 'product', 'students', and 'talent'. A typical response related to guidance was:

• To guide students in accepted practices or what seems to work or doesn't work.

Respondents indicated that guidance involved a teacher in on-going discussion with groups of students or individual students.

Other respondents used the term 'develop' to explain the purpose of composition assessment. In 'developing' products, however, a stronger onus was on teachers to solve composition problems than was evident in 'guiding'. In explaining how and where development occurred, the following were named: 'ability to express themselves', 'basic skills and concepts', 'composition skills via analysis of processes', 'consistency in stylistic language', 'good control of structure', 'ideas', and 'student composition'. Development of composition through reinforcement of positive values was evident in many comments. For example:

• The purpose of assessment is to enable students to develop their own composition ideas from having gained feedback - i.e. if it only says you can't compose, it has not been a useful learning tool.

Another formative purpose categorised under development which respondents suggested for assessing compositions was to 'improve' a composition. Twelve respondents mentioned 'improve' and four others commented on identifying 'strengths and weaknesses'. One response commented this would occur 'before the composition is completed'. Three examples show how assessment supports composition teaching:

• Indicate how the students could improve their composition.
• To give the students an idea of their strengths and weaknesses.
• To provide feedback to them and suggest ways to improve and expand on their ideas.

A small number of responses used the term 'direct' in relation to the purpose of assessment. Suggesting a more autocratic approach, two respondents stated that the purpose of assessment was 'to give directions' and another 'to try to direct while they're writing'. The third
application of the term was less authoritarian in that there was consideration of the student's input, with:

- To assist in taking existing (present) techniques and directing that technique toward developing each student's creative output and originality.

While the development of a composition was the most mentioned purpose, other formative purposes were identified. Twenty respondents \( (N=20; 5\%) \) identified motivation as a purpose for assessment of musical composition. Motivation was of an emotional level and replies were unspecific and unrelated to actual classroom experiences. Five comments briefly referred to 'challenge', 'give self confidence', 'inspire', and 'stimulate' as motivating experiences. Eight responses were more specific in how to apply motivation and used 'encourage' with one of the following: 'a creative process', 'confidence and extension', 'students', 'students to continue', and 'use of notation'. Three responses indicated that assessment encouraged 'effort'. One response provided a more practical description:

- To encourage students to explore sound sources in a wide variety of genres and areas they are interested in.

A third purpose of on-going assessment was to support initial stages of compositions \( (N=15; 4\%) \). These comments indicated that the purpose of assessment was to generate ideas, 'explore', 'experiment', 'foster imagination', 'organise thoughts', and 'select suitable genres'. Two comments used 'find' as in 'find a starting block' and 'find/determine ability and capabilities and channel into creative input'. Another comment was less optimistic of success: 'try to harness musical ideas'. The following comment explores assessment strategies and techniques in the beginning phase of composition development:

- Composition is a process not an outcome only. The majority of pupils experience considerable difficulty in working out/refining initial ideas. Direction on techniques is essential for progress.

While the above reasons for formative assessments were to support early and on-going progress in composition writing, a fourth purpose was identified as appropriate to the entirety of a composition's construction. Eleven respondents (3%) considered the purpose of assessment was to complete the whole composition, from goal setting through motivation, incubation, development, and improvement. Assessment was considered a progressive, constant process requiring discussion with a student using techniques such as - editing, revising, refining and often re-writing before completion of a final draft. Assessment provides stimulus in the example below:
• To help clarify composition process and give direction to the student in the development of the composition. Many compositions are re-used or re-worked into another composition so feedback is always important.

Another response suggested the completion of a first draft is only a step in the direction towards completion:

• Seen as part of the development of a composition, a point at which you consider/discuss/evaluate the composition and then move on to further develop/change it, as necessary.

Setting goals was yet another identified purpose for composition assessment and seven comments (2%) identified this purpose. One response said this was 'brief' and was used as a target for students to 'achieve and grow through'. Similar responses found assessment provided a 'yard-stick' by which a student can measure progress and musical development, and a 'bench-mark':

• To give students a bench mark for their progress and to give students ideas for standards re HSC.

Another respondent used comparisons between student compositions and other published works as a goal and two comments referred to leading students to achieving personal goals.

A final purpose of assessment conducted as on-going in composition processes was to encourage students to self-evaluate their progress. Some responses (N=7; 2%) indicated that students can develop to a level where they accept responsibility for their own learning, find their own direction, and achieve a musical maturity which encourages self criticism through assessment. Comments suggested that students could 'self assess' and could be trained to be self-critical, and monitor their own understanding of the process. Three examples demonstrate self evaluation concepts:

• (Self evaluation) made students consider their work objectively,
• A process of self-evaluating and perfecting a work till the best for that student is achieved, and
• To provide a forum for (self and group) evaluation.

Results from composition assessment purposes grouped in the formative category show that respondents considered that on-going assessment functioned as part of the teaching process, and that assessment was a pedagogical strategy. This would suggest that respondents use assessment as a functional part of composition pedagogy. The next section reports the second category of composition assessment purposes which were shown in Table 20. These are summative purposes.
The second group of responses in Table 20 showed that many respondents \( (N=163; \ 43\%) \) considered there were different purposes for assessment conducted after the completion of a composition, or on occasions throughout the course of a composition task. These were summative purposes used traditionally in education to grade, rank, and report student formally on achievement. Cartwright considered summative assessments were at the 'hard' end of the assessment spectrum and at the opposite pole to those which were described above as formative, or 'soft' assessments (Cartwright, 1989, p. 285). All titles identified under summative purposes implied another aspect of pedagogy which was different from pedagogical implication in earlier formative assessments. Pedagogy associated with summative assessment suggested that teachers were accountable for student outcomes, and their responsibilities were important in ensuring that defined composition parameters were demonstrated by students' compositions. Different purposes identified by respondents, listed in decreasing order of their occurrence in responses, were to 'grade' \( (N=51; \ 14\%) \), 'supervise' \( (N=44; \ 12\%) \), 'confirm authenticity' \( (N=30; \ 8\%) \), 'meet Board of Studies requirements' \( (N=29; \ 7\%) \), and 'rank' \( (N=9; \ 2\%) \). Each of these purposes will be described separately, and numerical descriptors accompany components of the named summative assessment categories.

The most common purpose for summative assessment of compositions was to 'grade' compositions. Such assessments were conducted either at points during the composition process or on completion of a composition. Few respondents \( (N=4) \) commented that grading took place 'at various stages of the composition'. The purpose here was to 'ascertain the development standard', and 'measure student progress'. The largest number of respondents who indicated they used assessment for grading purposes commented on the final product. Terms used were: 'appraise', 'gauge', 'give opinion on success', 'grade task', 'measure', and 'quantify value'. Teachers followed the grading term with one of the following values: 'ability', 'ability to complete and present the composition', 'concepts', 'development of harmonic/melodic material', 'effort', 'end result', 'music skills', 'musical effectiveness of the end product', 'progress', 'success', 'talent', and 'understanding and treatment of concepts'.

A second purpose for assessment of compositions on their completion was one of accountability. This purpose was to ensure that compositions were the students' work and that they were completed in accordance with course or task requirements. Responses \( (N=44; \ 12\%) \) which were in this category demonstrated little interaction with students and a stronger
emphasis on observation of student work, with the following terms used: 'check', 'ensure', 'make sure', 'monitor', and 'supervise', 'see', 'observe', 'determine', 'examine', 'identify', 'realize', 'reflect on', 'verify', and 'view'. A majority (N=23) of these respondents referred to keeping work 'on task' and 'on track', or 'meeting deadlines'. Comments focused on application of concepts or demonstration of skills, style, successful use of musical processes and techniques, and topic characteristics. Four respondents were concerned with 'sound' (N=2) and 'manuscript' (N=2). The following examples show respondents' concerns for both features:

- To ensure their work is playable and pleasing to the ear.
- To make it look professional - fine detail is most important.
- To see if the student has used structure, tonality, a good combination of tone colours in the performing media, innovative harmony and rhythm, a good balance of unity and variety etc.

Some respondents considered the purpose of assessment was to assure that a composition was an original piece of student work. Seven responses were concerned with authenticating the piece as original student work. One statement represents all of these:

- To make sure the student doesn't submit something that is not original.

The above purposes emphasised that grading, supervising, and authenticating were priorities for composition assessment for some respondents. Another summative purpose was stated by many respondents (N=29; 7%). This was to meet requirements in courses. Two responses implied a negative attitude towards mandatory requirements as required by the Board of Studies. The second remark with this views the Board of Studies as intrusive into the learning process:

- To give the Board something to justify its position.
- Providing the piece is performable and shows integrity and genuine thought and logical progression, assessment is merely a BOS tool and not an educational tool.

Ranking was the final purpose of composition assessments which was identified by a number of respondents (N=29; 7%). One respondent explained:

- To provide accurate discrimination between students and accurate ranking.

The above responses showed what purpose aspects of formative and summative assessments of senior music compositions served in the curriculum. One other class of assessment was presented in responses. Many respondents to this question of the survey took a broader view on the purpose of assessment of composition. In these comments, the composition itself appeared to be of secondary importance to a more fundamental purpose. This was evaluative
assessment. In this type of assessment a composition acted as a means to show other factors, which were teaching and learning outcomes. Seven respondents used assessment to evaluate the success or otherwise of teaching methods and strategies. Two other responses commented that assessment 'helps' teachers to understand the student, their use of musical processes and understanding concepts. The comment below reinforces a dependence on assessment for evaluation of the level of success of teaching strategies:

- For my own peace of mind - so I know where they are at, and there's no last minute panic (well, that's the aim).

Sixty-six comments (18%) suggested the purpose of assessment of composition was to determine student learning outcomes, which was to validate teaching pedagogy. Some of these comments (N=15), use the term 'assess' to further describe how this occurred. The following example shows this feature:

- To assess (sic) if students have extended the writing capabilities through practice of those techniques they are made aware of through studying other work and by experimentation with the limits of the instrument and ability.

All identified student learning outcome responses were itemised and are listed in decreasing order of usage: 'skills' (N=16), 'understanding' (N=14), 'concepts' (N=13), 'process' (N=9), 'notation' (N=5), 'progress' (N=4), 'style' (N=5), 'techniques' (N=3). Single references were made to 'effort', 'problem solving', and 'vocabulary'. Six respondents gave consideration to 'creativity'. Many responses integrated many of the above learning outcomes. For example:

- To demonstrate an understanding of and ability to manipulate the elements of a particular style/type of music. To demonstrate a knowledge of notation and theory in general.

The above data presentation described respondents' views from summative and evaluative assessments of senior compositions on the purpose of assessments. Interpretation of the wide range of views suggested that respondents were not in complete accord on this aspect of their work. Most important, however, was that they considered themselves accountable for the performance of their students in completing composition tasks successfully. Responses from evaluative comments further demonstrated teachers' personal accountability in student composition learning and in the wider context of the complete curriculum. The section to follow presents results of cross-tabulation between survey variables.
Cross-tabulations between variables

This is the final section in Chapter 4 and is the third which investigates respondents' views on relationships between composition assessment, composition pedagogy, and music education. It reports on tests of inter-relationships between IMCAI variables and is presented in two parts. The first part tests relationships between independent variables related to the first eight questions of the survey, and dependent variables in the later IMCAI questions. The second part tests relationships between dependent variables. The purpose of this analysis is to confirm that respondents answered consistently throughout IMCAI, and to establish observable patterns of music teaching and assessment practice.

Nonparametric chi-square procedures were used in cross-tabulations to determine the relationships between all independent variables identified in the first eight questions of IMCAI, with other IMCAI independent and dependent variables. Levels of significance were set at $p=.05$. Due to the large numbers of relationships which were not statistically significant at this level, only correlations which are statistically significant are reported. These are shown in Table 21. The first column in Table 21 shows independent variables, and the second column shows the variable against which the first column is cross-tabulated. The third column gives information on the IMCAI source of both variables. Columns four and five provide chi-square results and $p$ values.

Two major outcomes can be observed by the significant cross-tabulations between IMCAI variables in Table 21. Of major significance is that respondents were consistent throughout the survey. Music teaching years of experience (IMCAI, Q1) showed significant cross-tabulations with five other variables. All were correlated with a $p$ value of <.05, and three of these had a $p$ value of <.001. The first two significant relationships cross-tabulated years of teaching music in NSW secondary schools (IMCAI, Q1) with teaching experience in different senior music courses (IMCAI, Q5). Both confirmed survey response validity as experience was matched with maturity as a classroom music teacher. In the first correlation, respondents in the first five years of practice correlated with respondents who had not taught 2U(Common) music course. Similarly, respondents who had taught sixteen years or more correlated with respondents who had taught 2 Unit (Common) Music since 1995. Results reflecting the same trend were found in post hoc cell contributions for respondents' years spent in teaching and 2U Course 1 and/or 3 Unit Music, with a composition component (IMCAI, Q5b)
### Table 21

**Significant chi-square statistics between IMCAI independent variables.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variable</th>
<th>Cross-tabulated variable</th>
<th>IMCAI items</th>
<th>Chi-square</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Music teaching yrs</td>
<td>HSC 2U (Common)</td>
<td>Q1/Q5(a)</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teaching yrs</td>
<td>HSC 2U C1/3U</td>
<td>Q1/Q5(b)</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>.0003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teaching yrs</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Q1/Q6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teaching yrs</td>
<td>Impression</td>
<td>Q1/Q11(b)</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teaching yrs</td>
<td>Personal response</td>
<td>Q1/Q12(d)</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>HSC 2U C1/3 Unit</td>
<td>Q2/Q5(b)</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Composer</td>
<td>Q2/Q6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>.0009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Composition context</td>
<td>Q2/Q6(a)</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>Q2/Q12 (a)</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC 2U (Common)</td>
<td>Music teacher - SS*</td>
<td>Q5(a)/11(o)</td>
<td>14.46</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC 2U (Common)</td>
<td>Music teacher - DS*</td>
<td>Q5(a)/11(p)</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC 2U (Common)</td>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td>Q5(a)/12(i)</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>.0008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC 2U (Common)</td>
<td>Conventions</td>
<td>Q5(a)/12(j)</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC 2U1/3U</td>
<td>Adjustment (STP)*</td>
<td>Q5(b)/8(a)</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC 2U1/3U</td>
<td>Impression</td>
<td>Q5(b)/11(b)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC 2U1/3U</td>
<td>Observation</td>
<td>Q5(b)/11(j)</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC 2U1/3U</td>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td>Q5(b)/12(i)</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SS= same school, DS= different school, STP = senior teaching practice

A reversal of this pattern is shown by post hoc cell contributions between respondents' music teaching years of experience (IMCAI, Q1) and respondents' self perceptions as composers (IMCAI, Q6). Here, respondents in the first five years of teaching also indicated they were composers. Conversely, more senior respondents in the categories of six to fifteen years of teaching experiences, or more than sixteen years, indicated they did not compose.

The second result in Table 21 cross-tabulations shows relationships between different variables which had an impact on composition assessments. Two significant cross-tabulations occurred between respondents' music teaching experience (IMCAI, Q1) and 'impression' assessment (IMCAI, Q11d), and music teaching experience and assessment made through a 'personal response' (IMCAI, Q12b). Post hoc cell contributions here identified stronger use of 'impression' assessment procedures by respondents with more than sixteen
years experience in music teaching, while less use of 'impression' assessment treatments was made by respondents in the first five years of music teaching. Cross-tabulations between respondents' music teaching experience with 'personal response' assessment criteria showed similar trends, with a comparative increase in the use of this criterion consistently evident with increasing years of experience.

Table 21 showed 'gender' was cross-tabulated at a significant level with four other variables. Of these, three showed a $p$ value of $<.01$. Of importance to Research Question 2 are cross-tabulations between 'gender' (IMCAI, Q2) and each respondent's self perceptions as a 'composer', and the 'composing context' within this variable (IMCAI, Q6). Post hoc cell contributions suggested males were strongly represented as self acknowledged composers, and female respondents were equally strongly represented as self acknowledged non-composers. In addition, greater numbers of male respondents were represented in 'publication' and 'community' composing contexts whereas female respondents had greater representation in 'education' and 'pre-service' composing contexts.

Of greater importance to Research Question 2 in observing respondents' opinions on relationships between senior composition assessment and music education pedagogy, were cross-tabulations between respondents who taught 2U (Common) Music at HSC level since 1994, with two assessment criteria. These were 'use of concepts' (IMCAI, Q12i), and 'knowledge of conventions' (IMCAI, Q12j). The former cross-tabulation implies teachers with experience in this course considered the 'use of concepts' were important as an assessment criterion. Further discussion of reasons for this cross-tabulation between these two variables is included in Chapter 6. Conversely, respondents with no experience in teaching 2 Unit (Common) Music since 1994 found this criterion of less importance.

The above showed significant cross-tabulations between independent IMCAI variables. Chi-square statistics were again used in cross-tabulations to determine the relationships between variables in IMCAI Questions 11 to 13. Especially important in responding to Research Question 2 were cross-tabulations between assessment procedures in Question 11 and assessment criteria in Question 12. These are shown in Table 22. Of interest for implications which respond to Research Question 2 are significant cross-tabulations for two variables. These were for two assessment procedures, which were 'impression' and a 'set of criteria'.
Results suggest that these procedures are both used in senior composition assessment by a majority of teachers.

Table 22

Significant chi square statistics between IMCAI composition assessment variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent variable</th>
<th>Correlated variable</th>
<th>IMCAI identification</th>
<th>Chi square</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raw mark</td>
<td>Synthesis of concepts</td>
<td>Q11a/Q12f</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raw mark</td>
<td>Use of concepts</td>
<td>Q11a/Q12l</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression</td>
<td>Personal response</td>
<td>Q11b/Q12d</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression</td>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>Q11b/Q12g</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression</td>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td>Q11b/Q12h</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression</td>
<td>Modelling</td>
<td>Q11b/Q12k</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression</td>
<td>Process diary/student effort</td>
<td>Q11b/Q13a</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression</td>
<td>Process diary/student learning</td>
<td>Q11b/Q13b</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td>Personal response</td>
<td>Q11c/Q12d</td>
<td>19.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>Set of criteria</td>
<td>Q11d/Q12e</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>Q11d/Q12f</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>Musical processes</td>
<td>Q11d/Q12g</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>Techniques</td>
<td>Q11d/Q12h</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td>Q11d/Q12i</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>Conventions</td>
<td>Q11d/Q12j</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>Process diary/student learning</td>
<td>Q11d/Q13c</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Checklist</td>
<td>Process diary/comp outcome</td>
<td>Q11d/Q13d</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Six significant cross-tabulations were found between 'impression' treatments and other dependent variables with later IMCAI variables. Post hoc cell distributions in the four 'impression' cross-tabulations in Table 22 show that the second variables were considered to be very important. The cross-tabulated variables were: 'processes', 'techniques', 'process diary/ student effort', and 'process diary/ student learning' (IMCAI, Q12g, Q12h, Q13a and Q13b).

The largest numbers of cross-tabulations in results are shown for the use of a 'checklist' in composition assessment with other dependent variables. All cross-tabulations produced similar trends in post hoc cell contributions, with these indicating that those respondents who assessed compositions commonly through the use of a 'checklist' similarly rated the correlating criteria shown in Table 22 as very important. Assessment criteria which
correlated with 'checklist' in this way were: 'set of criteria', 'synthesis', 'musical processes', 'techniques', 'concepts', and 'conventions' (IMCAI, Q12e, Q12f, Q12g, Q12h, Q12i, and Q12j).

In interpreting results from cross-tabulations between variables in the IMCAI survey, three issues were highlighted. The first establishes that NSW secondary teachers who completed and returned IMCAI were consistent in their responses, and therefore that their responses were an accurate reflection of their opinions and attitudes on composition and assessment. The second suggests that selected variables are important in considering assessments of senior student compositions. These variables are concerned with student learning in composition, and assessment procedures. Preferred procedures are impression marking or a more detailed analytical approach. Also important are selected criteria which directly relate to student learning. These include musical processes, techniques, modelling of pre-existing music, synthesis of musical concepts, and a knowledge of conventions. A third issue indicates that other variables have little influence on respondents' assessments of senior student compositions. These include demographic locations of schools, and training in composition, in composition teaching, and in composition assessment.

Discussion
This section of chapter 4 responded to Research Question 2. This question investigated the extent of the relationship between secondary music teachers' pedagogy in composition and their assessments of composition in NSW senior secondary classes. IMCAI Question 8 asked respondents if they had adjusted teaching practices in their secondary music classes since 1994 when mandatory composition was introduced in the 2 Unit (Common) music syllabus and 10 provided data for this. IMCAI Question 10 asked respondents to indicate what they considered was the purpose of assessing compositions at senior secondary level. Both Questions 8 and 10 were important in examining the relationship between composition pedagogy and assessment.

Data confirm that there is a relationship between assessment and pedagogy in composition, and further show that the relationship impacts on both teaching and learning, in senior and junior secondary music classes. It was expected that in senior classes some adjustments would have been made to composition pedagogy as a result of changes to composition in the 2 Unit (Common) syllabus in 1994. In the senior school, respondents indicated there is a new awareness of the importance of composition in the curriculum, and most respondents have
implemented initiatives to ensure that students have access to appropriate composition learning opportunities. These encompass many aspects of pedagogy, including classroom practices, programming, personal teaching styles, student documentation, assessment strategies, and the content of composition lessons. Whereas prior to 1994 respondents indicated that they used harmony as the major component of composition lesson content, there was strong evidence that respondents had relaxed their adherence to formal four-part harmony for various musical and pedagogical reasons. Composition lesson content was related to learning skills and techniques in composition which could be found in analysis, listening and performance of music.

The impact of change in composition in the senior syllabus in 1994, however, was not restricted to senior classes. A measure of the importance of assessment on composition pedagogy is shown by a majority of respondents who made similar adjustments to composition teaching and learning in the junior school. While very similar to the above senior school initiatives, in the junior school, respondents indicated that since 1994 they use a greater amount of experimentation in performance to encourage composition writing, and for some respondents, composition is now a valuable pedagogical tool.

Data similarly confirm that there is a relationship between composition assessment and music education pedagogy. Respondents clearly demonstrated that since the 1994 changes to composition in the senior syllabus, in the senior school, composition had become more closely allied to musicology, especially with the study of Australian music written in the last twenty-five years. In the junior school, composition was equally connected with listening experiences from a broader range of music topics. In addition, the emphasis on group activities links performance and composition, and have impacted on the pedagogy used the teaching of composition.

The relationship between assessment and composition in NSW secondary music education was further explored in the results of Question 10. Here, respondents showed that assessment was associated with on-going pedagogy through formative assessments, with measuring student learning in composition through summative assessments, and in measuring student music learning and teaching efficiency through evaluative assessments. Formative, on-going assessments assist in respondents' teaching composition as they develop and incubate ideas, set goals, motivate students, refine compositions, and support self-evaluation. Summative
assessments conducted at the end, or at different stages of the development of compositions, provide traditional notions of the purpose of assessment as they grade, support supervision, confirm that the student is the composer, ensure that the teacher and student are accountable, and assist in ranking. Evaluative assessments consider a composition as an opportunity for students to demonstrate what they have learned, and give a teacher a finite way of assessing teaching outcomes. Respondents' clear perceptions of a broad range of purposes of composition assessment show the depth of the relationship between assessment, composition, and pedagogy.

Cross-tabulations of results of the survey suggest that several variables may have an influence on composition assessments. These are music teaching experience, HSC composition teaching experience, gender, and contrasting assessment procedures. Generally, it can be seen that considerable similarities in respondents' opinions about assessments of senior music composition exist, despite differences in gender, teaching experience, and respondents' self perceptions as composers. These similarities indicate that teachers have the same views on criteria which are important in composition assessments.

Chapter 5 reports the second research protocol, an experiment, which was based on data produced by the survey. Coding of variables in the survey drew attention to teachers' concern about procedures and criteria used in composition assessment at senior secondary level. Diverse procedures were demonstrated, although two, impression marking and content analysis, were most used. Considerable agreement about appropriate criteria was shown, especially craftsmanship criteria which related to teachers' pedagogy. The second protocol provided opportunity to further scrutinise issues of teachers' levels of agreement about assessment, the effects of different procedures, and of different criteria on their assessments. In this way multi-method triangulation is used to establish reliability, add depth to the study, and gauge whether there is consistency of results for different assessment variables when contrasting research methods are used.
CHAPTER 5

PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION OF EXPERIMENT DATA

Introduction
Chapter 5 presents results of the second research protocol, an experiment based on results partly derived from the survey. Results from the first protocol, a survey entitled *Investigation of Music Composition Assessment Issues (IMCAI)*, were presented in Chapter 4. These results identified assessment variables which could be further illuminated using a contrasting research method. These variables were teachers' reliability as assessors, assessment procedures, and assessment criteria. The function of the second research protocol was to test hypotheses using a small sample of teachers in the process of making assessments of compositions written at senior secondary level. This was accomplished by asking teachers to complete an *Assessment of Composition Experiment Research Form (ACERF)* while responding to questions about three experiment compositions. Inter-judge reliability, assessment procedures, and assessment criteria identified in the survey were subjected to this investigation, thereby linking the survey with the experiment. Results in this chapter describe and provide preliminary interpretation of the three hypotheses formulated for the experiment. These are:

Hypothesis 1
- *There will be no effect for different judges on grades allocated by each judge for three compositions written at a senior secondary level.*

Hypothesis 2
- *There will be no effect for different assessment procedures in assessing three compositions written at a level of senior secondary music students on:*
  1) judges' scores
  2) judges' decision-making processes.
Hypothesis 3

- There will be an effect for different criteria in assessing three compositions written at senior secondary level in:
  1) each composition
  2) all three compositions.

Data in Chapter 5 is presented in five parts. Reported first is a profile of the sample of teachers, identified as 'judges', who participated in the experiment. This first section corresponds to the earlier presentation of similar data in Chapter 4. Following this, Chapter 5 presents data which tests the three research hypotheses. The final part of the chapter presents results which respond to, and provide additional data for the first research question. In this final section significant correlation results between experiment variables are reported.

5.1: Judge sample profile

Results which are reported in this first section of Chapter 5 are structured in three sub-categories. These are personal backgrounds, composing experiences, and training. This mirrors the Respondent sample profile in Chapter 4 (pp. 106-130) and provides ease of comparison between the two samples to show whether they demonstrate similar characteristics and whether it can be conjectured that they represent the total population of secondary music teachers in NSW.

Personal backgrounds

This first part of the judge group profile reports data from the first five questions of ACERF, Part1. These questions describe judges' secondary music teaching experience in years, their gender, school location, school characteristics, and experience in teaching composition at HSC level.

All twenty-four judges reported the number of years they had taught music in NSW secondary schools. These ranged from four to thirty years, with a mean 16.1 years. Responses were grouped for presentation in three groups, from 1-5 years, 6-15 years, and 16+ years. Table 23 shows that a small number of judges had taught music in NSW secondary schools for less than five years (N=2; 8%). Larger numbers of judges had taught music in the other two
categories. Half of all judges had taught sixteen years or more (\(N=12; \ 50\%\)), and a smaller number had taught between six and fifteen years (\(N=10; \ 42\%\)). Significant results were found for cross-tabulations conducted between results for the number of years judges had taught music in NSW secondary schools with later ACERF results. Cross-tabulation results suggest that this variable may influence judges' assessments of senior student compositions. These results reflect similar statistical characteristics and percentages as those in the survey, and significant cross-tabulations for teachers' experience and assessment variables were shown.

Table 23 also shows judges' gender (ACERF, Session 1, Question 2). Both males and females were well represented although there were more female judges (59%) than male (41%). These proportional gender results corroborate those found in the Chapter 4 survey.

**Table 23**

Judges grouped by music teaching experience in NSW secondary schools and gender (ACERF Session 1, Q.1 and Q.2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges' music teaching experience in NSW secondary schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5 Years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-15 Years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16+ Years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23 additionally shows how the gender of judges was distributed in relation to the number of years they had taught music in NSW secondary schools. Only male judges were in the first five years of teaching. In the other two categories, more female judges were represented than were male judges. Chi-square cross-tabulations in Chapter 4 showed statistically significant results for the first two survey variables. No significant results were found for correlations between gender and assessment scores, conducted in the experiment.
and shown in the final section of Chapter 5. The lack of corroboration of results in the experiment suggests that gender and teaching experience may be less important to composition assessment than was indicated from the survey.

The third variable in experiment judges' personal backgrounds was the metropolitan region of the school at which each taught at the time of the research. Figure 3 shows the number of judges who participated in the experiment identified by their metropolitan regions. Table 24 shows statistically the numbers of judges' schools in the four Sydney metropolitan regions.

Table 24
Judges grouped by Sydney metropolitan region (ACERF Session 1, Q.3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan region</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan North</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan East</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan West</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan South-West</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experiment judges taught in all four metropolitan locations, and were therefore representative of the Sydney metropolitan area. Fewer judges taught in schools situated in the south-western and western city parts of the city. This was expected, as the experiment was conducted in the inner city which was in close proximity to East and North locations, and was less accessible from other locations.

In decreasing numerical order, subjects taught in the following metropolitan areas: North (N=9), East (N=8), West (N=4), and South-West (N=3). Correlations between this variable and other ACERF variables showed no significant results. This suggests that the location of a teacher's school is not important in composition assessment issues, and confirms survey results.
Figure 3

Judges grouped by Sydney metropolitan region (ACERF Session 1, Q.3)

(NSW Department of Education and Training, 1995)
Judges reported descriptive data of schools at which they taught. Results are less than comprehensive, as judges did not complete all responses in this question. There was an equal balance between judges from single sex schools (N=12; 50%), and co-educational schools (N=12; 50%). Judges identified other school characteristics: private (N=12; 50%), public (N=1; 4%); special schools in technology (N=2; 8%), and in languages (N=1; 4%); comprehensive schools (N=5; 20%), and selective schools (N=2; 8%). The terms 'comprehensive' and 'selective' suggest contrasting admission requirements, with the first open to all students, and the latter restricted to admission by academic examination. Results show that the schools in which judges taught had widely varied characteristics.

Of greater importance in the investigation of assessment of composition is ACERF Session 1, Question 5. All judges in the experimental group had experience in teaching composition at senior secondary level. Although all judges had not taught all the music courses offered to students at HSC level, all of them had taught courses which required students to prepare a composition for examination purposes at the senior level. Sixteen of the twenty-four judges (N=16; 67%) had taught Music 2 Unit (Common) both prior to and since 1994, in addition to four others who had taught this course since 1995 only.

Most judges (N=20; 83%) had taught either Music 2 Unit (Course 1), or Music 3 Unit with students who had submitted compositions as an examination option. When compared, judges who had not taught students at HSC level in Music 2 Unit (Common), were different judges from those who had not taught students at HSC level in Music 2 Unit (Course 1) and 3 Unit Music. Table 25 shows the number of judges with composition teaching experience at HSC level.

**Table 25**

*Judges' HSC composition teaching experience (ACERF Session 1, Q.5)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2Unit (Common)</th>
<th>2Unit 1&amp;3Unit</th>
<th>All Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>To '94</td>
<td>'95+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judges Number</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results from this question verify that in assessing the three compositions in the experiment, judges responded from an informed perspective based on first hand experience in teaching senior secondary music classes, and that their classroom methods could be compared with those they used in their senior secondary music classes. Results from this question, when compared with the survey, showed that a larger proportion of teachers in the experiment had taught composition in HSC courses.

The above report on experiment judges' personal backgrounds was the first part of the judge group profile which examined judges' secondary music teaching experience, their gender, school location, school characteristics, and experience in teaching composition at HSC level. Results showed that judges represented a wide range of teaching years, that male and female teachers were both well represented, and that judges taught at a variety of schools in Sydney. These results would suggest that the judge sample was representative of the total population. All judges had first hand experience in teaching composition at HSC level. The next section reports judges' composing experiences.

**Composing experiences**

Responses to the structured part of the question regarding composing experiences are recorded in Table 26. The table shows that nineteen subjects (79%) indicated that they had written original music and five subjects (21%) indicated that they had not. When correlated with results for Question 1, the five judges who had indicated they had not composed music were teachers who had been teaching for more than nine years. When correlated with results for Question 2, which described judges' gender, all subjects who indicated they had not composed were female.
Table 26  
*Judges grouped by composing experience, context, and category (ACERF Session 1, Q.6)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondents as composers</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Community</th>
<th>Publication</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composing Context</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arranging only</th>
<th>Creating only</th>
<th>Arranging and Creating</th>
<th><strong>Total</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composing Category</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number</strong></td>
<td>36</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>%</strong></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Judges provided further details of composing experiences if they had responded positively to the structured part of this question. In responding, judges provided details of diverse composing experiences. Details showed that judges identified composing experiences which were used both for performances at schools and in the wider community, but more often for performances by professional musicians. Judges described different composing techniques. While a majority of judges indicated that they composed original music, there were other judges, in the minority, who identified additional creative music writing activities, such as arranging and transcribing. For the purposes of accurate reporting, and consistency with earlier reporting of survey results, two processes were used to analyse data. In the first process, data were analysed by identifying three contexts for which judges identified they had written compositions, which were for education application, for community events, or for publication. A pre-service category, included in the Chapter 4 survey comparative table, was omitted from the experiment table as no judges indicated that they had written music which was appropriate to this category. In the second process, data was analysed by identifying
three categories of composition in which respondents identified they composed, which were arranging only, creating only, and, a combination of both arranging and creating.

Table 26 shows how judges identified their composing experiences, grouped by composing context. An additional 'nil' category has been included for judges who responded that they did not compose. Categories in Table 26 are cumulative, and the final categories suggest that judges also composed in previous contexts.

A number of judges identified they had composed in a professional context \((N=8, 33\%)\). Fewer of them registered that they had written music for education environments \((N=6, 25\%)\). Five \((21\%)\) composed for community needs. More detailed descriptions of judges' composing contexts shows the contrasts between different composition contexts.

Judges who composed for education and community contexts described composing for extracurricular musical ensembles and classroom consumption. Judges named a variety of ensembles, events, and genres to illustrate their composing experiences: a cappella, choirs, various instrumental combinations, and bands. Specific genres and events identified in composing contexts were a music festival, liturgical music, incidental music to a play, musicals, and school songs. Most references to music written in community contexts were for the purpose of church services. Little further detail was provided for these contexts.

More judges nominated writing music appropriate to the final category of professional composition in Table 26 than any other single category. Identified in this category were published works \((N=4)\), recordings and/or broadcasts \((N=7)\), and film or video scores \((N=4)\). Within some individual responses was a diverse range of experiences which suggested that these judges were both professional composers as well as professional music teachers. The examples cited below substantiate this view:

- Music for theatre, symphony orchestra, documentary film scores, pop songs, published chamber music, music for school choirs, band/orchestras, played jazz.
- Am a professional composer as well as school teacher. Have orchestral works played by ABC orchestras and run an electronic music studio.

Judges identified a wide range of genres and styles in this context. Genres they identified were advertising jingles, chamber music, choral, film, rock band, music theatre, orchestral music, and popular songs. Musical styles were named in a few responses: art music styles,
jazz, country, rock, and electronic. While nominated styles appear diverse when listed, the main focus of responses was art music styles.

All responses were re-classified according to composing categories. The first composing category was the creation of original music. The second category described skills such as arranging and transcribing. The third category combined arranging and creating. Analysis by categories suggested that some subjects viewed that there were distinctions between different types of composing skills. Numerical results of composing categories are shown on Table 26.

Analysis of responses by categories identified in Table 26 shows that many judges had composing experience through 'creating only' (N=10; 42%). Fewer judges were limited to 'arranging only' (N=5; 21%) experiences, and a small number of judges identified they had 'arranging and creating' experiences (N=4; 16%).

Generally responses clearly distinguished differences in the three categories of composition, which suggested an awareness of distinctions in skills involved in each. In this there was a difference with results from the survey, where a larger proportion of respondents showed some confusion in interpretation of the term 'composition'. Arranging was perceived as a non-original activity, and was a practical skill used to facilitate and enhance school music programs. Responses which identified creating original music were less specific in detailing experiences, and provided broader descriptions of experiences. The following responses provide examples in different categories. The first two describe only arranging experiences. The third example describes only creating experiences, and the final two examples identify both arranging of previously-composed music, and original music:

- Mostly arranging a cappella music to TTBB but some orchestra arranging, reductions.
- School ensembles - vocal and instrumental (mixed ensembles) arranging (sic) - publishing nil.
- Studied composition at university. (I) am an established composer with published broadcast works.
- Songwriter in country/rock/jazz styles. Some small scale instrumental work.
- Classroom arrangements, schools ensembles, church music, arranged a musical (original and new arrangements).

Fourteen (58%) indicated they had written original compositions. The above section reported results of ACERF Session 1, Question 6, which detailed judges' composing experience, and
was the second of three sections in the judge sample profile. The next section reports judges' training.

Judges' training

This section is the final part of the judge sample profile. Earlier data reported judges' personal backgrounds and composing experiences. This section reports responses to ACERF Session 1, Questions 7a, 7b, and 7c, which describe experiment judges' training in composition, in composition teaching, and in composition assessment.

Results from ACERF Session 1, Question 7a, report sources of training which judges identified they had in composition. Table 27 shows the frequency of contrasting sources of training in composition. A majority of subjects (N=21) selected one response only from the five available options. Three subjects selected two responses. Data in Table 27, by accommodating multiple responses, show larger response numbers than judges in the experimental group. The major training source was 'pre-service' study (N=10, 37%). 'In-service' training was identified slightly less frequently (N=9, 33%). Subjects infrequently selected other sources of training in composition: 'post-graduate' (N=3, 11%) and 'other' (N=1, 4%). Four judges considered they had no training in composition (15%).

Table 27

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Nil</th>
<th>Pre-service</th>
<th>In-service</th>
<th>Post-graduate</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighteen judges added further details to their responses which described their training in composition. These indicated that composition training provided by tertiary institutions through music teacher training courses was the most common source of their training. The NSW Conservatorium of Music (University of Sydney) was the only institution specifically
identified. Nominated courses were B.A.(Mus), B.Mus, and B.Mus.(Ed). One post-graduate course identified was a Masters degree in music education. Other judges explained that courses undertaken at undergraduate level included a composition component. For example, one judge described two courses in composition which were studied throughout two years of pre-service training. Judges named the following composers as mentors: Raymond Hanson, Peter Sculthorpe, and Martin Wesley-Smith.

Learning from less traditional sources was the second feature which was identified in judges' comments. In-service courses and seminars provided training. Three providers nominated were Association of Independent Schools, Metropolitan North Music Teachers' Association, and Musica Viva. A small number of judges identified they had informal training not associated with in-service courses. Judges considered they learnt composition skills from music performance and competitions. An example of one such response is:

- None in actually writing but plenty in performing (as a session singer for composers - songs, jingles, sound tracks and musicals).

Several subjects (N=4) considered that the experience of teaching students in the classroom was effective in composition training. The above results are similar to those which were shown from the research survey, and indicate that both samples shared common attitudes towards pedagogical issues. The next section reports data on judges' sources of training in teaching composition from ACERF Session 1, Question 7b. As was observed in the survey, noticeable differences are evident between results for Question 7a and 7b.

Table 28 shows the frequency of responses which identified judges' sources of training in composition pedagogy. A majority of subjects (N=13) selected one response only from the five options which were provided. Fewer respondents selected two responses (N=10) and one judge selected three responses. Thirty-six selections were made by the twenty-four judges.

Table 28 shows that most judges selected from two sources of training categories. 'In-service' was selected in fourteen responses (39%), and 'other' training was identified in thirteen responses (36%). Few judges selected 'pre-service' training (N=5, 14%), even fewer judges selected 'post-graduate' training (N=2, 5.5%), and two judges considered they had no training in composition pedagogy.
Table 28

Frequency of judges' responses for sources of training in teaching composition (ACERF Session 1, Q.7b)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Nil</th>
<th>Pre-Service</th>
<th>In-service</th>
<th>Post-graduate</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nineteen judges added further details to their responses which described their training in teaching composition. Comments showed the diversity of training experiences which judges had in composition pedagogy. Little reference was made to formal training at music institutions, and more frequently judges commented on attendance at in-service courses and other less formal experiences. Most prominent among informal experiences was discussion with colleagues and interaction with composers. In addition, judges acknowledged that teaching composition at different levels to students throughout secondary schooling was a valuable learning experience in composition pedagogy.

Judges' responses suggest that developing a pedagogy in music education is an eclectic and cumulative process. Also suggested by responses is an attitude of receptiveness and cooperation between peers and composers. A variety of in-service opportunities, identified as individual courses, seminars, and workshops, provided support to this aspect of music education. Similar providers to those identified in the previous question were named: the Association of Independent Schools, Australian Society for Music Education, and the Metropolitan North Music Teachers' Association. One judge commented on a technology course in composition, and study over a series of courses rather than a single event. Other judges similarly had attended more than one course. Most comments included a reference to discussions with other teachers as a common way to learn skills which were used in music classes. Several comments named previously identified composers with whom subjects maintained a dialogue as a source of training in their classroom teaching in music. Examples of comments are:
- Attended courses in music and technology in Mac Programs, Micro logic, Cue Base, Band in a Box.
- Lots of listening, discussion with colleagues/peers/composers, reading and studying composition and musical concepts.

Responses to this question in the judge group profile reflect similar results to those from the respondent group profile in the survey reported in Chapter 4. The above section has reported training which supports judges in composition pedagogy. The next section reports training identified by judges in assessing compositions.

This section reports sources of training in composition assessment and investigates the relationship between assessment and composition pedagogy. Table 29 shows the frequency of judges' responses which identified their sources of training in assessing composition. A majority of judges (N=20) selected one response only from the five options provided. Four subjects selected two responses. Data in Table 29, by accommodating multiple responses, show larger response numbers than judges in the experiment.

**Table 29**

*Frequency of judges' responses for sources of training in assessing composition (ACERF Session 1, Q.7c)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Nil</th>
<th>Pre-service</th>
<th>In-service</th>
<th>Post-graduate</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 29 shows two sources of training in assessing composition were selected by a majority of judges. 'Other' was selected in fourteen responses (50%), and 'in-service' training was identified in nine responses (32%). Five judges considered they had experienced no training in assessing of composition.

Eighteen judges added further details which described their training in this area of the music education curriculum. Comments showed the NSW Board of Studies was valuable in providing training in assessing composition, and in this these results reflected those which
were found in the survey. The opportunity to participate in formal marking of HSC music papers, both in composition and other areas in music learning (aural skills, musicology, and performance) was highly valued as training in composition assessment. Other experiences were additionally associated with NSW Board of Studies training such as discussions with teachers who had marked HSC examinations, in-service courses, written guidelines from the NSW Board of Studies, and published exemplary compositions. The following examples demonstrate the strong influence of the Board of Studies on judges' learning to assess composition:

- At HSC aural marking I picked up notes on the marking of HSC composition. I have picked up (training from) past HSC composition exemplary tapes.
- Eight years of HSC marking (6 of which in old and new style composition).

Judges who had not had experience marking HSC music papers for the NSW Board of Studies listed other sources of training in assessing composition. Most of these describe how composition assessment takes place, and suggest that the process is intuitive. These sources were dependent on individual experience, and on contact with other music teachers. The first example below shows that for one subject, assessment is constant, on-going, and valuable. The second example describes how composition assessment is conducted and suggests the process is a collaboration with a disinterested party, in this case another music teacher at a different school.

- Composition has been an integral part of music classes. I constantly give feedback and assessment at all levels in high school music.
- Assessment between schools - comparison of works composed by students of neighbouring schools.

In the above responses a common approach is strongly evident. This approach shows that teachers share ideas, experiment, and learn from their previous experience. Judges' training in composition assessment completes the final section of the judge sample profile. A short discussion summarises and interprets data to conclude this section.

**Discussion**

The above report presented and provided preliminary interpretation of data from the judge sample profile data from *ACERF* Session 1, Questions 1-7. Data show that there was proportional consistency in gender and experience in secondary music teaching. Approximately twenty percent of males and thirty percent of females had less than fifteen years of teaching experience, and this balance was maintained for judges with more than
This section is structured to show judges' rank order preferences for the three experiment compositions, judges' grades for the three compositions, and the consistency of rating between judges, and tests their levels of agreement in response to the first hypothesis. Copies of sound recordings and manuscripts of three experiment compositions used in this section are included in Appendix B (pp. 290-291), and Appendix C (pp. 292-303) respectively under the titles *Funny Feeling*, *Les Moustiques*, and *Test Tube Song*. The three compositions are presented in alphabetical order in all results to maintain consistency in reporting.

ACERF research design and analysis were described in the methodology chapter (pp. 89-101). In the experiment design, three middle experiment sessions, titled *Impression* (Green), *Global* (Blue), and *Specific* (Red) were concerned directly with judges' assessments of the three experiment compositions. Table 30 shows judges' rank order preferences of compositions during the *Impression* (Green) experiment session. The table shows that half of the judges \((N=12; 50\%)\) were unanimous in their composition ranking preferences.

**Table 30**

*Judges' rank order preferences for three experiment compositions (ACERF Impression (Green) Session, Q.1a)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition rank order</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Total                        | 24 | 100% |

Twelve judges (50%) ranked compositions from first to third in this order: *Les Moustiques*, *Funny Feeling*, and *Test Tube Song*. A further six judges (25%) similarly placed *Les Moustiques* first, and reversed the preference of the latter two pieces. These results would suggest that many judges generally had comparable views on the success of the three experiment compositions. Six judges (25%) ranked the pieces very differently. Of these, four judges placed *Funny Feeling* first, and two judges placed *Test Tube Song* first.
Results of judges' grades selected for Test Tube Song, Funny Feeling, and Les Moustiques are shown in Figure 4. Figure 4 line graph displays five grades from A to E on the X axis, with A indicating the highest grade and E indicating the lowest grade. The Y axis shows the numbers of judges who selected each grade for the experiment compositions.

Selected grades for Funny Feeling and Les Moustiques range from A to D; and grades for Test Tube Song have a wider range from A to E. Grades for Feeling Feeling are: A (N=1), B (N=8), C (N=13), and D (N=2). Grades for Les Moustiques are: A (N=9), B (N=10), C (N=3), and D (N=2). Grades selected for Test Tube Song are: A (N=1), B (N=0), C (N=12), D (N=8), and E (N=3). Two judges, (numbers 3 and 21) selected the same grade for each of the three compositions.

Figure 4 additionally shows that the three compositions were graded differently from each other. Twenty-one judges rated Funny Feeling with either a B or a C grade and nineteen judges rated Les Moustiques with either an A or B grade. Twenty judges rated Test Tube Song with either a C or D grade. No judge used the lowest grade for either Funny Feeling or Les Moustiques and only one judge rated Test Tube Song above a C grade.
Figure 4

Graph showing grades allocated by judges for Funny Feeling, Les Moustiques, and Test Tube Song (ACERF Impression (Green) Session, Q. 2b)
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Comparison between judges' grades shows that a large majority of ratings are in complete agreement, or within one grade level from each other. Table 31 shows a summary of cross-tabulations of judges' agreement on the three compositions calculated from the above.

**Table 31**

*Summary of cross-tabulations of judges' agreement on grades for three experiment compositions (ACERF Impression (Green) Session, Q.2b)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compositions</th>
<th>Absolute Agreement %</th>
<th>Difference of 1 Grade Number %</th>
<th>Difference of 2 Grades Number %</th>
<th>Difference of more than 2 grades Number %</th>
<th>Totals Number %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funny Feeling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Les Moustiques</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test Tube Song</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>295</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chi-square statistics conducted for summary data of judges' cross-tabulations of agreement for the three experiment compositions shown in Table 31 show significant results. Chi-square results are: *Funny Feeling* has a chi square of 12.294 and a $p$ value of <.0001; *Les Moustiques* has a chi square of 6.996 and a $p$ value of <.0001; and *Test Tube Song* has a chi square of 18.314 and a $p$ value of <.0001. Comparison between the three results indicates that the level of agreement between judges varies for each piece. *Test Tube Song* has the highest level of judge agreement, *Funny Feeling* has the middle level of judge agreement, and results for *Les Moustiques* show the lowest level of agreement between judges.

Results of the analysis of judges' grades to test the first research hypothesis illustrate that judges have a high level of agreement. Grades were in five levels, which was considered appropriate for discrimination in previous composition research studies (Pilsbury and Alston, 1996; Simmonds, 1988). At this level, agreement between judges for the experiment
compositions have high statistical significance. Different levels of discrimination are shown between different experiment compositions. While discrimination for different experiment pieces is evident in composition assessment research (Hickey, 1995; Searby and Ewers, 1996; Simmonds, 1988), the results in this study are not in complete accord with other research. In common with other research are results for Test Tube Song. This piece, considered by judges of least merit, had the highest level of inter-judge agreement. Conflicting with results from other studies is the level of agreement between judges for the other compositions. Les Moustiques, considered by most judges to be highest in merit, had the lowest level of inter-judge reliability. Funny Feeling, judged generally as average in merit, produced the middle level of inter-judge reliability. In other research studies, pieces which are in the middle range of merit, generally produce the lowest level of inter-judge reliability.

This section has shown that judges were in strong accord in grading the three compositions. Due to the high level of inter-judge consensus, the first research hypothesis, that there is no effect for different judges' on grades allocated to three research compositions, is accepted. The next section will investigate assessment procedures and their effects on judges' assessments.

5.3: Hypothesis 2

Hypothesis 2

- There will be no effect for different assessment procedures in assessing three compositions written at a level of senior secondary music students on:
  i) judges' scores
  ii) judges' decision-making processes.

In this section, the focus moves from assessors to assessment procedures and their effect on assessment scores. At first, an interpretation of terminology used when judges allocated marks to the three compositions during the experiment is presented to establish whether the judges had similar perceptions of the composition assessment task. Following this is the presentation and interpretation of results which test the two parts of Hypothesis 2. A discussion of results completes this section.
Judges clarified how they interpreted the terminology which was used to allocate scores to the three experiment compositions throughout the duration of the experiment. *ACERF* Session 5, Question 1, asked judges to define how they attributed success in the context of composition assessment. In responses, judges suggested the meaning of this statement was primarily directed towards the craftsmanship demonstrated in a composition, in combination with 'other' features. Some aspects of craftsmanship were frequently identified: how a composition demonstrated idea development, synthesis of concepts, the balance of unity and variety, and less commonly, observed merit or standard of technical ability. The following three responses describe craftsmanship details, especially the use of musical concepts, application of composing techniques, and communication of the composers' ideas through aural and visual presentation:

- How well the concepts of music were manipulated through various compositional devices, and how well these musical ideas were communicated through the score and recording.
- I didn't think about it because I am so tuned to marking composition with the thought that the students need to manipulate all concepts to show their composition skills. I thought all three were successful.

These three descriptions present 'success' as synonymous with craftsmanship. Additionally, the last quotation makes a judgement of the three experiment compositions collectively in these terms.

Most prominent among the 'other' features noted are judges' personal responses to a composition. Statements which implied an acknowledgment of subjectivity used the following terms: 'holds interest', 'convincing', 'communicates', 'impression', 'I feel', 'listener's interest is attracted and maintained', 'do I like it?' As well as subjectivity, various features for which 'success' had meaning included guidelines provided by the NSW Board of Studies, finding and maintaining a suitable style, and originality. Examples of the interpretation of the term 'success' as a combination of craftsmanship with 'other' features are shown in the following:

- Assessing the musical outcomes and a breakdown of each of the concepts. Treatment of style and the use of unity and contrast.
- Not just scoring, not just sound, but overall style and how elements combine to create a 'feel'.
- As an overall piece of music in its own right and impression marking. What was demonstrated in each piece as far as originality and development of ideas.
Two comments presented some interesting and alternative approaches to the notion of 'success'. These are reported here as they raise concerns appropriate to a broader perspective than composition assessing alone, and are appropriate to the wider concepts of music education in the secondary school. One response to a definition of the 'success' of a composition suggested that the physical presentation of the composition is most important, and cited possible discrepancies between aural and visual presentations, which affected assessments in the experiment compositions. A second comment questioned the notion of originality of student compositions, and hinted at a connection between musicology and composition which could encourage modelling or formulaic solutions at the expense of problem solving and experimentation.

- Experience only with what you are asking.
- I understand this to mean a piece written within a time limit which was designed to demonstrate understanding of musical composition in a very specific style. The aural presentation was very helpful but in the end are we marking the composition or the performance? Both were not the same in some cases!
- Personally, first of all, my tastes are impossible to by-pass in these terms: the poorest music has no sustaining interest after the first hearing whether through lack of coherency or logical progression/ development of ideas. Momentum and independence from hackneyed use of modelling are two factors that sway me.

In summary, the term 'success' was a broad combination of criteria primarily concerned with evidence of craftsmanship, and other criteria generated by a judges' teaching experiences and by the experiment compositions. In application in the experiment, judges' perceptions of the task showed an aggregate of slightly different approaches with a common core around which each composition was judged according to the same principles. This common core, and the diversity of other opinions, was considered appropriate for both a comprehensive and focussed assessment of the experiment compositions. The next section reports the effects of the three assessment procedures on judges' scores.

To determine the effect for different assessment procedures, judges' numerical scores for each experiment composition provided during the three different experiment procedures are reported. In the Impression (Green), Global (Blue) and Specific (Red) sessions, judges were asked to place a numerical score for each composition, resulting in three numerical scores for each composition throughout the progress of the experiment. Numerical scores allocated by judges had a range from zero through to a maximum of ten, and allowed for half values. Numerical scores for Funny Feeling, Les Moustiques, and Test Tube Song at each assessment procedures are shown in Appendix L (p. 340). A surprising result from judges' numerical
scores for the three compositions during the three experiment sessions is the amount of change made to numerical scores by the experiment judges between assessment procedures. From twenty-four judges, only three (Judges 8, 20, and 22) maintained the same numerical scores for the three compositions during all the procedures. The profiles of these three judges were somewhat similar to each other. All three were female, had taught between nine and twenty-three years, and were not self-acknowledged composers. Two of the three had experience at HSC examination marking and the third had discussed marking with an HSC examination marker.

All other twenty-one judges made some change to numerical scores in different procedures. Some changes were minimal from one procedure to the next, for example the numerical scores allocated by Subject 7 to the three compositions. Subject 7 adjusted the numerical score of one composition once only by lowering the numerical score for 'Les Moustiques' in the Global (Blue) procedure by 0.5. Other changes in judges' numerical scores were more radical than this. For example, Judge 6 had a variation of four marks for numerical scores to assess Funny Feeling from the Impression (Green) session to the Global (Blue) session. Seventeen judges maintained the rank order of the three pieces throughout, two judges (Number 16 and 21) changed the ranking of the compositions, and five judges used equal numerical scores for two compositions within some procedures, even though they were requested to use different numerical scores for the compositions.

Summary statistics of results in Table 32 show how different assessment procedures produced different numerical scores for each of the experiment compositions. Summary statistics for the three compositions show the mean, standard deviation, maximum and minimum numerical scores, and the sum of the squares for the three compositions in the three procedures.
Table 32

Summary statistics of numerical scores for three compositions in three experiment procedures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary Statistics</th>
<th>Impression (Green)</th>
<th>Global (Blue)</th>
<th>Specific (Red)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Funny Feeling</td>
<td>Les Moustiqués</td>
<td>Test T Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of Sq's</td>
<td>973.5</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>606.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To determine the level of difference between each procedure, a Friedman rank test was conducted on numerical scores shown in Appendix L (pp. 340-341). Results are shown in Table 33. The table shows chi-square values and mean ranks for the three experiment compositions collectively and results for each composition separately.
Table 33

Friedman rank results for effects of three assessment procedures on three compositions separately and collectively (ACERF Impression (Green), Global (Blue), and Specific (Red) sessions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Sum Ranks</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Chi square</th>
<th>p value</th>
<th>DF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Three compositions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression (Green)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>160.5</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td></td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global (Blue)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>122.5</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific (Red)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>149.0</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compositions:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Funny Feeling</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression (Green)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global (Blue)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific (Red)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Les Moustiques</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression (Green)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td></td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global (Blue)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific (Red)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test Tube Song</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impression (Green)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>9.55</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global (Blue)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specific (Red)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results in Table 33 show that the effect of each procedure used in the experiment was different from the effect of the other two procedures. The effects for three procedures were consistent when results for the three compositions were tested collectively, and when individual compositions were tested. In all Table 33 results, the Global (Blue) procedure provided the most generous scores, indicated by the lowest numbers in the sum of ranks and mean rank columns. In the same way, results for Specific (Red) procedures consistently demonstrate the middle scores. In contrast, results for Impression (Green) show that this procedure consistently is less generous than the other two procedures.

Results in Table 33 generally show low p values which suggest statistical significance. One result, for Funny Feeling, is divergent. Due to the consistency of results, and the level of
significance of a majority of results, the null hypothesis that there is no effect for different assessment procedures on judges' scores is rejected. Results from this experiment suggest that assessment procedures do influence judges' scores in compositions. The next section, which addresses Hypothesis 2(ii), continues to examine differences in procedures, and confirms qualitatively the results which were presented in this section.

**Subjects' decision making processes**

Hypothesis 2(ii) was designed to explain reasons for quantitative decisions made during each of the three assessment procedures. Data in this section are qualitative and are included to confirm results from quantitative data, and to provide insights into how different assessment procedures influence judges' perceptions. Following a brief summary in the following paragraph, each procedure is addressed separately.

Responses showed that different procedures produced varying approaches to assessment decisions. *Impression* (Green) treatment produced erudite comparative comments which synthesised opinions, and frequently used ranking to establish justifications for selected scores. Comments about *Global* (Blue) and *Specific* (Red) procedures were varied. Many judges showed a strong tendency either to weigh positive and negative features of compositions, and other subjects identified clear critical condemnation or commendation for aspects of each composition. In contrasting both treatments, *Global* (Blue) treatments produced slightly polarised individual comments while *Specific* (Red) treatments produced slightly more evenly-balanced responses.

In the *Impression* (Green) assessment procedure, judges were asked to respond to the three experiment compositions which were presented in quick succession. This session was short, and completed in six minutes. Responses generally reflected either strongly positive or negative attitudes towards each composition. Many comments compared each of the three pieces in support of ranking requirements implied in this treatment, and some responses gave inclusive and generalised reasons, without identifying individual compositions. Two examples show how judges justified *Impression* (Green) judgements:

- *Funny Feeling* is too cluttered – over extended with little thought to the process of composition. *Les Moustiques* is concise, with effective use of rhythm and instruments – hits the spot. *Test Tube Song* was simple and repetitive but was within its range.
- *Funny Feeling* good rhythmically, however could be thought of 'too much the same'. *Les
In responding to Global (Blue) assessment procedures, judges addressed individual compositions separately and no responses in this session compared compositions. Judges completed responses after listening to each piece, and answering fifteen questions which were general in character. In this procedure, judges concentrated on each piece for seven minutes. Responses were not restricted to features of the fifteen Likert-response statements which were presented as part of this procedure (p. 92). More frequently, responses demonstrated that judges weighed the merits of each piece against its perceived faults.

Comments for the three compositions were different in focus in Global (Blue) assessments. Funny Feeling produced evenly balanced evaluations within individual responses. One example balanced criticism with commendation for Funny Feeling. This comment is similar to comments written by half of all judges:

- Funny Feeling. While I would have liked to see more variation within instrumental parts, I feel that this works for the length of the piece. Variation in texture was well handled. Overall shape of the structure is fairly good. Little development shown of individual ideas but possibly stylistically appropriate.

In contrast with Funny Feeling, polarisation of comments in Les Moustiques and Test Tube Song was more evident. Individual comments on the latter pieces provided less consideration of features which combined both commendation and criticism. Comments about Les Moustiques generally recognised strengths, while Test Tube Song comments located weaknesses. The following two quotations exemplify these trends:

- Les Moustiques shows development of motif, has variety, structure, unusual combination of performing media. Uses post 1970 musical characteristics, eg 7/4, chromaticism. Shows sense of style – works well.
- Test Tube Song Simple, repetitive, lacks variety. Poor use of performing media. A weak composition.

Specific (Red) assessment was similar to Global (Blue) assessment in that each piece was presented for judges' consideration individually and judges responses did not compare compositions against each other. Judges completed responses after listening to each piece, and responding to twenty-one Likert questions (see p. 94). Each piece was considered for fourteen minutes. Analysis of responses shows that Specific (Red) responses were generally different from responses to Impression (Green) and Global (Blue) assessment procedures.
Specific (Red) responses were for the most part highly evaluative of each composition, and covered a broad perspective of many characteristics. Many responses provided substantiation for comments by reference to printed manuscripts. Although there was similarly a slight polarisation of responses in both Funny Feeling and Test Tube Song, comments reflected comprehensively on both the perceived strengths and weaknesses of all three compositions.

An example of the comprehensive quality of Specific (Red) assessment comments is:

- *Funny Feeling.* The piece was effective as there was a successful sax blues melody and accompanying bass riff counter-melody. The syncopated rhythms of the percussion were very successful and helped to blend the soft rock/jazz style piece together. The piece lost marks in that it did not have enough variety ie there could have been a jazz solo - sax solo typical of the jazz idiom.

In the above comment, the judge provides reasons for the composition’s success, and identifies rhythmic and style elements. In addition the comment offers suggestions to enhance the piece further.

The following selection of responses provides samples of three comments from the same three judges (Judge 18, Judge 10, and Judge 12) for each of the compositions during different assessment treatments, as exemplifying the contrasting effects of the three assessment procedures on individual judges. Each shows comparisons identified in the above analysis. The first three examples describe *Funny Feeling.* Although the first comment fails to compare this piece with others, the second has a broad holistic approach which identifies limitations and strengths in the piece. The final comment discusses a wide range of features, and reports on manuscript details:

- *Funny Feeling* is a bit clichéd, but did show development of ideas.
  (Judge 18 – Impression (Green) session)
- *Funny Feeling* shows the use of the blues scale and combining riffs but lacks originality. Sounds like ‘muzak’. It doesn’t show much creativity or individuality.
  (Judge 18 – Global (Blue) session)
- *Funny Feeling* shows elementary use of musical concepts. However, lacks development of ideas. Score is lacking in detail eg dynamics, tempo. Some ideas lack originality.
  (Judge 18 – Specific (Red) session)

The second group of quotations are responses to justify numerical scores in Les Moustiques. The first suggests ranking with other compositions, while the second reflects on holistic criteria, and commits to a subjective viewpoint. The third comment explores a wide range of features, and makes a negative suggestion on the derivation of the composition, implying a formulaic solution:
• *Les Moustiques* is the highest in original use of melody and treatment of unity/variety.
  
  (Judge 10 – *Impression* (Green) session)

• *Les Moustiques* fulfils all requirements of demonstrating use of composition devices – variety, unity, performing media. I like the tempo changes and the selection of performing media – it’s cute!
  
  (Judge 10 – *Global* (Blue) session)

• *Les Moustiques*. The composer has obviously explored 'like' pieces in great detail and has used a formula to gain a satisfactory piece. Ostinato for unity, pizzicato for variety, second section contrasting, use of unusual time signature, melodic treatment second half. ABA treatment. Well devised piece
  
  (Judge 10 – *Specific* (Red) session)

The final three quotations justify numerical score allocation to *Test Tube Song*. The first makes no reference to ranking and is concise in appraisal. The second refers to manuscript for support, and presents all negative arguments. The third comment is similar, but identifies features which have merit:

• *Test Tube Song* has problems with balance and instrumental roles. Texture and stylistic features are evident but confused.
  
  (Judge 12 – *Impression* (Green) session)

• *Test Tube Song*. Percussion performance directions allows performers to do as they like. Guitar symbols confused - poor placement - not all present and correct. Dynamics and tempo indications are sparse. Use of 'etc' is not acceptable in Higher School Certificate composition as with percussion directions. More contrast in roles and textures - poor use of instruments and poor stylistic understanding demonstrated.
  
  (Judge 12 – *Global* (Blue) session)

• *Test Tube Song*. Candidate has shown a very confused understanding of the style, poor understanding of guitar writing/playing styles. Confusion of percussion style in relation to the rest of the work. Vocal parts are quite successful. Evidence of structure demonstrated. Need to show variety in use of instruments and balance the instruments and the vocal lines. Attention to dynamics and expressive directions very very (sic) limited.
  
  (Judge 12 – *Specific* (Red) session)

Qualitative data confirms that each assessment procedure affects reasons for score decisions differently. The null hypothesis that there will be no effect for different assessment procedures on assessment scores is therefore rejected. These results confirm earlier quantitative results. A discussion of these results follows.

The purpose of Hypothesis 2 (i) and 2(ii) was to test the effect of different assessment procedures on judges' scores and decision-making processes. At first it was necessary to determine the validity of assessment scores by examining subjects' interpretations of terminology. This showed that subjects considered 'success' was a demonstration of technical skills in combination with other features. Frequently these were intuitive, and often balanced with personal reactions acquired through experience in the domain of composition teaching.
A common awareness of the task was observed which showed that the judges had similar opinions on what was required of them in the assessment experiment.

Quantitative analysis produced results which were corroborated by the qualitative results. A Friedman rank test showed that each procedure, Impression (Green), Global (Blue), and Specific (Red), had a different effect on scores from the other two procedures, and these effects were consistent for the three compositions collectively and individually. Impression (Green) procedures produced the least generous numerical scores, Global (Blue) scores were the most generous, and Specific (Red) numerical scores were consistently between the scores from the two other procedures. Qualitative data in Impression (Green) procedures used ranking, were either positive or negative towards compositions, and descriptions were generalised. Global (Blue) located each composition's strengths and weaknesses, while Specific (Red) qualitative data was evenly balanced, frequently referred to both sound and manuscript for descriptive comment. In the latter procedure judges added advice for improvement. Chapter 6 provides further discussion of these findings and their applicability in music education. The section which follows tests the third research hypothesis.

5.4: Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3

- There will be an effect for different criteria in assessing three compositions written at senior secondary level in:
  
  i) each composition
  
  ii) all three compositions.

This fourth section of Chapter 5 examines criteria used to assess experiment compositions to test Hypothesis 3(i). In analysis of data throughout this section, qualitative data is presented first. Criteria in these qualitative analyses are identified, listed, and compared numerically. Criteria used to assess compositions were viewed by judges with either a positive or negative orientation, and these orientations are reported in results. Factor analyses of Specific (Red) sessions only is presented in quantitative data in this section, as items in these sessions reflect most closely those generated from qualitative analyses. Twenty-one Specific (Red) items were used, and adjustments were made to the set which is shown in Appendix D (p. 304). Some selectivity was necessary for factorial analysis due to missing responses. In particular,
Question 3 was omitted. This question asked 'Is this piece identifiable as an example of a specific musical style?' Question 2 (a), which investigated genre, was added. This question is listed under item (u) in the list below and asks 'Please rate the success of this piece in the use of the chosen combination of instruments/voices'. The twenty-one items used in the factor analysis are shown below.

- Rhythmic features are used skillfully in this piece
- Dynamics are sensitively applied throughout this piece
- Melodic fragments are repetitive and overused
- This piece is novel in its use of one or more concepts
- Harmonic features, including chord choice, chord progressions, modulation and cadences suggest a high level of expertise
- I enjoy the melodic ideas in this piece
- There is a logical flow through a series of structural events
- This piece is proficient in its selection and manipulation of textural treatments
- There is rhythmical cohesion in this piece
- This piece is proficient in handling musical processes eg development, variation
- The treatment of instruments and/or voices demonstrates knowledge of conventions
- There are errors in instrumental and/or vocal use eg register/range/appropriateness of role
- This piece demonstrates comprehension of timbral qualities in its vocal/instrumental scoring
- The recording impedes an accurate appreciation of this piece
- This piece satisfies requirements of the task - 'Music since 1970'
- There is a clichéd use of one or more concepts in this piece
- Melodically there is sufficient balance between unity and variety
- The score is accurate giving sufficient attention to detail
- The harmonic language is simplistic
- The standard of composition is not consistent throughout this piece
- Please rate the success of this piece in the use of the chosen combination of instruments/voices.

This section describes assessment criteria in the three compositions individually. The pieces are presented as follows: Funny Feeling, Les Moustiques, and Test Tube Song.

**Funny Feeling**

Qualitative data which describe Funny Feeling demonstrate that many criteria were used in its assessment and the application of craftsmanship was the most commonly identified criterion in responses. Comments which addressed this criterion in Funny Feeling accounted for over fifty-six percent of the total comments. Three of the most identified variables within this broad criterion were the application of musical processes, use of musical concepts, and demonstration of knowledge. Of these, the application of musical processes in Funny Feeling, and the demonstration of knowledge, were strongly criticised. Also disparaged was the standard of the writing, and originality. In contrast, the use of musical concepts was most
frequently commended, and the application of style was strongly applauded. Genre, although less frequently, was similarly commended for its application in *Funny Feeling*. Subjectivity, synthesis, and compliance with task requirements were seldom mentioned. Table 34 shows comparative numbers, percentage of total comments, and the positive or negative direction of comments in identified criteria. A detailed description of *Funny Feeling* assessment criteria follows this table.

### Table 34

**Assessment criteria identified in experiment judges' assessments of Funny Feeling**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Numerical order</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
<th>% of total comments</th>
<th>Comment number orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td><strong>N/A</strong></td>
<td><strong>83</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments were generally critical of the application of craftsmanship in *Funny Feeling*. Craftsmanship was demonstrated by numerous features, such as the application of musical processes and demonstration of knowledge (N=15 and N=9 respectively). In *Funny Feeling* comments which described processes and knowledge were generally negative. Processes are interpreted for the purposes of this analysis as broad skills which address balance, unity, variety and development. Critical comments concerning processes used in *Funny Feeling* revealed a perception that the composition was highly repetitive (N=15). It was observed that fragments of melody or ostinati were repeated throughout the piece with few concessions to development or change. Judges observed that the emphasis of development was on repetition. Critical comments directed towards *Funny Feeling* included: 'lack of exploration', 'lacks development of ideas', 'lacks variety', 'more development required', 'too repetitive', 'does not develop the ideas in a sophisticated manner', 'uses one idea over and over - needs more contrast', and 'not enough contrast or variety achieved'.
Although a majority of judges found *Funny Feeling* had severe deficiencies in musical processes, six responses suggested that application of this variable had merit. One comment recognised potential in the composition: 'ideas are on the right track for development - it seems to just miss!', and compared with the other experiment compositions, a similar comment suggested *Funny Feeling* had 'a less contrived development'. One judge was impressed by the seemingly imperceptible merging of phrases, by suggesting:

- The answering phrases between the instruments gives the feeling that the work was written with unity and balance in mind - not separate lines put together at last.

Highly critical were comments which described the application of knowledge of musical conventions in *Funny Feeling* (N=9). Observation of the printed manuscript generated most comments appropriate to this variable. Specific comments reflect perceived *Funny Feeling* weaknesses in manuscript accuracy, notation, and an absence of directions. The attention to the printed manuscript was important in judges’ responses in this composition, and in the other two experiment compositions, and the attention provided to this feature is an underlying theme in all analyses. This indicates that technical considerations concerned with the ability to notate symbols which represent sounds are a high priority in assessments. Some brief quotations show how this variable was viewed by many judges: 'not enough attention to detail in the score', 'bad scoring of percussion part and saxophone over two staves', 'notation of drum part a problem - no dynamics or tempo directions', 'serious notation problems - no uniformity to the accidentals/key etc.’. Two responses demonstrate the strong influence that poor notation skills in *Funny Feeling* had on some judges. Both show that the sound of the composition was of less consideration when inadequate manuscript skills were evident.

- Some presentation very poor (hasn't taken the time to find out how to use the program properly). Drums - wrong clef. Sax wrong score style and not transposed. Bass - no variety. Drums - not a lot of variety. Nice chords.
- Limited register and sense of harmonic movement. Too much melodic repetition. Improvisation like nature of the sax part required further listening or experimentation. No attention to dynamics and performing techniques or tone colour exploration. No understanding of drum kit writing/notation (kick - bongos?). Do they mean tom toms?

While most comments about craftsmanship criteria were critical of their application in *Funny Feeling*, many judges observed that musical concepts were well utilised (N=9) in this piece. Musical concepts most commended were rhythm, melody, harmony, and texture. Melodic fragments, given momentum by the syncopated rhythmic pulse, were praised, and the
accumulated effect of increasingly thickening textures was considered to demonstrate aptitude in compositional ability. The following comment represents how many judges viewed the use of musical concepts in *Funny Feeling*:

- Good rhythmic feeling – nice chord at the end. The melodic ostinato is a jolly good tune. The texture does have some build up but it meanders along a bit.

Comments suggested that application of stylistic features, and their maintenance in *Funny Feeling*, were strongly applauded (*N*=12). Style was reported in a variety of terms, which were: 'techno', 'groove/funk', 'jazz/rock' and 'jazz'. The composition was considered effective in achieving and maintaining the idiosyncrasies of these styles by its application of appropriate stylistic features. Features of these styles were also identified, and those mentioned were: 'ostinati', syncopation', 'riffs', and the 'blues scale'. The following comment demonstrates the general approval of style in *Funny Feeling*:

- The piece was effective as there was a successful sax blues melody and accompanying bass riff counter-melody. The syncopated rhythms of the percussion were very successful and helped to blend the soft rock/jazz style piece together.

Other comments were less commendatory. One comment suggested the style was 'clichéd', while another identified *Funny Feeling* as 'muzak'. The following remark encapsulates this not uncommon stance:

- A good piece. Good enough for any elevator.

Some criteria identified in assessing *Funny Feeling* were less frequently used. The standard of the composing (*N*=8), and originality (*N*=7) were both generally viewed negatively. Standard or quality was perceived by some judges as 'ordinary', and one judge suggested the composition revealed the level of student competency which was inferior to the composer of *Les Moustiques*:

- The piece . . . would indicate a less able student to the first piece (*Les Moustiques*), but still competent.

This opinion was not unanimous, as one judge considered *Funny Feeling* to be 'excellent'. A personal quality was attributed to the composer to account for score deficiencies - 'Lazy when it comes to scoring the piece properly.' From a creative standpoint, *Funny Feeling* was perceived as unoriginal and derivative. Three judges used positive emotive language when
responding to this piece, and considered it - 'enjoyable', 'grows on you', and 'likeable', while a fourth judge found *Funny Feeling* was simply 'boring'.

Interpretation of results will be conducted later in this chapter. However, qualitative results for *Funny Feeling* suggest that judges used quite clear criteria which were viewed either positively or negatively for assessment purposes. A factor analysis of twenty-one *Specific* (Red) items reports quantitatively on criteria used in the assessment of *Funny Feeling*. Table 35 isolates factors used in *Funny Feeling* Likert responses. Each *Specific* (Red) variable is identified briefly in the table.

**Table 35**

*Five factor oblique solution loadings (> or = 0.64) for twenty-one *Funny Feeling* Specific (Red) variables.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Pitch/melody</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Originality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Pitch/harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Pitch/melody</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Texture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Musical processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Performing media</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Timbre</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Quality of recording</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Conforms to the task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>Non-originality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>Pitch/melody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>Pitch/harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>Timbre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A principal components factor extraction provided ten factors with a chi-square of 578 and a $p$ value of <.0001. Of these the final five factors were omitted from the *Funny Feeling* analysis as the first five accounted for more than 70% of the total variance. Only variables with a factor loading higher than 0.64 have been included in factor descriptions to provide a high level of discrimination. Comparisons between the first five extracted factors show eigenvalues and percentages of Factor 1 are substantially higher than corresponding values for other factors.

Factor 1 includes four variables (a-duration; c-pitch; f-pitch; and g-structure), and is named 'concepts'. Factor 2 consists of two variables (k-performing media; and m-timbre), and is named 'instruments'. Factor 3 consists of one variable (o-conforms to the task), and is named 'compliance'. Factor four consists of two variables (d-originality; and r-score), and because of its complexity is named 'originality and accuracy'. The final factor consists of one variable (m-manuscript), and is named 'manuscript'.

Comparison between the five factors from the factor analysis and criteria identified in the qualitative analysis show strong similarities. The first factor, 'concepts' relies on pitch and duration, in addition to structure. Concepts are similarly substantial in Table 34 which analysed criteria qualitatively. In qualitative results, concepts of duration and pitch through application of rhythm and melody in *Funny Feeling* were commended. The high factor loadings in Factors 4 and 5, which describe 'originality and accuracy' and 'manuscript', were also discussed in judges' comments. Results from the qualitative analysis found that there was a general consensus that manuscript conventions were overlooked in *Funny Feeling*.

*Les Moustiques*

Analysis of criteria used to assess *Les Moustiques* is structured in a similar way as the analysis of criteria for *Funny Feeling*. Qualitative data which describe *Les Moustiques* show that many criteria were identified in the assessment of this composition and there is a considerable amount of common agreement on each. Craftsmanship criteria feature prominently and account for approximately two thirds of all assessment criteria. Criteria within craftsmanship are confidence in handling processes, ability to use concepts correctly, synthesis of musical concepts, knowledge of conventions, and the use of techniques/skills. Less prominent are the following criteria: genre, subjectivity, compliance with task requirements, style, and standard of achievement. While most comments commended the
application of this group of criteria in *Les Moustiques*, all comments which used the latter criterion considered *Les Moustiques* reflected a high level of composing competence. Originality is the single criterion about which some judges registered reservations. Table 36 shows comparative numbers, percentage of total comments, and the positive or negative direction of the application of each criterion in *Les Moustiques* as identified in judges' assessments.

**Table 36**

*Assessment criteria identified in experiment judges' assessments of *Les Moustiques* *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Numerical order</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
<th>% of total comments</th>
<th>Comment number orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques/skills</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivity</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals</strong></td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36 shows that musical processes and their manipulation were highly significant in assessing *Les Moustiques* (*N*=19). Many comments valued developmental procedures used in *Les Moustiques* and commended structure, balance, unity and variety within this composition. Judges commented that *Les Moustiques* dealt with the complexities of the composition process through problem-solving methods. Two judges elaborated on the demonstration of appropriate musical processes in two quotations presented during different assessment procedures:

- *(Les Moustiques)* develops motivic material - has a grasp of elements and how they can be manipulated. Work shows signs of 'chewing over' elements. Has a logical flow - problem solving rather than the first thing that pops into your head.
- *(Les Moustiques)* communicates and has a sense of movement through time - a journey.
Some criticism was directed toward musical processes used in *Les Moustiques* \((N=8)\). While two judges considered overall ideas in this piece were 'static' and 'without structure', the major point of criticism was with the middle section of the piece - its tempo, length, and motivic development. Some comments suggested that the tempo was too slow in this section, and others were dissatisfied with how the composer had realised contrast. The following quotation shows how some judges considered the middle section failed:

- The middle section grows out of the ideas stated in the 'A' section but not enough to grow from it. In such a short piece the melodic ideas stated could have had more relevance to 'A' as with the accompaniment. The 'A' section I feel is quite successful but the work is spoilt by the lack of continuity into the middle section. An interesting work in parts eg bar 35 to the end.

Judges strongly commended the use of other craftsmanship criteria in *Les Moustiques*. Generous praise was attributed to the way this composition used musical concepts \((N=8)\). Commendation for instrumental tone colours, sonorities, rhythmic motives, melodic material, textural and mood changes, dynamics, tempo contrast and interpretative subtleties were itemised. Allied with the use of concepts, judges identified many technical skills utilised in *Les Moustiques* \((N=7)\). These included 'accents', 'augmentation', 'ostinato', 'pizzicato', 'ternary form', 'tone cluster', 'tritones', and 'unusual time signatures'. Interesting technical combinations were found throughout the piece. For example, judges reported 'use of accents in vibraphone against violin pizzicato', 'augmentation in the piano part bar 8 of vibraphone melody', and 'good use of ostinato and contrasting longer note melodies'.

The manipulation of various concepts in the creation of a piece was frequently labeled as 'cohesion'. The term 'synthesis' was seldom used, but it was clear that judges appreciated synchronisation of concepts, processes and skills in *Les Moustiques* \((N=9)\). For example, the first quotation below provides a broad amalgam of craftsmanship criteria. The second example is the single reference to the programme aspects of the composition:

- The work demonstrates mature stylistic understandings in its use of structure, thematic material, development of ideas, use of performance directions and instrumental understanding.
- *Les Moustiques* was written in an Art music style and had a lot of variety. The instruments were written to exploit the various tone colours and portrayed a mosquito effectively. There was a good use of countermelody, ostinato, rhythmic variety etc. Similar in style to a Ross Edwards piece ie professional.
Criteria, which included craftsmanship, standard, and programme features, located in the statement above, reflect on the merit of *Les Moustiques* as a composition, and collectively can be viewed as a 'synthesis' of learning conditions.

Comments which described the knowledge of conventions demonstrated by *Les Moustiques* were divided into two distinct viewpoints. Attention to accuracy in the manuscript was frequently noted and fine details regarding registration and articulation were commended $(N=4)$. Opposed to this, other remarks were critical of the writing for the oboe, piano, vibraphone, and violin. Criticism of the use of these instruments was predominantly aimed at registers used, while the writing for piano was perceived as 'simplistic' in some comments $(N=4)$.

Other criteria, especially genre, style, standard, and subjectivity were frequently identified as criteria used to assess *Les Moustiques*. Identified as inhabiting a 'chamber music' genre, judges made reference to the role of each instrumental part, with some recommending further exploration of tone colours and registers was required $(N=8)$. Style was seldom discussed $(N=4)$. A single comment likened it to 1950s film music, although it was identified by some judges as showing Bartokian influences, and two judges defined it as 'minimalist'. The level of competence achieved in *Les Moustiques* was highly praised $(N=7)$, as is shown in the following extracts from comments: 'best overall, 'best structures', 'much higher level of sophistication', 'clear superiority', 'professional'. Other extracts commend the level of expertise achieved in *Les Moustiques* further:

- So much better than the other two pieces. The mark keeps getting higher by comparison.
- *Les Moustiques* is far in front of the other two with a real sense of personal style and sophisticated manipulation of the elements of music.

Some judges articulated strong personal approval by providing more emotive responses. One judge considered *Les Moustiques* 'hits the spot', and another declared 'I like the tempo changes and the selection of performing media'. Others found it was 'cute', and 'humorous, witty'. Two judges, however, considered it was 'dull' and 'predictable'.

Comments showed that *Les Moustiques* was considered unoriginal $(N=6)$. There were some exceptions which expressed the view that the piece was creative, but most reflected that the composition was imitative. Some examples demonstrate this view: 'ideas aren't always unique', 'clichéd twentieth century piece', and 'lacks exploration'. Preliminary interpretation of
Les Moustiques results suggest that judges use quite clear criteria which were for the most part very positive.

The above information described criteria which judges used to assess Les Moustiques using qualitative analysis. Results from factor analysis of Likert items from the Specific (Red) session are shown in Table 37. This table isolates variables which combine to describe factors used to assess Les Moustiques during the Specific (Red) session. A principal components factor extraction provided ten factors with a chi square of 835 and a p value of <.0001. Of these, the final seven factors were omitted from the Les Moustiques analysis as the first three accounted for more than 70% of the total variance. Comparisons between the first three extracted factors show that Factor 1 values are substantially higher than corresponding values for Factors 2 and 3. Further, Factor 1 is comprised of all Specific (Red) variables with factor loading $>or = 0.88$. Factor loadings for Factor 2 are $>or = 0.75$ and for Factor 3 are $>or = 0.52$.

Factor 1 includes five variables (a-duration; e-pitch; f-pitch; i-duration; and q-pitch), and is named 'concepts'. Factor 2 consists of one variable (s-pitch), and is named 'harmony'. Factor 3 consists of one variable (r-score), and is named 'score'. Comparison between the five factors from the factor analysis and criteria identified in the qualitative analysis show strong similarities. The first factor, 'concepts' relies exclusively on pitch and duration concepts. Although musical processes used in Les Moustiques were the most prominent criteria of the qualitative analysis, rhythmic motifs, melodic material, and complex harmonic features were frequently noted. Factor 2 similarly uses harmony in its description. Factor 3 is described in terms of score accuracy. In qualitative analysis, approval for the fine details of articulation, and attention to points of interpretation, were commended frequently, and attention to accuracy in the score is consistent between both analyses. While the qualitative analysis provides additional criteria on which Les Moustiques was assessed, both analyses are complementary in describing criteria concerned with musical concepts and manuscript presentation.
Table 37

Three factor oblique solution loadings for twenty-one Les Moustiques Specific (Red) variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variab</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Pitch/melody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Originality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Pitch/harmony</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Pitch/melody</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Texture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Musical processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Performing media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Timbre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Quality of recording</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Conforms to the task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>Non-originality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>Pitch/melody</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>Pitch/harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>Timbre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Tube Song

Analysis of criteria used to assess Test Tube Song is structured in a similar way to the analyses of criteria for Funny Feeling and Les Moustiques. Qualitative data which described how judges assessed Test Tube Song show that many criteria were used and there was a considerable amount of common agreement on each criterion. There was an imbalance in the proportion of comments which reflected positive or negative values towards this composition, and most reflected dissatisfaction for the application of criteria in Test Tube Song. Only one criterion, style, reversed this trend, and in this criterion, a balanced distribution was registered. Criteria used to assess Test Tube Song were predominantly those which can be identified as craftsmanship, and the most commonly used were handling musical processes and the use of concepts. Two other prominent criteria used were style and the standard of the composition. Table 38 below shows all criteria, ranked in order of frequency, used in
comments which described how *Test Tube Song* was assessed. The table shows comparative numbers, percentage of total comments, and the positive or negative direction of the application of each criterion in *Test Tube Song*.

Judges' perceptions of the application of musical processes in *Test Tube Song* observed through balance, unity, variety, and development of material were overwhelmingly negative (*N*=14). Judges' responses identified flaws in developmental processes, with most considering *Test Tube Song* demonstrated inadequate expansion of musical ideas, and an over emphasis on repetition at the expense of contrast or evolution. The first example below shows the type of perceptions commonly held towards processes demonstrated in *Test Tube Song*. Three judges, however, presented an opposing view in which musical processes used in *Test Tube Song* were weighed against the genre and style of the piece. As a result, perceptions of merit were increased:

- Needs more variety to make use of instruments available: must have contrast otherwise we will be bored! Needs more development of ideas.
- Worked well in the genre selected. Had a sense of development - stuck to a few basic ideas and used them well and gave them a direction. Used both the harmony (vocals and guitar) to get there. Each layer worked together well in achieving a common goal. Limited stylistically however, there were no surprises.

Judges were equally divided on the success of the use of concepts in assessing *Test Tube Song* (*N*=10). Concepts were perceived as being used with an understanding of their potential, but in application concepts failed to achieve the full effect which was promised in their early exposition. Comments were tempered with some reflection of inadequacy, for example 'an understanding of voices and instruments shown, except for marimba'. Perceptions ranged across a variety of concepts, and are shown in the following quotations: 'percussion parts nearly work', 'melodic ideas not developed', 'has good ideas - key change', 'an attempt at harmonic variety', 'dull harmonic vocabulary', 'no form', and 'poor use of instruments'. While the vocal writing was occasionally commended as being 'interesting', contrary opinions were expressed on idiomatic treatment of the performing media. Some writing was considered 'awkward' in *Test Tube Song* and some judges identified there was limited control over musical concepts.
Table 38
Assessment criteria identified in experiment judges’ assessments of Test Tube Song

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Numerical order</th>
<th>Number of comments</th>
<th>% of total comments</th>
<th>Comment number orientation</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Processes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concepts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Originality</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjectivity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compliance</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Techniques/skills</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals N/A 82 100% 26 56

Little reference was made to technical skills used in Test Tube Song (N=2). When identified, this variable was usually not supported by specific details. A rare comment commended the achievement of the climactic point, although as in the use of concepts, the comment was accompanied by ubiquitous criticism for this piece:

- Some good manipulation of ideas but having the marimba doubling the melodic material was unsuccessful. Climax point in bar 27 worked well with the contrary motion vocal parts. Percussion was too repetitive.

Comments were again highly critical of a perceived failure of Test Tube Song to demonstrate a knowledge of conventions (N=7). Most of these comments alluded to inadequacies in the printed manuscript, with some simply stating that the 'score was inaccurate'. Others provided a comprehensive description of demonstrated problems with the manuscript:

- Score problems. Percussion – one person could not play all those parts. Vocals (backing) not accurately notated. Chords and lyrics floating in the margin. Lyrics not vertically lined up. No title. Too much span for lead voice and not enough for bass voice. Backup vocals on tape more interesting than the score.

The above comment shows the strong attention given to the printed manuscript for assessment purposes and confirms results which were identified in qualitative criteria used to assess Funny Feeling. When assessing Funny Feeling, judges placed considerable emphasis on the
printed presentation of this composition, and found some weaknesses in the manuscript which were not evident in the sound recording.

The establishing and maintaining of appropriate style as an assessment criterion was a high priority in assessing Test Tube Song. Some confusion and disagreement was demonstrated by judges' opinions about this criterion \((N=11)\). There was no consensus on what style was evident in the piece, which was labelled under many contrasting titles. These were 'rock', 'Beatles', 'pseudo-flamenco', 'folk', and 'popular'. The mixture of styles gave rise to the perception that Test Tube Song did not conform to task descriptors, which were that the music should reflect music written since 1970. Two judges considered it was too similar to the Beatles' sound of the pre-70s. An assortment of stylistic features made identification of a common genre somewhat difficult. Three judges labeled Test Tube Song as a rock piece, and one judge considered the piece worked well in that genre. However, two other judges observed that in the rock genre an absence of a bass guitar was out of character. These judges explained that a strong bass line, a characteristic of rock music, was omitted from the composition.

More criticism was directed toward Test Tube Song for its perceived low standard \((N=10)\). Identified as 'simplistic', 'too simple - not at a 2/3 Unit standard', and 'a weak composition', the quality of this piece was seen as inferior. Two longer examples provide further reflections on Test Tube Song based on standards of expertise. The second quotation questions the composer's ability, and recognises that the flamboyant performance could have concealed a lower standard composition:

- A poor repetitive piece. Poor use of performing media, repetitive chord structure, weak impact.
- The recording and the score give an impression of a high level of competence at the style attempted. The composer should give up the pretence, however, that the piece could be performed with only one guitar.

Test Tube Song was considered unoriginal, clichéd and conventional \((N=7)\). This is a criterion for which Les Moustiques was equally criticised. One judge suggested that Test Tube Song was a 'complete copy of ideas' but failed to identify the source of this implied plagiarism. Others expressed the same doubts - 'Originality is questionable. Sounds contrived'. Two judges disagreed with this summation, and considered Test Tube Song was 'willing to explore and be original'. Two judges reacted personally to Test Tube Song,
describing is as 'numbing' and 'annoying', while a third subject dismissed it on the subjective
ground that it did 'not hold attention'.

A second analysis of criteria used by judges to assess Test Tube Song was conducted on
twenty-one Likert scale responses in the Specific (Red) session. Results are shown in Table
39. The factor analysis in this table, using a principal components factor extraction, provided
ten factors with a chi square of 609 and a p value of <.0001. Of these, the final five factors
were omitted from the Test Tube Song analysis as the first five accounted for more than 70%
of the total variance. Comparisons between the first five extracted factors show that Factor 1
values are considerably higher than corresponding values for other factors.

Table 39
Five factor oblique solution loadings (>or = 0.63) for twenty-one Test Tube Song Specific
(Red) variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Factor 5</th>
<th>Eigenvalue</th>
<th>% of variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>Dynamics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>Pitch/melody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>Originality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>Pitch/harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f</td>
<td>Pitch/melody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g</td>
<td>Structure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>Texture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j</td>
<td>Musical processes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k</td>
<td>Performing media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l</td>
<td>Manuscript</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m</td>
<td>Timbre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>Quality of recording</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o</td>
<td>Conforms to the task</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p</td>
<td>Non-originality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>q</td>
<td>Pitch/melody</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>r</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>s</td>
<td>Pitch/harmony</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>u</td>
<td>Timbre</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Four variables comprise Factor 1 *Test Tube Song* (e-pitch; h-texture; n-quality of recording; and u-timbre). This factor is named 'concepts and recording'. Two variables comprise Factor 2 (s-pitch; and t-standard), which is called 'standard' due to the high loading of comparative of the latter variable. The third factor is comprised of two variables (b-dynamics; and r-score) and is called 'score'. Two variables comprise Factor 4 (c-pitch; and l-manuscript), and this is called 'manuscript'. Factor 5 consists of one variable (k-performing media), and is entitled 'performing media'. In comparison with qualitative analysis, factor analysis failed to identify musical processes which were important in the former analysis. However, concepts were important in the first factor, and criteria identified in the other factors were in accord with the qualitative analysis. Consideration of manuscript, and correct score features, and the standard *Test Tube Song* were criteria which were of concern in both analyses. A discussion of criteria used in the three pieces is presented following the analysis of criteria used for all three pieces collectively.

Hypothesis 3(ii) was designed to test the effect for different criteria in assessing *Funny Feeling, Les Moustiques*, and *Test Tube Song* collectively. Data to test this hypothesis used results from fifteen Likert responses in the *Global* (Blue) session, and twenty-one Likert responses in the *Specific* (Red) session. Identification of the items and their content from both Likert scales is shown below.

**Global (Blue) Likert items:**

1. **a** This piece has a sense of cohesion in its development of ideas
2. **b** This piece demonstrates a convincing sense of style
3. **c** Musical ideas are highly appropriate for the selected performing media
4. **d** This piece is original and uses unique ideas
5. **e** The piece meets the requirements of the task 'Music since 1970'
6. **f** In my opinion this piece has no artistic merit
7. **g** This piece is successful in using compositional techniques
8. **h** The composer's intention is clearly communicated
9. **i** This piece does not sustain my interest throughout
10. **j** This piece derives its ideas from pre-existing music
11. **k** This piece has no variety
12. **l** This piece demonstrates a high level of musical discrimination
13. **m** My personal response to the music - I like it
14. **n** This piece fails to demonstrate expertise in the manipulation of musical materials
15. **o** This piece is creative

**Specific (Red) Likert items:**

- **a** Rhythmic features are used skilfully in this piece
- **b** Dynamics are sensitively applied throughout this piece
- **c** Melodic fragments are repetitive and overused
This piece is novel in its use of one or more concepts

Harmonic features, including chord choice, chord progressions, modulation and cadences suggest a high level of expertise

I enjoy the melodic ideas in this piece

There is a logical flow through a series of structural events

This piece is proficient in its selection and manipulation of textural treatments

There is rhythmic cohesion in this piece

This piece is proficient in handling musical processes eg development, variation

The treatment of instruments and/or voices demonstrates knowledge of conventions

There are errors in instrumental and/or vocal use eg register/range/appropriateness of role

This piece demonstrates comprehension of timbral qualities in its vocal/instrumental scoring

The recording impairs an accurate appreciation of this piece

This piece satisfies requirements of the task - 'Music since 1970'

There is a clichéd use of one or more concepts in this piece

Melodically there is sufficient balance between unity and variety

The score is accurate giving sufficient attention to detail

The harmonic language is simplistic

The standard of composition is not consistent throughout this piece

Please rate the success of this piece in the use of the chosen combination of instruments/voices

This analysis compares the comparative means of all Global (Blue) Likert items and Specific (Red) Likert items for three compositions. Results are shown in two graphs, Figures 5 and 6.

In both graphs, the order of items from the two experiment sessions is altered from the order shown in the above sets of items to provide for easier interpretation of the content of the graphs. Both graphs are displayed with the X axis showing the lists of Likert items appropriate to each, and the Y axis displaying the mean of the Likert responses as provided by the twenty-four judges. Likert responses with low means indicate high approval, and Likert responses with high means indicate low approval for items.

Results in both Figure 5 and 6 strongly demonstrate a common pattern. In all but two items (j-Figure 5, and n-Figure 6), the comparative means of the three compositions maintains the same pattern throughout. This shows that Les Mousquitues had a mean rating which is consistent regardless of what criteria were used in its assessment, and this piece was considered the most effective piece in the use of these items. Test Tube Song also had a mean rating which was similarly consistent throughout all items and similarly was always considered the least effective piece in the use of these items. Funny Feeling had a mean rating which always scored between the means for the other two pieces, and while the means were not always an equal distance between the other two pieces, the pattern changed only in the two identified items.
Figure 5
Graph showing the comparative means of responses to fifteen Global (Blue) items for assessment of experiment compositions
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Figure 6

Graph showing the comparative means of responses to twenty-one Specific (Red) items for assessment of experiment compositions
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A second pattern can be seen from Figures 5 and 6. This is that some items show that all three pieces have a positive rating (lower than 3.5), and that there are other items, although fewer, in which the pieces are all rated negatively (lower than 5.5). This might suggest that there are some criteria which provide greater discrimination for assessment than others. Item (e) in Figure 5, and Item (o) in Figure 6 were the same question which was repeated in both experiment sessions. This was the highest rating item in both graphs, and the three means are alike. At the opposite extreme, items (j) in Figure 5 and (p) in Figure 6 are concerned with originality, and were rated the lowest of all items, with (j) sharing a common mean for all three pieces.

One item, identified earlier as (n)-'The recording impairs an accurate appreciation of this piece' from figure 6, was the single disparate result from the pattern identified earlier in all 'Global' (Blue) and 'Specific' (Red) items. In this item, the mean for Funny Feeling was higher than that of Les Moustiques, and Test Tube Song was also rated close to the means of the other two pieces. This suggests that the recording of Les Moustiques which was made from a live performance with acoustic instruments, may have been detrimental to the assessment of this piece. Several comments were made which suggested that the recording was of inferior quality in comparison with the recording quality of the other two pieces. A discussion of results to test the two parts of Hypothesis 3 follows.

**Discussion**

Hypothesis 3(i) was a positive hypothesis which tested the effect for different criteria used by judges when assessing the three experiment compositions individually. In qualitative data, judges were quite clear on their choice of criteria used in their assessments. Each composition was assessed according to a paradigm which included craftsmanship as an underlying criterion. This criterion combined with a wide variety of other criteria which were initiated by parameters generated within each individual composition. Criteria were from either a positive or a negative viewpoint. Data from factor analyses of Specific (Red) criteria reinforced the dependence of assessments on the application of concepts in compositions, although other criteria were evident which were important to the assessment of the three compositions. Each composition is discussed briefly using a combination of results from both qualitative and quantitative analyses.
Criteria used in *Funny Feeling* assessment were clearly identified as the use of processes, and the application of concepts, style, and knowledge. The rhythmic flow established in the piece was highly commended, but in manuscript presentation this piece was found deficient. There was a broad range and combination of criteria used to assess *Les Moustiques*, and craftsmanship variables featured prominently. The standard of this composition was considered high, and the application of concepts, their synthesis in the piece, and the use of techniques and composing skills were important criteria. *Test Tube Song* was rated on processes which were considered inadequate in this piece, as was the standard, which judges generally considered as inferior to the other pieces.

Prominent criteria used in the assessment of the above pieces were: craftsmanship, which involved an amalgam of skills, abilities, and knowledge; the use of concepts; style, and its maintenance within the composition; standard; genre; originality; subjectivity; and compliance with task requirements. The hypothesis that there will be an effect for different criteria in assessing three individual compositions written at senior secondary level is accepted. The next part of the discussion responds to Hypothesis 3(ii) that there will be an effect for different assessment criteria when the three compositions are considered collectively.

Results from the two graphs which compared the criteria used in Likert scales responses in two assessment procedures would indicate that there is little effect for different criteria in assessing the three compositions collectively. Certain criteria have higher discrimination value than others, however. Judges considered that originality is difficult to achieve at the senior secondary student level, and they acknowledged that students imitate techniques they observe in musical examples, and that assessments accommodate some writing which is derivative of other music. Conforming with task requirements was important in judges' assessments. Judges consistently demonstrated they had clear views on the meaning of music since 1970, and conforming to this task requirement was a guide to assessment. Nevertheless, the hypothesis that there is an effect for different criteria in assessing three compositions collectively, was not proven.

The difference in attitude of males and females to composition was not a priority of the second research protocol, and no attempt to explore this issue was made in the experiment. However, one judge identified accurately the gender of the composer of *Les Moustiques*. The
comment is reported here as it demonstrates that gender traits were attributed to the composing style demonstrated in the composition.

- This is the default compositional style of MANY candidates (usually the female ones) at HSC level - it's easy - it comes off - it's derivative - oh well.

The author of the above comment was a male judge who identified that he was a professional composer. Comments by other judges similarly accurately identified the gender of the composer of *Test Tube Song*. In comments, the composer was identified as male by several judges. These observations, demonstrated judges' experiences in classroom situations teaching both boys and girls, and may have implications for gender and composition which may influence learning in composition, and equally teachers' assessments of compositions.

5.5: Research question 1  
(from a post-experiment perspective)

Research Question 1  
- *In teaching composition to senior students in NSW secondary schools, what do secondary music teachers report are their:*
  
  i) assessment strategies, and  
  
  ii) assessment criteria?

The final session of the research experiment (*ACERF*, Session 5) provided judges with an opportunity to add further data which was not required for experiment purposes, but which they considered was appropriate to assessment of composition within the parameters of the senior music curriculum. For this reason, two questions (Q 2 and Q 3), explored personal procedures used, and notation and/or manuscript preferences respectively. Although presentation of data to address the first hypothesis at this point in Chapter 5 appears retrospective, chronological presentation of data has been selected to maintain the two research projects as separate entities.

Data provided to address Hypothesis 1 from the research experiment were limited to details which were most appropriate to the experiment. These details described how judges viewed differences and similarities in time, procedures, and strategies used in the experiment with what they usually used in normal practice with senior secondary composition assessment.
Judges additionally supplied information on their preferred modes of composition presentation, and enumerated insights into manuscript and sound generation.

The section to follow provides detailed information on the above categories. In summary, several features can be confirmed as demonstrated by a majority of judges. A range of responses showed no specific time was traditionally used for summative assessment of senior secondary compositions, although generally one week was commonly devoted to this function. Similarly with the experiment, judges considered they should be familiar with both the written and aural experience of each composition. Different from the procedure used in the experiment, judges disliked using a generic set of Likert-style questions. More preferred, and not available in the research experiment, was observation of the composing process, and a knowledge of each composition's development through a diary or by interview with the composer.

Both aural and written presentation of compositions together were overwhelmingly preferred to any individual form of presentation. While individual preferences were evident for and against technological support in delivering manuscripts and sound recording, it was generally agreed that most important was the need for clarity and authenticity in the presentation of sound, and legibility and accuracy in the presentation of manuscripts. Results which follow present qualitative data, with the exception of one section which includes a summary table which describes judges' preferences for sound and notation.

**Results**

Judges compared the final assessment of student compositions in senior secondary music classes and assessment of the research experiment compositions. Of concern was the time allocated in the final appraisal of a senior secondary student composition. Responses identified finite amounts of time which judges committed to this activity. While one judge reflected that, depending on the individual composition, the process could take as little as thirty seconds, or as long as a week, half of all judges maintained that the final assessment of a single composition could be completed in one hour. Eight judges considered they required more than one assessment session over a period of between one day and one week. Four judges felt a final assessment was longer term, and could take up to several weeks.
In addition to confirming how long the assessment process was, judges \( (N=12) \) indicated that assessment was not merely a summative process, as was suggested by the experiment. As teachers are present throughout the composition process, they are familiar with student products prior to final assessment. Judges indicated that assessment at the final stage of the writing of a composition fulfilled both formative and diagnostic needs. Judges singled out student interaction as an important part of the assessment enterprise, and suggested that teaching, learning and assessment were part of one process which was continual and more of a team effort than an individual obligation of the teacher.

Other points of view concerning summative assessment were presented. Two judges considered that when marking multiple numbers of compositions, ranking was a fair and helpful exercise. Familiarity with an assessment composition was important, and many judges stressed the importance of repeated visits to a composition manuscript and composition recording. Two sample responses illustrate the features described above:

- It varies as I am usually closely involved during the process so one is constantly assessing. In the final appraisal one is constantly measuring one student's work against another. It could take a whole day or longer.
- Ongoing from beginning – final session I guess 1 hour. However my assessment moves over weeks. Final assessment a formality only.

Judges compared and contrasted similarities and differences between strategies and procedures in the experiment with how they would normally conduct assessment of senior secondary student compositions in the school environment. Most agreed that structurally the assessment process of the experiment was similar to their personal use. There was tacit agreement that pieces required familiarisation through aural and visual presentation and no judge made any negative reference to the style or genre of the three experiment pieces. There was no dispute with an examination of pieces through impression, global, and specific procedures.

Comparisons between research implementation and normal practice for assessment of senior student composition used by the twenty-four judges reflected common procedures. Three judges, however, suggested a change in order from that which they experienced in the experiment. The rotation of procedures which was important in the experiment design caused this difference. Judges preferred a cursory first observation, followed by more intense investigation. Two of these comments are shown below:
• More of a gut feeling rather than deep analysis at first. Procedures such as harmonic use, relevance of topic, use of instruments/texture etc. follow.
• Very similar – take an initial ‘gut reaction’, then go back and look carefully at musical elements/developments etc.

Some subjects \(N=8\) identified differences in practice from the research experiment. Most of these commented on the time allocation in individual sessions. In some sessions, they suggested, they had rushed their responses. In their classroom assessment, these judges considered they would use less questions, and take longer to consider aspects of each piece. Additionally, in classroom practice in the senior curriculum, judges would be familiar with student compositions, so questions would be less generic than those used in the experiment, and would grow from individual pieces. This view is shown in the following quotation:

• At HSC I tend toward specific remarks and assessment of the piece itself, rather than generalities about musical elements.

Several differences between judges’ assessment strategies and those implied in the research experiment emerged. Judges’ comments were frequently conflicting. For example, three judges commented that they were averse to Likert scales, but in contrast two subjects normally utilised a check list. One judge recommended that guidelines from the NSW Board of Studies assisted in personal assessment strategies. Another comment questioned the fundamental premise of music teaching based on a conceptual approach, which was strongly evident in:

• Too much acceptance in the questioning of the nineteenth century-borne academic pigeon-holing of concepts.

As described earlier, strategies suggested that formative aspects of assessment to include student interaction, such as vivas and process diaries, were different from those used in the experiment.

Thirteen judges proposed other procedures which could be utilised in composition assessment which had not been identified either in the experiment or in their previous comments. The most frequently mentioned suggestion was to take account of the composing process \(N=7\), by use of a journal, log, process diary, draft material, or a viva voce. One comment reiterated the difficulty of assessment when contrasting styles and genres are considered:

• Only that it is very hard to apply the same criteria for assessing diverse pieces of music! This also appears to be an occult, intangible element which contributes to the value of a piece of music.
Other comments suggested procedures such as study of the score, style, and the use of technology, all of which were previously included in the research experiment design, could be used as criteria for assessing compositions in the senior curriculum.

Judges described their preferred form of composition production in the final assessment of senior secondary music compositions. Judges completed a series of three five point Likert-style questions to indicate the frequency of the use of three approaches to composition presentation. Three given approaches were 'sound only', 'notation only', and 'sound and notation'. Five options available for responses represented the following frequency of use: 'always', 'frequently', 'sometimes', 'occasionally', and 'never'. Results are shown in Table 40.

Results showed judges' choices and the comparative frequency of use of three contrasting approaches to composition presentation. A large majority of judges (N=19; 75%) identified a combination of 'sound and notation' together was the most used approach in presentation of compositions for assessment. Other judges indicated that they used 'sound and notation' 'frequently' (N=5; 21%), and the remaining judges used 'sound and notation' 'sometimes'. Judges demonstrated an ambivalent approach to composition assessment from a 'sound only' approach, with many indicating that they avoid this type of presentation to assess compositions, and an equal number revealing that they made use of this approach.

Table 40

Judges' preferred approaches to composition presentation (ACERF Session 5, Q.4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always or frequently</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Occasionally or never</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound Only</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notation only</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sound &amp; notation</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Judges commented on two related methods of composition production. The first was a comparison between the visual presentation of manuscripts, either computer-generated or in a student's own handwriting. The second was comparison with sound presentation, either through synthetic or acoustic production. In responses, judges provided considerable qualitative data, which indicated the level of interest in this aspect of assessment.

A majority of judges suggested that all four presentation methods were acceptable for examination purposes, and many responses listed the advantages and disadvantages inherent in the application of all four presentation methods. Personal preferences gravitated towards either electronically-produced or acoustic sound, and computer-published or hand-written manuscripts. Most important in all responses was the need for clarity and authenticity in the presentation of sound, and legibility and accuracy in the presentation of music scores. In the qualitative report which follows, advantages and disadvantages of each presentation method identified by judges are summarised with appropriate examples of judges' comments. Reporting of music scores will be addressed first, followed by sound generation.

In presenting music scores for assessment, most judges agreed that providing that certain requirements are met, apart from a teacher's personal preference, there is no effect on assessment for computer-generated and hand-written scores. These requirements are that the score is neat, legible, accurate, includes all expressive and tempo directions, and avoids unnecessary errors. The following examples indicates the general consensus of opinion:

- No difference – check range, notation etc that it is accurate – ongoing.
- I expect only the highest conformity to accepted standards. How the student gets close to this is his business.

Several other comments suggested, as did the latter quotation, that the ultimate arbiter of presentation of the manuscript is a comparison with professional copy, and the achievement of this is a concern of each individual student.

Five judges indicated that they preferred personally written manuscripts for assessment purposes. The major criticism of this type of presentation was that 'handwriting can be messy'. In direct contrast, another judge disputed this criticism, and cited from personal experience that 'I have many students who script as well as a computer'. One subject offered the opinion that certain styles are traditionally hand written, and implied a preference towards this approach:
• Makes no difference although pop/rock isn't as appropriate to use computer generated scores – handwritten is more intimate to read.

Some judges also advocated this form of presentation for the reflection of a personal quality which was expressed only in a hand-written manuscript.

A greater number of judges (N=9) confirmed that for an assessment context, they preferred students to generate scores electronically rather than to write them personally. Reasons given for this choice were that scores were easier to read and looked more professional. Many judges considered that scores should be presented in this form as today the appropriate technology is commonly used in education. Familiarity with programs and the obvious extension to submission of music manuscripts using technology is shown in two responses:

• I encourage all students to use computer generated scores. We start using notation software in Year 7 so by the time they are in Yr 12 it is not a problem to use.
• I have rarely marked a hand-written score and never at HSC level.

The major debate about score presentation when presenting computer-published scores applied to challenges faced by students in learning how to use software programs. Knowledge of the idiosyncrasies of software programs, especially of editing procedures, and adequate knowledge of conventional notation procedures to avoid inaccuracies, were identified as essential. One judge identified an often-mentioned problem with drum notation when using software programs:

• Scores (manuscripts) – no problem providing drum parts are correctly notated, parts are not left with over four leger lines and all expressive markings are included. Students should be penalised if these are left out.

A second judge considered that addressing inaccuracies of this type caused the teacher considerable time and effort. Despite this extra burden on themselves as teachers to support learning through technology, a majority of judges strongly advocated the use of computer-publishing in senior student composition assessment.

In presenting sound recordings of composition pieces for senior composition assessment, judges took a different view of technology. A consensus of all judges recommended that acoustic sound was highly preferable to synthesized sound and some responses were adamant that synthesized sound should be avoided completely. Judges suggested that synthesized sound, generated by computer programs, was superior only to an absence of sound whatsoever, and had the potential to affect a teacher's mark negatively in assessment, as sounds were frequently not authentic to the tone colours indicated in associated scores. In
contrast, generating sounds acoustically was seen as important in the composition learning process. Learning includes knowledge of tone colours and capabilities of performing media, which are best understood through experience with acoustic sound. In final assessments, judges recommended acoustic sounds as they provided an assessor with a clear description of the composer's intention. In defence of synthesized sound, five judges considered some advantages which could be explored by senior students. Most advantages supported learning rather than assessment. One judge explained that technology facilitates easy exploration in preliminary stages of composition preparation and avoids accessing musicians for experimental purposes. In this way synthesized sound is 'good as a sketch pad'. Other judges considered it was 'better than nothing' and 'sometimes necessary'. Two judges explained that some music styles, especially electronic music, required that sounds were generated synthetically.

Ten judges were critical of computer-generated recordings of assessment compositions. They cited distorted and inaccurate sounds to represent specific instruments and voices. Judges considered computer-generated recordings lacked scope for expressive and technical subtleties. One judge explained why there is an aversion to computer-generated recordings:

* It does affect it (assessment). Particularly with sounds that are very different to the intended instrument. It is difficult to mark. I don't think the process is as effective for the kids.

A second judge was uncompromising in criticism of computer-generated recordings, insisting that each composition should be as close to perfection as possible. A reversion to colloquial expression reflects the strength of the judge's conviction in this view:

* I’ll spew if I have to hear another general MIDI composition. Students should fork over some money and get into a real recording studio and get their work properly produced.

Most judges, however, were prepared to accept computer-generated recordings as occasionally necessary, but considered 'the real thing is preferred'. The section above described data which was provided by judges from a post-experiment perspective about the experiment and and to respond to Research Question 1. The following results show results of \( t \)-tests which confirm correlations between variables in the experiment.

This section reports results of paired \( t \)-tests which investigated the importance or otherwise of two variables in the conduct of the experiment. These were judges' gender, and their teaching experience in NSW secondary schools. Comparisons were made between these variables and
the scores allocated to the three compositions during the 'Global' (Blue) and 'Specific' (Red) sessions. Results for judges' teaching experience in NSW secondary schools showed significant results in both sessions. Results of t-tests conducted for teaching experience and 'Global' (Blue) scores all had a $p$ value of <.0001 and the $t$ values of 6.39, 5.83, and 7.13 were shown for *Funny Feeling*, *Les Moustiques*, and *Test Tube Song* respectively. Results of $t$-tests conducted for teaching experience and 'Specific' (Red) scores similarly all had a $p$ value of <.0001 and the $t$ values of 6.53, 5.82, and 7.11 for the same three pieces. These results show that years of teaching experience in NSW secondary schools has some influence on judges' assessments. The following discussion interprets results from the previous section.

**Discussion**

Information from the post-experiment results provides insights into comparisons between assessments which judges conduct in their schools with experiment assessments. This information also confirms results from the survey. Judges described procedures, strategies, and the mode of composition presentation which they preferred. Similarly with the survey, judges indicated that assessments were preferred for formative purposes, so that students could contribute to assessment sessions and benefit from the teacher's input, and be part of the composition process. Judges commented that the experiment was limited as no knowledge of composition processes were provided for them. Equally, in their own assessment practices, judges indicated they would be unlikely to use generic questions evident in the Likert scales.

Impression, global, and specific assessment procedures were commonly used by judges. However, a preference was shown for a sequence of procedures which commenced with a cursory observation of a composition followed by more detailed scrutiny. Judges prefer to have a thorough knowledge of the composed music so their judgements are made from an informed position. This corroborates results from the survey, in which respondents indicated they used different procedures in their assessments. Judges confirmed that ranking was a common practice in both protocols, although many expressed a reluctance to use this form of assessment which compared students against one another, music styles against others, and did little to enhance student learning.

The presentation of compositions in aural and written form was a concern which was ubiquitous in all areas of the experiment, no less so than in the final session. Of most importance is that the sound is clear and authentic, the manuscript writing is legible and
accurate, and both forms of presentation communicate the same messages. Judges favour the use of both sound and manuscript when they assess senior student compositions. Since the conduct of this research, the NSW Board of Studies advised teachers in *Board Bulletin Official Notices* (NSW Board of Studies, 1999a) that the marking of submitted compositions is now based on both the written score and sound recording. Additionally, this same notification informed teachers that the quality of the sound recording is used as a guide only, and its quality is not taken into consideration for marking purposes.

Judges preferred acoustic sounds to synthesised sound, although they indicated that the use of synthesised sound can be of benefit while students are composing music. In presentation of a manuscript copy of a composition, judges accept both computer-generated and hand-written scores equally. These results, while more detailed, similarly confirm results from the survey which strongly supported the use of both sound and manuscript copy of a composition for assessment purposes.

Results of *t*-tests show that teaching experience in secondary schools had statistical significance with the scores for the three compositions. This result suggests that teaching experience at the level of senior secondary education has an effect on composition assessment, and confirms results from the survey which found that this variable was important. Different from the survey, however, were results for gender. In the experiment, judges' gender had no significant influence.

This concludes the presentation of and preliminary interpretation of results. The next chapter summarises findings and draws conclusions of this research.
CHAPTER 6

SYNOPSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

Introduction
This chapter presents a synopsis of the study, synthesizes findings, and provides conclusions in the context of secondary music education in NSW. The opening synopsis restates the purposes of the investigation, the research questions and the research hypotheses. It also defines issues presented in the literature as a means of placing this study in increasingly widening contexts of education systems where similar concerns for composition have been demonstrated as those in NSW since 1994. In the preceding two chapters, results from the survey and the experiment were presented, summarised and discussed separately to maintain the integrity of the reporting and preliminary interpretation of data within each protocol. Here, the samples of these two chapters are compared to establish that the subject samples in both the survey and the experiment exhibit the same characteristics, and that consequently results from both protocols can be interpreted from an integrated framework.

6.1: Synopsis
Chapter 1 situated the study from observation of gradual change in NSW in the position of composition in secondary music education since the late 1950s. In other countries, especially Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America, from the 1960s a major movement in music education also encouraged greater attention to children's composition. Notable in this initiative were Schafer in Canada (1976, 1986), and Dennis (1970, 1975), Paynter (1972, 1977, 1982b, 1992), and Self (1967, 1976) in the United Kingdom. In the United States of America, numerous projects, two of which were The Young Composers' Project, and The Manhattanville Music Curriculum Program (Mark, 1986) advocated creative approaches in music education. Although agreeing on the significance of composition in
music teaching, different advocates of this movement admitted to contrasting purposes for composition in music education. For example, Self (1967) used composition as a way of understanding the avant-garde, while Paynter (1972, 1982b) had a clear vision for music pedagogy through composition. He considered that composition was fundamental to music education as composition taught music through the experience of writing music.

Paynter's (1972, 1982b) experiential learning theory reflected developments in the pedagogy of teaching and learning in general education. Fostered by a variety of learning philosophies, from the discovery learning of Froebel, Dewey and Montessori, developmental philosophies of Piaget and Bruner, and behavioural and sequential philosophies of Gagné and Bloom, pedagogy in music education progressed rapidly during the middle decades of the twentieth century (Abeles, 1994; Comte 1988; Fletcher, 1987; Mark, 1978; Plummeridge, 1991; Rainbow, 1989). Educational pedagogy at that time emphasized the central dimensions of freedom, discovery and activity in a learner-centred environment which varied in the styles of different teachers, and also in the styles of the same teacher in different settings (Hargreaves, 1986; Mark, 1978). Despite these developments in composition and in educational pedagogy, many classroom music educators consistently demonstrated a tardiness in adopting them in their teaching (Bartle, 1986; Goodlad, 1984; Jeanneret, 1993; 2001; van Ernst, 1993a; Witkin, 1974).

In the literature on this topic a discrepancy between music education theory and practice in different countries over many decades was noted. In the United Kingdom it was observed that music education had not kept pace with other subjects. In art and science, for example, students were able to learn from creating their own work by experimenting with the basic materials of these subjects. Self (1967) and Paynter (1972) observed that learning in music showed little evidence of this practice. Witkin (1974) considered teachers' apprehension of experimentation and musical invention was responsible for their poor record in developing individualism and self expression in students. He blamed teacher training which imposed disciplines and the restraints of instrumental learning, and pedagogy which stressed theoretical knowledge, analysis and interpretation for this situation. A similar lack of progress in the creative arts was observed in the United States of America. The responsibility
for this was again placed on teachers' lack of creative accomplishment which made it difficult for them to consider goals other than skill achievement and performance (Goodlad, 1984).

From the 1960s, music educators in Australia were similarly observed as failing to realise the full potential of composition, despite being influenced by developments from other countries. Bartle (1968), in an intensive investigation of music education throughout this country noted that in secondary schools, only half the teachers he encountered encouraged students to invent music, and few of these extended creative practices beyond the first two years of secondary schooling. Hunt (1970) attributed the slow progress of the teaching of composition in NSW schools at that time to teachers' lack of personal experience in composing. Like Witkin and Hunt, Jeanneret, almost two decades later, confirmed that teacher training in NSW continued to develop performance skills 'at the expense of a more holistic approach to learning in music which includes experimentation and composition' (Jeanneret, 1993, p. 49).

In a review of literature written in the 1990s focussing exclusively on composition in music education, van Ernst (1993a) observed that in recent decades in Australia there had not been a great deal of change in music pedagogy, and maintained that a continued emphasis on instrumental work prevented the development of a creative approach in music education. The slow progress of composition in the curriculum was continuously attributed in literature to teachers' limited training and to their lack of pedagogy. Music composition, and the opportunities it provides for music learning, were generally unfulfilled in NSW music education from the 1960s into the 1990s (Bartle, 1968; Comte, 1988; Gill, 1970; Hunt, 1970; Jeanneret, 1993, 2001; van Ernst, 1993a).

Literature on children's composing in primary and secondary music education in the latter part of the twentieth century internationally advocates an approach to teaching of composition which encourages learner-centred pedagogy through problem solving, experimenting, group activities, and integration with other learning experiences, especially with improvising and musicology. For example, Barrett (1996) in Australia, Kennedy (1999) in the United Kingdom, Freed-Garrod (1999) in Canada, and Gromko (1996) also in the United States of America, investigated primary and secondary children's compositions from these
perspectives. Additionally, evolutionary trends in the assessment of aural skills, performance and musicology, notably the practice of integration between these activities, had been introduced and incorporated into teaching practice in earlier music syllabus reform in NSW (NSW Board of Studies, 1983). However, assessment procedures in NSW maintained a position on composition which was in conflict with the pedagogical position identified above. In NSW as well until the early 1990s the tradition of assessing composition by pen and paper tests of harmony, melody writing, and word setting in the 2 Unit (Common) Music course at HSC level was still maintained, and the writing of original pieces of music was only included as an additional option.

This study was prompted by change in the assessment of composition at HSC level in NSW which mandated that all students in 2 Unit (Common) Music submit an original composition representing the topic 'Music 1970 Onwards (Australian focus)' (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, p. 18). For implementation with HSC 2 Unit (Common) syllabus candidates from 1995, this change in examination procedure moved composition from its position as an option to a position as a compulsory component of this examination. Omitted from the 1994 syllabus was the necessity for students to complete theoretically based exercises. Additionally, teachers were required to monitor student progress and achievement through a student process diary. The subsequent responsibility on teachers was to teach composition, and in complying to NSW Board of Studies' requirements in ongoing internal assessment, to assess student achievement in it (Board of Senior School Studies, 1984; NSW Board of Studies, 1996). To achieve this, teachers were compelled to assess student compositions which were now in the form of original pieces of music.

While seemingly an innocuous manoeuvre in one area of the music curriculum, implicit in these reforms was that teachers would need to develop ways to teach composition and to assess student compositions in order to comply with changed student outcomes and to adhere to ongoing, equally weighted assessment. This study was designed to investigate how teachers have responded to syllabus and examination change by exploring practices NSW music teachers use when assessing compositions and to reveal how these have relevance to their teaching of composition. To facilitate this, the following research questions were formulated
to examine if changes in the position of composition in the curriculum had influenced the ways teachers assessed composition, and whether this had an effect on their composition pedagogy:

Research Question 1

- *In teaching composition to senior students in NSW secondary schools, what do secondary music teachers report are their:*
  
  i) *assessment strategies, and*
  
  ii) *assessment criteria?*

Research Question 2

- *What is the extent of the relationship between secondary music teachers' pedagogy in composition and their assessments of composition in NSW senior secondary classes?*

Chapter 2 presented a review of related literature in composition assessment which focussed on assessments of children's compositions written within an ongoing music curriculum. Designed to review literature which addressed composition assessment strategies and criteria, and composition pedagogy in the music curriculum, the construction of this chapter reflected the structural plan of the survey which was conducted as the first research protocol of this study. In literature on this topic there is a lack of clarity and consistency between theories, purposes, strategies, and criteria used to assess students' compositions. Studies identified in the review of literature demonstrated that in music education, assessments of compositions by teachers and researchers are complex, irregular, and not devoid of risk.

A difference between research and classroom practice in composition assessments is evident in literature on this topic. Researchers frequently assess music written by students who have had little classroom composing experience. In contrast, composition assessments from a practical perspective suggest students have levels of skills which increase with their experience in music education and tuition. An amount of literature on this topic was appropriate to students at primary education levels, for example Bangs (1992), Davies (1994),
Hanley (1994), and Paynter (2000). Similarly, studies have examined composition assessment in the early and middle years of secondary school, for example, Bunting (1987, 1988), Pilsbury and Alston (1996), Preston (1994), and Mellor (1999). Most research from an Australian viewpoint in children’s composing at these levels concentrates on composition processes rather than on the assessment of them or their products (Barrett, 1996; Hogg, 1994; van Ernst, 1993b). Other composition assessment studies were at university level, for example Colley et al (1992), Davidson and Welsh (1988), and Williams (1999).

There was little literature on compositions written by students at senior secondary level. In two such studies by Burnard (1995) and Kennedy (1999), composition assessments were subordinate to the investigation of composition processes. Apart from these studies, no other literature was found which examined compositions written by students at senior secondary school level, or which examined the ways in which these compositions were assessed by music teachers. This study was therefore intended to contribute understanding of composition teaching, learning, and assessing in the context of the senior secondary music curriculum.

Findings from a survey in this study showed that music teachers in NSW have many common ideas about composition assessment. These include the scheduling of assessments, their purposes, appropriate personnel and material resources used in the task, and how a process diary supports teaching. Three other concerns which demonstrated a high level of consensus in the study were inter-judge reliability, assessment procedures, and assessment criteria. Derived from the importance shown for these three variables in the survey, three hypotheses were used to test teachers’ levels of agreement on each of them in an experiment. Studies identified in the review of related literature, from the 1994 2 Unit (Common) Music syllabus, and from the results of the survey were used in the construction of this experiment. These hypotheses were:

Hypothesis 1
- There will be no effect for different judges on grades allocated by each judge for three compositions written at a senior secondary level.
Hypothesis 2

- There will be no effect for different assessment procedures in assessing three compositions written at a level of senior secondary music students on:
  i) judges' scores
  ii) judges' decision-making processes.

Hypothesis 3

- There will be an effect for different criteria in assessing three compositions written at senior secondary level in:
  i) each composition
  ii) all three compositions.

6.2: Conclusions

Results and preliminary interpretation of data were presented in Chapters 4 and 5 of the thesis. Both chapters commenced with participant sample profiles. In Chapter 4, data on composition assessment strategies and criteria, and respondents' opinions on relationships between senior composition assessment and pedagogy were reported. In Chapter 5, results of the effects on assessments of different judges, different assessment procedures, and different assessment criteria were reported. Chapter 5 concluded with insights on the first research question from a post-experiment perspective to show how strategies used in the experiment differed from practices and strategies teachers use in their classrooms.

Before integrating the findings from Chapters 4 and 5, and discussing them in detail, it is methodologically essential to prove that the samples of teachers in each protocol are similar enough to presume comparability. This section therefore compares the respondent sample profile with the judge sample profile to determine that the samples are similar to one another and that the findings from both protocols can be integrated. Following this confirmation, results from both protocols are amalgamated and additional findings of the study are presented. Conclusions from the study drawn from findings to the research questions and hypotheses are presented in the final part of this chapter. Findings and conclusions are
generalised to the total population of NSW secondary music teachers in a snapshot representation which depicts teachers' attitudes and opinions. In the following presentation, 'respondents' are subjects identified from the survey, 'judges' are subjects from the experiment, and 'teachers' represent subjects from the combined protocols.

**Comparison of subject sample profiles**
The two profiles presented identical questions to both subject samples. In the section to follow, these are tabulated and juxtaposed to demonstrate the levels of similarity between the two samples. There were ten variables in the subject sample profiles: NSW secondary school teaching experience, gender, demographic location of schools, characteristics of schools, experience in the teaching of composition at HSC level, personal composing experience, training in composition, training in teaching composition, and training in assessing composition. Comparisons between the results of these variables in the two subject sample profiles from the research protocols are shown in Table 41.

Comparisons in data between the two subject samples about teaching experience, gender, experience in the teaching of composition at HSC level, and personal composing experience are congruent. A difference no greater than 10% was shown between results for these four variables in the two protocols. In responses to questions about training in composition and training in composition pedagogy, the same statistical profiles were listed. Items from the survey in these variables registered no more than 15% difference between comparative items in experiment variables. Sources of training in assessing composition, with more widely varied percentages, reflected less agreement between protocols, although similar profiles were shown.

Table 41 shows comparative results from the two protocols for school student gender. In this variable, more judges in the second protocol taught at single sex schools in the metropolitan regions, in comparison with respondents from the survey who taught throughout NSW. In a similar way, survey respondents represented all regions in NSW, while experiment judges represented Sydney regions only. These two variables demonstrated some disparity which was inconsistent with results of all the other variables.
Table 41

Comparison of results for variables from subject sample profiles for respondents in the survey (IMCAI, Q1-7) and judges in the experiment (ACERF, Q1-7).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables in group profiles</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Experiment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number in sample</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music teaching experience in NSW</td>
<td>3 groups distributed as follows:</td>
<td>3 groups distributed as follows:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1-5 yrs 17%</td>
<td>1-5 yrs 8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6-15 yrs 43%</td>
<td>6-15 yrs 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16+ yrs 40%</td>
<td>16+ yrs 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male 37%</td>
<td>Male 41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female 63%</td>
<td>Female 59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School location</td>
<td>Evenly distributed throughout NSW regions</td>
<td>Representative of all Sydney regions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School description</td>
<td>Single sex school population 25% Co-educational school pop. 75%</td>
<td>Single sex school population 50% Co-educational school pop. 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC composition teaching experience</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects’ status as self-identified composers</td>
<td>Original music 54% Arrangement 16%</td>
<td>Original music 59% Arrangement 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major sources of training in composition</td>
<td>Pre-service 52% In-service 22% Nil 11%</td>
<td>Pre-service 37% In-service 33% Nil 15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major sources of training in composition pedagogy</td>
<td>Other 30% In-service 28% Pre-service 22%</td>
<td>In-service 39% Other 36% Pre-service 14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major sources of training in assessing composition</td>
<td>Other 31% Nil 26% In-service 21%</td>
<td>Other 50% In-service 43% Nil 14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, differences in subjects' school locations and school gender reflect sampling differences in the research design, and demographic contrasts beyond the control of the research, rather than any other factor. Apart from the latter two variables, comparisons reflect a high level of agreement. It can be conjectured that both the samples are similar, and therefore that findings from both protocols can be amalgamated. It is also conjectured that both samples are representative of the population of NSW secondary music teachers, and that findings present a genuine representation of NSW secondary music teachers' practices and strategies.

**Additional findings**

In addition to data which responded to the research questions and hypotheses, the study revealed issues associated with composition, its assessment and pedagogy in senior music education which had not been anticipated prior to the conduct of the research, and which were extraneous to the research questions and hypotheses. Before embarking on a presentation of conclusions drawn from the research questions, these additional but pertinent findings are discussed.

One universal finding from the research is that secondary music teachers are highly likely to think the same way on matters related to composition assessment and pedagogy. Unambiguous in the research was the confidence and willingness of teachers to communicate information about their composition teaching and composition assessment practices. Equally clear was that these teachers had a perception of their role as educators, their responsibilities to their students, their commitment to providing appropriate pedagogy in music education, more specifically in composition pedagogy. Teachers demonstrated a predisposition for their own accountability in supporting students in composition learning and in providing assessments of student compositions. In this context, there were several variables appropriate to teachers' backgrounds which showed that teachers demonstrated similar characteristics. These were training in composition, in composition pedagogy, and in composition assessment.
Of importance in findings about teachers' training was that teachers had learnt from various sources which demonstrated patterns of behaviours not only consistent between individuals, but between both research protocols. These patterns were evident despite an absence of any pre-determined guidelines from educational institutions. Findings revealed that when confronted with change in the curriculum, as occurred in 1994, NSW secondary music teachers acknowledged that adjustment to their teaching practices was necessary. In response, secondary music teachers took a pragmatic rather than epistemological approach to the situation. To generate student compositions which complied with submitted composition guidelines, secondary music teachers relinquished teaching practices which they considered could not achieve new student outcomes, and in place of these, teachers developed practical schemes, rather than theories, which responded to the underlying implications for reform of composition in the curriculum.

In reacting to the 1994 syllabus and examination change, teachers showed where they considered their training needed supplementary support, which had not been provided in their pre-service studies. In composition, a majority of teachers considered that their pre-service study, although not specifically in composition, had provided background knowledge which was adequate for their needs, as pre-service training was responsible for the largest amount of their preparation in this.

However, different findings about teachers' training in composition pedagogy and assessment were shown. To teach and to assess composition, teachers indicated that extra training was desirable in addition to that which had been provided by pre-service institutions. Training in pedagogy identified by teachers as 'in-service' calls into question traditional notions of what constitutes the term, as much of the 'in-service' which was identified originated from sources where education was not the main purpose. Training to teach composition was eclectic, utilitarian, and showed teachers' resourcefulness. It involved listening to and analysing music, attending courses, discussing, and reading. Numerous sources provided training which teachers considered appropriate such as: contact with composers through lectures, consultations, observations and performances; contact with colleagues though networks and discussions; and learning through researching and writing about music. Training opportunities
were provided by commercial, professional, and educational organisations. Findings showed that there was little assistance for teachers in training to assess compositions, and in this endeavour any support provided by the NSW Board of Studies was highly valued even though in-service to teachers was no longer a function of this office (NSW Board of Studies, 2000).

The first additional finding about the influence of assessment change in senior composition was in teachers' pedagogy in the general music curriculum, and not only in composition. A strong link between composition and musicology was shown, with teachers avid consumers of music which was representative of recent Australian art music, as presented by commercial providers. Those opportunities which were especially valued were offered by the Sydney Symphony Orchestra 'Meet the Music' program. This program provided teachers with strategies for teaching music by contemporary Australian composers, suggestions for generating student compositions, composer interviews, live performances, resources, and workshops. In conforming to the mandatory topic at that time, 'Music since 1970' (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, p. 18), familiarity with current compositions was a high priority to teachers, and they increasingly integrated student creation of new pieces with listening experiences.

A recurrent theme, and second additional finding, is that the gender of teachers influences whether they consider they have personal composing experience. In the survey, males more strongly identified themselves as composers than did female teachers. In the experiment the five judges who were not self-acknowledged composers were all female. Additionally throughout the research male teachers who indicated they composed were predominant in the context of publication. In this, music which these teachers had written was performed professionally, recorded, and/or published. In contrast, both protocols showed that female teachers composed for contexts concerned with their pre-service training and for performances in schools, using skills more for expediency than for any other purpose. In these situations, females were less disposed to consider themselves composers than were their male colleagues.
That a teacher must be a composer to teach composition in the senior secondary school is not an interpretation to be taken from these findings. Nor, despite thorough correlative investigation, was there any corroborating data which indicated that teachers' personal background in composing influenced their assessments of composition. The impact of these findings, however, is important in its effect on composition pedagogy. Evidence from research has demonstrated that at secondary school and university level, females often display negative attitudes which lead to neglect in the development of their composing abilities (Cant, 1990; Green, 1993; Hanley, 1996). Other literature on composition links children's composition and gender with technology, and in these contexts, males have been shown to demonstrate greater confidence (Armstrong, 2001; Colley et al, 1997). These findings suggest that gender may be an impediment in the effective and confident widespread teaching of composition in the NSW music curriculum. Other survey results showed that all respondents, both male and female, who were in the early years of their career had greater composing experience than did their more experienced counterparts. Concerns for the impact of gender on composition teaching therefore may be of short term consequence.

Although references to gender were avoided in the experiment design in order to focus on the issues identified in the three hypotheses, judges nevertheless made references to gender in their comments. In comments gender traits were attributed to composition characteristics. Remarks reflect preconceptions about gender and composition identified by Cant (1990), Green (1997), and Hanley (1994), and which stereotype children on characteristics of gender rather than on their musical ability. Comments which included reference to gender were disparaging in tone. In assessments of compositions, therefore, teachers demonstrate bias based on preconceptions about gender traits which may be detrimental to student composition assessment.

A third additional finding is that teaching experience in secondary schools has an influence on how teachers both teach and assess compositions. Teachers in the early years of their careers demonstrated less conformity about assessment than did more experienced teachers. Judges with greater experience strongly agreed on the numerical scores which they allocated to the experiment compositions and this was not reflected in judges with little teaching experience.
Similarly, more senior survey respondents indicated that they were more inclined to assess composition by reflecting intuitively about them while less experienced respondents took a more analytical view. Experience in teaching individual music courses also influenced the ways teachers view assessment criteria. Respondents who had taught 2 Unit (Common) Music showed greater appreciation for the use of concepts as a criterion than teachers who had not taught this course.

Although the *Music Syllabus 2 Unit Course 1* (NSW Board of Studies, 1994b) reflected similar specifications for composition as determined in 2 Unit (Common), an adherence to them was identified by teachers of the latter course. Mandatory composition in this course ensured that syllabus parameters were maintained. This finding confirms education literature that assessment is important to pedagogy as it assists in determining not only student learning outcomes, but how teachers achieve these outcomes and what they use to achieve them (Broadfoot, 1992; Gasking, 1947).

A fourth finding additional to the research questions is that teachers were challenged in finding a common definition of composition. Despite clarification of composition in both protocols as the 'creation of original music', teachers included activities as varied as arranging, creating new music, harmonising, improvising, and transcribing in their answers. Experiment judges presented a clearer definition of composition as creating music than did survey respondents. It is noted however, that the inclusion of arranging as composition may be a lingering effect of previous HSC syllabuses, in which arranging formed an optional component of what was then categorised as 'Composition 2' in *Music syllabus 2 Unit (Related) and 3 Unit for Years 11 and 12* (NSW Board of senior School Studies, 1983). In practice, any confusion in what constitutes composition, and in aptitudes appropriate to composition learning, have the potential to hamper the implementation of composition as a learning experience in senior secondary education.

Omitted from responses was reference to how teachers used their own composing for classroom activities. In interpreting this, teachers appear to value only completed, major, substantial pieces while underestimating potential for the art of composing to support their

Findings which answer the research questions are now described by integrating results from the two research protocols. As the second protocol grew out of results of the survey, and variables identified in the survey were subjected to further investigation in the experiment, discussion of findings from the three hypotheses used in the experiment are incorporated into discussions of the research questions.

Research Question 1

_In teaching composition to senior students in NSW secondary schools, what do secondary music teachers report are their:

i) assessment strategies, and

ii) assessment criteria?

Findings about strategies indicated that teachers considered assessing their students' compositions was part of their role, and that they were little inclined to relinquish this responsibility. The role of teachers in all strategies was mainly that of guide or mentor and this role underpinned their teaching. Teachers in the study strongly agreed on: when assessments of compositions were best conducted; procedures and resources; and on preferences for different ways to assess composition. Most teachers preferred to assess senior student compositions both during the writing process, and after each composition's completion. They showed a preference for narrative descriptions and written comments to indicate merit in composed pieces, and disliked numerical indicators of achievement, such as grading, providing marks, and ranking. Teachers were adamant that compositions at senior secondary level should be examined through observation of both notation and sound. In the latter, acoustic sounds were preferred to those which distort instrumental timbres and are technologically produced, despite stylistic considerations.
Preference for formative assessments, and a less positive view towards summative assessments of student compositions was evident. This was clearly demonstrated when subjects considered assessing process diaries. Respondents indicated that the main purpose for assessing process diaries was to gauge levels of student learning, rather than to rate student self assessment, composition outcome, or student effort. An unexpected result, however, was that in assessing process diaries, teachers valued student effort more highly than the composition itself.

By assessing difficult to measure affective objectives of attitudes and values, Oliver (1978) pointed out that a clearer picture of students' progress is made than is possible by only objective assessment measures. These often provided a formidable challenge, Oliver conceded. In placing value on student efforts, respondents showed that they valued less finite and more difficult to measure learning which was identified in syllabus documents as 'decision-making processes', 'reflections', and self 'appraisals' (NSW Board of Studies, 1994a, p. 36). Valuing of student effort, providing feedback and motivating students during developmental stages of compositions indicated that formative assessments were important tools teachers use to assist students in their composition processes. They were used to gauge different objectives, and they functioned as part of teachers' composition pedagogy.

Survey respondents showed preference for two composition assessment procedures which were used both alternatively or together, as required, and reinforced teachers' pedagogy as crucial in determining the conduct of assessments. The first procedure was the use of checklists. Checklists could be tabulated inventories, but more commonly were intuitive catalogues of essential competencies. Checklists were shown to be used frequently in combination with other variables such as sets of criteria, synthesis of concepts, application of musical processes, and knowledge of conventions. These findings reinforce that assessments through checklists reflect pedagogical techniques, especially those categorised as craftsmanship and identified above through the use of concepts, application of musical knowledge and musical processes. Teachers identified that they taught composition by addressing these proficiencies.
A second important assessment procedure teachers indicated they used was impression marking. This was shown to be used frequently in combination with assessment from a personal response, in addition to the application of musical techniques and processes. This procedure showed that an approach based on teachers' subjective reactions also included pedagogical considerations. Ranking and providing marks were additional and necessary procedures which were used reluctantly by teachers, as their use highlighted normative aspects of assessment, which was contrary to teachers' pedagogical purposes.

Hypothesis 2 was designed to investigate if there was an effect for different procedures on judges' assessments. Judges provided three experiment compositions with numerical scores in each of three sessions, which reflected the procedures identified above. Specific, or analytic, procedures assessed compositions using many questions about individual musical concepts and their application in the music, and took forty minutes to complete. Global, or holistic, procedures used fewer questions which were broadly based on style, subjectivity, the demonstration of knowledge and composing skills, and originality, and was completed in twenty minutes. Impression, or the general impact of a composition, was a procedure in which there was only one question which justified the allocation of numerical scores for each of the three compositions. The three compositions were played in quick succession in this procedure which was completed in six minutes. The three compositions and three procedures were rotated in the experiment to avoid bias.

Changing the procedures changed the assessments. These changes were consistent for all three compositions, and for the three compositions collectively. Significant statistical results from a Friedman test conducted on the mean ranks of all numerical scores for two of the three compositions during the three assessment procedures were found, and for the three compositions when their numerical scores were combined. Impression marking produced the least generous results, global marking produced the most generous results, and specific marking produced the middle results.
Findings challenge views on the reliability of individual teachers to maintain consistency when assessing student compositions. Most reliable are procedures which closely relate to pedagogy in composition, which focuses concepts and the application of skills, and which are generally found in intensive analyses of students' work. In these a wide range of characteristics is examined and an evenly balanced assessment is evident. From these procedures, results were generated which were neither higher nor lower when compared with other procedures.

Procedures which rank students' work, by impression, which involve comparative judgements between compositions, result in lower marks for compositions when compared with other procedures as they allow for little more than a cursory reflection of a composition's merit. In contrast, global procedures, which include acknowledged subjectivity on the part of teachers, and are concerned with holistic composition processes, raise assessments of students' work. In global procedures, characteristics within compositions can provide greater objectivity in the assessor. In their classrooms, teachers prefer to use combinations of procedures, and different procedures at different times in the development of compositions.

To ensure that the relative merits of compositions are appropriately considered, and to guarantee reliability of teachers' judgements, several recommendations for final assessments of composition are made for teachers in schools. It would appear that a thorough and analytical investigation of compositions as part of assessment would produce a balanced assessment. In providing reliable assessments, numerical scoring of compositions could be deferred until all intended procedures have been conducted. If using impression marking which ranks students only, it would be wise to consider that lower assessments may be generated from this than from other procedures. The use of multiple assessment procedures would ensure fair and accurate personal assessments and would avoid distortion of assessments evident by the use of only one procedure.

A strong relationship exists between pedagogy in composition and teachers' expectations of composition outcomes, through identification of common criteria in both. Criteria heavily favour application of craftsmanship and the demonstration of musical knowledge.
Craftsmanship included: use and synthesis of musical concepts, manipulation of musical techniques and processes, and knowledge of conventions.

Another criterion which respondents also identified as prominent was originality, and in this there were considerable contradictions, which are reflective of those described in the review of related literature. Judges in the experiment consistently rated all three pieces poorly on the criterion of originality, and they commented that the pieces were clichéd, imitative, and lacking in it. However, judges' numerically scored assessments did not conform with their stated views in this criterion. Perhaps as imitating music written by other composers was a feature of teachers' composition pedagogy, compositions which demonstrate derivative characteristics of other music reflects teachers' expectations of student composition at this level. In contrast to this perception, a lack of originality in compositions was observed as a weakness in the 1998 HSC examination. Here, compositions identified as 'weaker' demonstrated 'a lack of compositional and listening experiences often resulting in "imitation" rather than "creation"' (NSW Board of Studies, 1999b, p. 63). The evaluative comments in the experiment suggest that in solving compositional problems, students should explore their personal solutions further to resolve them, rather than using pastiche of other composers' resolutions.

Demonstration of a musical style in compositions is less important to judges than all the preceding criteria, although consistency within a selected genre or style is expected. Acknowledgement of judgements from the perspective of a personal response was avoided where possible. This criterion, when used, acted as an general indicator of value in a composition which was subsumed by references to finite pedagogically-based criteria.

Two additional criteria were identified in the survey, and tested in the experiment. A preference for composition assessment through compliance with task requirements, which in the experiment was that used in the 1994 2 Unit (Common) syllabus, to reflect music written since 1970. It was explained by teachers that the course of study, student ability, style of composition, and relationship to the syllabus topic, all give direction for assessment criteria when a composition is written. This finding confirms literature which similarly showed that
relating assessment to the design and implementation of composition requirements is highly productive in achieving consensus in assessors (Searby and Ewers, 1996). In the experiment, this criterion was outstanding in its importance in assessment, and the three compositions were rated highest in their compliance with it.

The presentation of a written score and sound recording also acts as a criterion, and accurate representation of music was considered by teachers as a high priority in compositions at 2 Unit (Common) HSC level. The effect of this criterion in the experiment was exceptional. Sound quality was the one variable which made a difference in the assessment of the three experiment compositions. The close relationship between music literacy and aural development is evident throughout both protocols. The link between aural identification of sound with appropriate symbols in duration, pitch, dynamics and expressive techniques shows that music writing is now approached from practical experience which relates directly to sound representation. Writing from a tertiary education perspective, Stowasser recommended that writing experiences would enhance music literacy further if they were related to practical experimentation with real music. The findings in this study agree with her that by valuing both sound and literacy combined in student compositions, the theoretical base which provided students with a 'stumbling block' had been removed (Stowasser, 1991, p.19). The NSW Board of Studies (1999b) made a minor correction in 1999 in which the marking of submitted compositions from that time was based on both the written score and the sound recording, which has further reinforced the importance of the relationship between musical sound and symbol.

Research Question 2

*What is the extent of the relationship between secondary music teachers' pedagogy in composition and their assessments of composition in NSW senior secondary classes?*

Teachers have clear perceptions of the reasons for assessing senior compositions. Ranging from formative, though summative, to evaluative purposes, the emphasis in teachers' comments is for the support of student learning in a sensitive environment which encourages students to continue to develop their musical skills and understanding. All three purposes
were strongly acknowledged by teachers. Summative purposes were most strongly acknowledged. These were traditional reporting mechanisms in education. The teacher's role in summative assessments was seen as that of a critic, and in this teachers were less comfortable than in their role as mentor. Purposes of summative assessment were to grade and rank student work fairly, supervise completion of work, confirm the authentication and origins of compositions, meet requirements of examination boards, and report results. Evaluative purposes of assessment, although less strongly acknowledged as a purpose for assessment, assisted teachers in knowing the effectiveness of their teaching and student learning, and thus supported their pedagogy.

Formative assessments, ongoing during composition processes, were considered valuable, as they supported and indicated the effectiveness of teachers' pedagogy in composition, and in these assessments teachers were guides and mentors, a role in which they felt comfortable. However, these were less commonly identified than were summative assessments. Teachers used assessment to assist composition development, to motivate students, to incubate musical ideas, to refine completed compositions, to set targets, stimulate progress, and to help students to evaluate their work. Essentially, ongoing assessment became pedagogy in composition, and assessment procedures became pedagogic procedures.

Several questions in the survey specifically implied a relationship between composition assessment and pedagogy to see if there was in fact a link between them. Findings show how connections are made between these, and suggest ongoing inter-dependence between the way teachers teach composition and the ways they assess it. The modification in assessment in 1994 in the 2 Unit (Common) syllabus caused transformation in the way composition is taught. For many teachers, changes made in senior classes were dramatic. For example, some had altered school staffing and timetabling to comply with syllabus reforms; some had employed composers to teach the composition component of the curriculum. Other adjustments made without changing school staffing were wide-ranging and concerned assessment practices, classroom teaching techniques, composing skills (especially the omission of four-part harmony), course content, programmes, resources, strategies, and the introduction of technology.
Change in composition in the HSC in 1994 also impacted on teachers' practices in junior secondary classes, showing that teachers were more aware of the need to foster strong composition skills in the earlier years of secondary music education. In this way, many explained that students would develop their composing abilities in preparation for their needs at the senior level. Different from the senior school, teachers used more composition in junior secondary classes, and integrated improvisation, group work, problem solving and experimentation with composition work. Practical applications in classrooms showed that varied approaches to composition were introduced, some contradictory to others. For example, some teachers had introduced set composition tasks for students to complete in each school term, whereas other teachers explained that frequently ideas which evolved in lessons developed into larger scale composing projects with no set time frame. Essentially, teachers explored ways which were personally suitable to their teaching styles to develop an effective composition pedagogy for secondary schooling from Year 7 to Year 12.

Implications from findings suggest that there is a pedagogical pathway used in teaching composition at senior secondary level. Despite the following description, there were several dissenting viewpoints on this. Of these, one teacher indicated that composition was a highly personal and complex process, and 'not the reverse of analysis'. A second teacher began to compose herself, to discover how to effectively teach her students to compose. Composing with and for her music classes, she considered, would serve not only to support her teaching, but would also model composing behaviours which could be emulated by her students in solving composition problems. These two teachers represented a small number who did not follow the direction which is outlined below, and who both reflected the recommendations of Odam in *Composing in the Classroom: The Creative Dream* (2000), in which teachers' personal composing skills and creative music activities should serve as a foundation for students' composing.

In Year 12, the pedagogical pathway extrapolated from this research commences with listening to composed pieces, especially those which conform to task descriptors of Australian music written since 1970. The pathway continues with content analyses of pieces usually by reference to music concepts as listed in the syllabus under discussion. In this there is an
examination of craftsmanship and the manipulation of musical concepts, techniques, and processes. Observation of numerous pieces in this way provides an accumulation of knowledge about composing within the framework of the task descriptors. This knowledge has been identified by researchers under various titles, such as 'prior knowledge' (van Ernst, 1993b, p. 22), 'background in musical experience' (deTurk, 1989, p. 21), and 'knowledge acquisition' (Moore, 1989, p. 53), and is used in a task defined for students by teachers in which students can transfer acquired knowledge to their own compositions.

Derived from a battery of learned knowledge, intuitions, materials and techniques in this pathway, students develop their own individual compositions. Collectively, teachers indicated that compositions were written through experimentation, manipulation of concepts and processes, rehearsal, performance, reflection, rejection and evolution. In junior secondary music composition, teachers identified entry on the pathway at task setting points. Tasks in junior school years had more variety than those identified in the senior school. They varied in length, time frame, style, and were produced in groups or by individuals. Conclusions are that this pathway in composition was the method used by a majority of teachers, or that this was the direction taken, as the basis of their pedagogy in secondary music composition.

For teachers, assessment is an integral part of the composition pedagogical pathway. Formative assessments are conducted as compositions progress, and provide advice and feedback to students, mainly through comments. Feedback can be passive affirmation of progress through teacher observation, or can involve teacher intervention, which is generally through discussions with students. From task setting points, and during the composition process, formative assessments support student learning.

Summative assessments occur at different times during the process, and on completion to gauge student achievement. In the conduct of assessments, progress on the pedagogical pathway is reversed. Summative assessments take the form of a content analysis which is similar to that used in the analysis of musicology examples at the commencement of the pathway. Just as exemplars were identified as complying with the task requirements, so too is this criterion considered in the student's composition. Observing both sound recordings and
written scores, teachers consider music literacy and knowledge of conventions as
demonstrated in the music, and accuracy of both representations to reflect the composer's
intentions. Teachers then apply content analyses of craftsmanship abilities to assess students' efforts in composing within the framework of the task requirements. Often intuitive, this process can take little time, or can be conducted over a longer period. In composition pedagogy, assessments form an invaluable link between teaching, composition processes, and composition outcomes.

* * * * *

The purpose of this research was to explore the relationships between composition, composition assessment and composition pedagogy, in the context of the contemporary music curriculum from the perspective of the senior secondary classroom music teacher. The context in the curriculum focussed on change in composition assessment in the 2 Unit (Common) Music syllabus in 1994, for implementation with HSC students in 1995. The main conclusion drawn from the study is that this reform has facilitated change in the music curriculum which has impacted generally on composition, composition assessment, composition pedagogy, and music education in NSW not only in the senior curriculum, but throughout the years of secondary school.

A final conclusion from the study is in the consideration of the total secondary music curriculum in NSW. This study demonstrates that in secondary classrooms, as a result of 1994 syllabus reform, students increasingly learn music by composing, and that composing has become a pedagogical tool in the musical development of all students, not only of a minority elite. With both change in the role and purpose of composition, the four learning experiences of performance, musicology, aural, and composing have become equal providers of music instruction to all students. A comprehensive and balanced music training for NSW secondary students was endorsed by change in the assessment of music composition in senior classes, and by their commitment to implementing change in their pedagogy, NSW secondary teachers have ensured that the music education they provide has the potential to fulfil this objective.
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Appendix A

*Investigation of music composition assessment issues (IMCAI)*
This questionnaire investigates assessment of music composition.

It is specifically aimed at Year 11 and Year 12 music composition in Board of Studies syllabuses and not AMEB courses. By 'assessment' is meant any form of appraisal of a student's work. By 'composition' is meant the creation of original music. Please consider all student composition in your response, including but not only submitted composition.

Please tick the appropriate response, or answer briefly.
Questions 1-7 concern your background and experience.

1. How long have you taught music in secondary schools?
   - □ 1-5 years
   - □ 6-15 years
   - □ more than 15 years

2. Your gender:
   - □ male
   - □ female

3. Indicate the area that best describes the location of your school.

   □ Hunter
   □ Metropolitan East
   □ Metropolitan North
   □ Metropolitan South West
   □ Metropolitan West
   □ North Coast
   □ North West
   □ Riverina
   □ South Coast
   □ Western

4. Indicate from the following the categories most appropriate to your school:

   □ single sex
   □ co-educational
   □ comprehensive
   □ selective (academic)
   □ specialist
   □ performing arts
   □ music
   □ other specialist (specifically)
   □ any other category (specifically)

5. Have you taught any of the following?

   a. HSC classes in 2/3 Unit Related Music
      □ 1994 or before
      □ 1995 or after

   b. HSC classes in 2 Unit Course 1 and/or 3 Unit Music (with students who submitted composition elective)
      □ 1997 or before
6. Have you had any experiences as a composer? eg. writing for a rock or church group, performing in a jazz ensemble, writing for school performance, published work etc.

☐ Yes ☐ No

If yes please give details:


7. This question concerns your studies and/or training in music composition, its teaching and assessment. What is your background in these areas? Please tick as many responses as are appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Preservice</th>
<th>Inservice</th>
<th>Post Graduate</th>
<th>Other eg. entering a composing competition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Composition</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give details:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Preservice</th>
<th>Inservice</th>
<th>Post Graduate</th>
<th>Other eg. discussion with a composer, other teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Teaching of composition</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give details:


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None</th>
<th>Preservice</th>
<th>Inservice</th>
<th>Post Graduate</th>
<th>Other eg. HSC marking, BOS advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>☐ Assessment of composition</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give details:


8. This question concerns your teaching.

Have you made any adjustment to your teaching practice since mandatory original composition was introduced in 2/3 Unit Related Music in 1993?

a. In HSC and Preliminary classes

☐ Yes ☐ No

Please give details:


b. In Junior Secondary classes

☐ Yes ☐ No

Please give details:
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Questions 9-13 concern your assessment of student composition.

9. When do you assess a student’s composition in Preliminary and HSC classes (2/3 Unit Related, 3 Unit and 2 Unit Course 1)?

   a) □ during the process of the writing of a composition
   b) □ on completion of the composition (final assessment)
   c) □ a combination of a and b

10. In relation to the teaching of music composition in both 2/3 Unit Related, 3 Unit and 2 Unit Course 1, what is the purpose of assessment (in your own words)?

11. The following question applies to assessment procedures and resources you might use with Preliminary and HSC student music composition. Please respond to every statement:

   1 = always, 2 = sometimes, 3 = never.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>raw mark (eg. 7/10)</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impression mark - overall judgement</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ranking students by drawing comparisons (if 2 or more students)</td>
<td></td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>checklist (eg. demonstrates understanding of tonality, structural unity, etc)</td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for mastery of a specific skill eg. thematic development, textural treatments</td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>grading - excellent, good, satisfactory, unsatisfactory, very unsatisfactory</td>
<td></td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notation only</td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sound only</td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combination of notation and sound</td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further comment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>teacher observation</td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher verbal comments</td>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher written comments</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student verbal comments (self assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student written comments (self assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments by student peers</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments by other music teachers (same school)</td>
<td></td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments by other music teachers (different school)</td>
<td></td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>comments by other experts (eg. judge in competition)</td>
<td></td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further comment:
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12. How important are each of the following criteria when you make a final assessment of student music composition in Preliminary and HSC classes? Please respond to each statement.

1 = extremely important, 2 = very important, 3 = some importance, 4 = little importance, 5 = no importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>originality</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to use technology</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possibility for success beyond the classroom</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>success of the piece as a composition judged on personal response</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>success of the piece as a composition judged on a set of criteria</td>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>synthesis of musical concepts</td>
<td>f</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>confidence in handling musical processes eg, development, variation</td>
<td>g</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use of techniques/skills eg, appropriate rhythmic treatment</td>
<td>h</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ability to use music concepts correctly eg, idiomatic writing for instruments</td>
<td>i</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>knowledge of conventions eg, correct vocal and instrument range, notation</td>
<td>j</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modelling an existing piece of music</td>
<td>k</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>authentic use of a musical style</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further comment: ____________________________

This question concerns student documentation.

13. How important are each of the following criteria when you assess a process diary in Preliminary and HSC music classes? Please respond to each statement.

1 = extremely important, 2 = very important, 3 = some importance, 4 = little importance, 5 = no importance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>student effort</td>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student self-assessment</td>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student learning</td>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>composition outcome</td>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further comment: ____________________________

Please include any comments you wish to make concerning assessment of composition.

Thank you for completing this survey.
Please place the survey in the enclosed stamped/addressed envelope and return to me at the following address: Pauline Berton, P.O Box 1548, Neutral Bay, 2089 by Monday March 16th, 1998. Alternatively you can fax directly to (02) 9964 5702. To obtain a copy of the report on the survey, please phone (02) 9964 5702.
Appendix B

Three compact discs:  *Impression* (Green)
*Global* (Blue)
*Specific* (Red)
Appendix C

Miniature scores:  

*Funny Feeling*

*Les Moustiques*

*Test Tube Song*
Les Moustiques
Test Tube Song

All male voices.
All sound octaves lower than written (except Marimba and percussion)

Percussion instruments: 1 conga, Turkish tabla, rice shaker

Percussion notation:
Turkish tabla
Conga (with fingers) = C (2nd from top)
Conga (with base of palm) = A (3rd from top)
Rice shaker (hit on congas, and tremolo "shake") = F (bottom space)

All percussion and guitar rhythms are a guide - the players may add more (or less) where necessary.
Appendix D

Assessment of composition experiment rating form (ACERF)
Assessment of Composition Experiment

This experiment will investigate teacher assessment of music composition.

It will ask you to grade, mark and rank 3 original compositions. Please consider all responses as you would for a final assessment of compositions at Higher School Certificate level in Course 2/3 Unit (Common).

Before commencement of the experiment, you are asked to complete the questions on the following pages.

Please note: All responses and comments you make during the course of this experiment will be anonymous and confidential. The code will facilitate collation of session results for statistical analysis.

Please enter your code here ________________________________
Please respond to the following:

- 1. How long have you taught music in secondary schools?

   __________________________ years

- 2. Your gender:
   - ☐ male
   - ☐ female

- 3. Indicate the area that best describes the location of your school,
   - ☐ Metropolitan East
   - ☐ Metropolitan North
   - ☐ Metropolitan South West
   - ☐ Metropolitan West

- 4. Indicate from the following the categories most appropriate to your school:
   - ☐ single sex
   - ☐ co-educational
   - ☐ specialist
   - ☐ performing arts
   - ☐ comprehensive
   - ☐ music
   - ☐ other specialist
   - ☐ selective (academic)
   - ☐ public
   - ☐ private (specific category)
   - ☐ any other category

- 5. Have you taught any of the following?
   a. HSC classes in 2/3 Unit (Common)
      - ☐ 1994 or before
      - ☐ 1995 or after
   b. HSC classes in 2 Unit Course 1 and/or 3 Unit Music (with students who submitted composition elective)
      - ☐ 1997 or before

- 6. Have you had any experience as a composer? eg, writing for a rock or church group, performing in a jazz ensemble, writing for school ensembles, publishing compositions etc.

   - ☐ Yes
   - ☐ No

If yes please give details:

________________________________________________________________________
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7. This question concerns your studies and/or training in music composition, its teaching and assessment.

a) What is your background in composition?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Preservice</th>
<th>Inservice</th>
<th>Post Graduate</th>
<th>Other eg entering a composing competition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITION</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give details

b) What is your background in the teaching of composition?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Preservice</th>
<th>Inservice</th>
<th>Post Graduate</th>
<th>Other eg discussion with a composer, teachers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TEACHING OF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give details

c) What is your background in the assessment of composition?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Preservice</th>
<th>Inservice</th>
<th>Post Graduate</th>
<th>Other eg HSC marking, BOS advice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ASSESSMENT OF</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPOSITION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give details

8. Please identify what you consider are the most important criteria when you make a final assessment of student composition in senior secondary classes.

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________
Assessment of Composition Experiment

Impression (Green) Session

◆ This session asks you to assess 3 compositions each 1 minute in length.
  Test Tube Song
  Les Moustiques
  Funny Feeling

◆ Please consider your assessment:
  1) at the level of composition required for Higher School Certificate, Course 2/3 Unit (Common). Each piece represents the mandatory topic, 'Music from 1970 Onwards'.
  2) as the final assessment of each piece
  3) by using your personal criteria and standards.

◆ Scores identified by titles are provided for your observation.

◆ Each piece will be played once.

◆ A beep tone will sound 10 seconds after the end of each piece. The next piece will commence 10 seconds after. After the 3 pieces have been played there will be 2 minutes writing time.

◆ Please write your code here ____________________________________________
Question 1

a) Please rank the pieces in the order, in order of merit from the highest to the lowest, in the space below. Please avoid equal values. Please rank in order of the success of each piece as a piece of music. Please identify each piece by its title:

Title of the highest piece

Title of the middle piece

Title of the lowest piece

b) Please write a brief comment explaining why you ranked the pieces in the above order

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________

Question 2

a) Please provide an appropriate score for each of the 3 pieces on the ranges of scores printed below. Each piece should be considered on its success as a piece of music. (10 represents the maximum, 6 and 3 middle, and 1 the minimum score. Half marks are acceptable) Please avoid equal marks for any pieces.

i) Score for the highest piece:

(maximum) 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

(middle)    10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

(minimum)   10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

ii) Score for the middle piece:

(maximum) 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

(middle)    10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

(minimum)   10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

iii) Score for the lowest piece:

(maximum) 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

(middle)    10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

(minimum)   10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
b) Please provide an indication of the grades you would select for each piece by circling the relevant letters printed below. Equal grades are acceptable.

A = well above average (top 10%)
B = above average (next 20%)
C = average (middle 40%)
D = below average (next 20%)
E = well below average (lowest 10%)

i) Grade for the highest piece:
   A       B       C       D       E

ii) Grade for the middle piece:
    A       B       C       D       E

iii) Grade for the lowest piece:
     A       B       C       D       E
Assessment of Composition Experiment

Global (Blue) Session

◆ This session asks you to assess 3 compositions each 1 minute in length. They are:

Les Moustiques
Funny Feeling
Test Tube Song

◆ Please consider your assessment:
  1) at the level of composition required for Higher School Certificate, Course 2/3
     Unit (Common). Each piece represents the mandatory topic, 'Music from
     1970 Onwards'.
  2) as the final assessment of each piece
  3) by using your personal criteria and standards.

◆ Scores identified by titles are provided for your observation.

◆ Each piece will be played once.

◆ Following each piece there will be 6 minutes writing time.
  After 2 minutes 1 beep tone will sound.
  After 4 minutes 2 beep tones will sound.
  After 6 minutes 3 beep tones will sound.
  After 20 seconds the next piece will commence.

◆ Please write your code here ______________
Title of Piece:

Question 1

Please respond to the following statements by circling the response which corresponds to your judgement for each item. The responses use a Likert scale rating with the numbers from 7 through to 1, with 7 being the highest rating and 1 being the lowest.

7=very strongly agree, 6=strongly agree, 5=agree, 4=neutral (neither agree nor disagree), 3=disagree, 2=strongly disagree, 1=very strongly disagree

a) • This piece has a sense of cohesion in its development of ideas
++ (agree) neutral (disagree—
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

b) • This piece demonstrates a convincing sense of style
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

c) • Musical ideas are highly appropriate for the selected performing media
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

d) • This piece is original and uses unique ideas
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

e) • The piece meets the requirements of the task 'music since 1970'
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

f) • In my opinion this piece has no artistic merit
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

g) • This piece is successful in using compositional techniques
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

h) • The composer's intention is clearly communicated
7 6 5 4 3 2 1
i) • This piece does not sustain my interest throughout
++ (agree)  neutral (disagree) --
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

j) • This piece derives its ideas from pre-existing music
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

k) • This piece has no variety
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

l) • This piece demonstrates a high level of musical discrimination
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

m) • My personal response to the music - I like it
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

n) • This piece fails to demonstrate expertise in the manipulation of musical materials
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

o) • This piece is creative
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Question 2

Title of Piece:

a) Please provide a mark out of ten to indicate your impression of 'Les Moutiques' as a successful piece of music. Please place a circle around the appropriate number on the following range of scores. (10 is high, 6 and 5 the middle, and 1 is low. Half marks are acceptable).

(high) (middle) (low)
10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

b) Please write a comment explaining why you chose the above mark.

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________________________________
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Assessment of Composition Experiment

**Specific (Red) Session**

◆ This session asks you to assess 3 composition each 1 minute in length. They are:
  Funny Feeling
  Test Tube Song
  Les Moustiques

◆ Please consider your assessment:
  1) at the level of composition required for Higher School Certificate, Course 2/3 Unit (Common). Each piece represents the mandatory topic, 'Music from 1970 Onwards'.
  2) as the final assessment of each piece
  3) by using your personal criteria and standards.

◆ Scores identified by titles are provided for your observation.

◆ Each piece will be played once.

◆ Following each piece there will be 12 minutes writing time.
  After 4 minutes 1 beep tone will sound.
  After 8 minutes 2 beep tones will sound.
  After 12 minutes 3 beep tones will sound.
  After 20 seconds the next piece will commence.

◆ Please write your code here _____________________________
Title of Piece:

Question 1

Please respond to the following statements by circling the response which corresponds to your judgement. The responses use a Likert scale rating with numbers from 7 through to 1, with 7 being the highest rating and 1 being the lowest.

7=very strongly agree, 6=strongly agree, 5=agree, 4=neutral, 3=disagree, 2=strongly disagree, 1=very strongly disagree.

a) • Rhythmic features are used skillfully in this piece
   + (agree) neutral (disagree) -
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

b) • Dynamics are sensitively applied throughout this piece
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

c) • Melodic fragments are repetitive and overused
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

d) • This piece is novel in its use of one or more concepts
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

e) • I would prefer to view a score written by hand rather than computer-generated
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

f) • Harmonic features, including chord choice, chord progressions, modulations and cadences suggest a high level of expertise
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

g) • I enjoy the melodic ideas in this piece.
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

h) • There is a logical flow through a series of structural events.
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1

i) • This piece is proficient in its selection and manipulation of textural treatments
   7 6 5 4 3 2 1
There is rhythmic cohesion in this piece

+ (agree) neutral (disagree) -
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

This piece is proficient in handling musical processes eg development, variation etc.
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The treatment of instruments and/or voices demonstrates knowledge of conventions
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

There are errors in instrumental and/or vocal use eg register/range/appropriateness of role
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

This piece demonstrates comprehension of timbral qualities in its vocal/instrumental scoring
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The recording impairs an accurate appreciation of this piece
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

This piece satisfies requirements of the task - 'Music since 1970'.
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

There is a cliched use of one or more concepts in this piece
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Melodically there is sufficient balance between unity and variety
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The score is accurate, giving sufficient attention to detail
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The harmonic language is simplistic
7 6 5 4 3 2 1

The standard of composition is not consistent throughout this piece
7 6 5 4 3 2 1
Question 2 -

a) Is this piece identifiable as an example of a conventional combination of instruments/voices? eg. accompanied song, chamber combination, orchestra, rock group, stage band,

Yes □ No □

If yes, please identify the combination ________________________________

Whether you answered either YES or NO, please answer Question 2(b)

b) Please rate the success of this piece in the use of the chosen combination of instruments/voices. (7 represents very successful, 4 the middle and 1 is unsuccessful)

• 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
c) Please provide a comment explaining why you chose the above rating

Question 3 -

a) Is this piece identifiable as an example of a specific musical style, or combination of musical styles? eg. calypso, expressionist, folk, gospel, minimalist, rock, techno, serial, swing,

Yes □ No □

If you ticked YES please complete Question 3b and 3c
If you ticked NO please continue to Question 4

b) If you ticked YES, please name any style you can identify and indicate on the scale below the success rating of the piece is that style. (7 represents very high, 4 is neutral and 1 is very low)

Style i) ________________________________

• 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Style ii) (if applicable) ________________________________

• 7 6 5 4 3 2 1
c) Please provide a comment explaining why you chose the above rating(s)
Question 4

Please provide:

a) A mark out of ten for 'Funky Feeling' to indicate your consideration of its success as a piece of music. Please place a circle around an appropriate number of the following range of scores. (10 is high, 6 and 5 the middle, and 1 is low. Half marks are acceptable)

(high) (middle) (low)
10 , 9 , 8 , 7 , 6 , 5 , 4 , 3 , 2 , 1

b) Please write a comment explaining why you chose the above mark.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Assessment of Composition Experiment

Final Session

◆ This session asks you to respond to each question or comment briefly. No music will be played.

◆ Please write your code here
Question 1

1) This experiment asked you to consider each composition on its success as a piece of music. How did you interpret this statement?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

b) Do you wish to make any further comments concerning assessment of the 3 experiment pieces?

☐ Yes  ☐ No

If yes, please comment in the space below:
Les Moustiques

__________________________________________________________________________

Funny Feeling

__________________________________________________________________________

Test Tube Song

__________________________________________________________________________

Question 2

This question explores final assessment of student compositions in Higher School Certificate classes.

a) How long would you normally spend on the final appraisal of a composition? (1 hour, 1 day, 1 session, a number of days, a week)
b) Please comment on similarities and differences between the procedures and/or strategies used in this experiment and those you would normally use in assessing student compositions at Higher School Certificate level.


c) Are there other procedures which are important in your own assessment not included in this experiment?


Question 3

How important do you consider the following in the final assessment of a music composition at HSC level? 5=of the utmost importance, 4=extremely important, 3=important, 2= somewhat important, 1=neutral

a) craftsmanship (demonstrating knowledge/ability/synthesis of concepts etc)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>of the utmost importance</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b) stylistic authenticity

| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

c) originality

| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

d) ability to use technology

| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

e) the appeal of the music to your own tastes and preferences

| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

f) a general overview of the success of each piece

| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

g) meeting the requirements of a task

| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |
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h) Please specify and rate any other criteria you consider important in the final assessment of student composition at HSC level.

| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

**Question 4**

a) Please comment on how you use the following in the final assessment of student composition for senior secondary classes. 5=always, 4=frequently, 3=sometimes, 2=occasionally, 1=never

i) sound only

| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

ii) notation only

| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

iii) combination of sound and notation

| 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 |

Further comment:

b) Please comment on the use of computer-generated scores in your assessment in contrast with a student's own handwriting

---

b) Please comment on the use of computer-generated scores in your assessment in contrast with a student's own handwriting

---

c) Please comment on the effects of the use of synthesized sound of music on your assessment.

---

**Question 5**

a) Are there any comments you wish to make concerning assessment of composition for the Higher School Certificate, or in senior secondary classes?
Appendix E

Request to NSW Board of Studies for a list of schools with HSC music candidates
Mr Sam Weller  
President  
NSW Board of Studies  
171 Clarence St  
Sydney NSW 2000

Dear Mr Weller

I am currently researching the teaching and assessment of composition in senior secondary music classes. This research will lead to a PhD dissertation through Sydney Conservatorium of Music. As part of my research I will be surveying those secondary music teachers who have entered students for the HSC in Music, both 2/3 Unit Related and 2 Unit Course 1. It would assist me if I could have access to the names of schools from which students have been examined in Music for the HSC. Is this at all possible?

At the moment my applications for ethical approval from Sydney University, and for permission to conduct a survey from the Department of School Education are in process. While I understand the extreme delicacy of gaining access to NSW Board of Studies information I stress that all my research is confidential and does not identify any specific school, teacher or individual student. Only my supervisor and myself will see the completed surveys and the surveys themselves will not indicate the schools from which they were returned. If the Board of Studies agrees to this request I would need lists of schools which have entered students for HSC Music examinations from 1994 on.

I enclose a copy of the questionnaire I will be using for my survey for your information, and would be happy to discuss this with you or to supply any further information if required.

Yours sincerely

Pauline Beston  
25 August 1997
Appendix F

Letter to school principals
Re: Survey on the assessment of original music composition in NSW secondary schools.

Dear Principal,

The Music staff of your school are invited to take part in a survey on the teaching and assessment of original composition. This is a component of research for a PhD in music education.

The purpose of this survey is to investigate the current situation concerning assessment of composition in Preliminary and HSC music classes. It will explore teacher background and training, procedures, resources, strategies and criteria used in assessing composition. An outcome of the survey is to provide an overview of the most common practices music teachers use. The involvement of your Music staff in this survey only requires the completion and return of a short questionnaire (copy enclosed).

All aspects of the survey, including results, will be strictly confidential and only my supervisor, Dr Peter Dunbar-Hall, and myself will have access to the returned copies of the survey. All surveys are confidential and at no time will you, your staff or your school be identified in any way. A report of the study will form part of the PhD thesis and may also be submitted for publication or presented at conferences. The results of the study will only be reported in summary form. I will be happy to provide your school with a copy of my final report.

All relevant approvals appropriate to the conduct of this study have been obtained. Please find enclosed a copy of the research approval from the Department of School Education.

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Manager of Ethics and Biosafety Administration, University of Sydney, on (02) 9381 4811.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Paulina Boston
16 February, 1998
Appendix G

Letter to secondary school music teachers
Re: Survey on the assessment of original music composition in NSW secondary schools.

Dear Colleague

You are invited to take part in a research study into the teaching and assessment of original music composition in NSW secondary schools. The study is being supervised by Dr Peter Dunbar-Hall and conducted by Pauline Beston as a component of the research for a PhD in music education. The term 'assessment' does not refer to the Assessment policy of the NSW Board of Studies, rather to the ways that you evaluate, mark and grade your students' work.

All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the supervisor and I will have access to them. At no time will you or your school be identified in any way. While a coding process will be used to process data, no individual teacher can be identified. To ensure anonymity, please do not write your name on the questionnaire. A report of the study will form part of the PhD thesis and may be submitted for publication or presented at conferences. Results of the study will only be reported in summary.

Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Manager of Ethics and Bidability Administration, University of Sydney on (02) 9351 4811.

To assist in the study you are asked to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me, either in the envelope provided or by fax on (02) 9904 5702. Please contact me if further copies are required or you have any questions concerning the study.

Yours sincerely

Pauline Beston
19 February, 1998
Appendix H

Copy of DET approval to conduct research in public schools
Pauline Beston  
61 Park Avenue  
Cremorne 2090

Dear Pauline  

SERAP Ref: 97170

I refer to your application to conduct a project in Departmental schools entitled:

A study of assessment of composition from a music education perspective

I am pleased to inform you that I have approved your application to conduct research in NSW government schools. I ask that you now contact the principals of the nominated schools to seek their participation. This approval remains valid until: 25/10/98

In conducting research, you should be aware of the following requirements:

- the principal must approve the methods of gathering information in the school and has the right to withdraw the school from the study at any time;

- the privacy of the school and the students is to be protected.

You are reminded that the participation of teachers and students must be voluntary and must be at the school’s convenience. Note that in advising principals that approval has been given for you to seek their support in your study, you should include a copy of this letter with the documents you send to schools.

When your study is completed, please forward your report marked to my assistant, Annette Reidema, at the Department of School Education, Locked Bag 7, Hamilton Mall Centre, Hamilton, 2303.

I wish you every success with your project.

Yours sincerely

[Signature]

Dr. Terry Palmer  
Director, Research and Development  
21 October 1997
Appendix I

Invitation to secondary school music teachers to participate in the experiment.
Re: Research experiment in teacher assessment of original composition

Dear Colleague/s,

I wish to thank the many teachers in schools who assisted me by completing the recent questionnaire on assessment of original composition. Over 40% of teachers responded throughout NSW. A vast amount of data has been provided and the valuable information in each of the responses will ensure an accurate and comprehensive analysis.

You are now invited to take part in a research experiment into teacher assessment of original composition. This will involve your participation in one 90-minute experiment at Sydney Conservatorium of Music, 109 Pitt St, Sydney. The experiment will be conducted in a specified session during the period 24 August to 14 October, 1998. In this experiment I will be asking teachers to listen to 4 pieces of music, grade them, and indicate how the grading took place. The purpose of this experiment is to explore validity and reliability in the use of assessment criteria. Responses will be anonymous.

This research is being conducted by Pauline Beston as a component of a PhD in music education and supervised by Dr Peter Dunbar-Hall. All aspects of the study, including results, will be strictly confidential and only the supervisor and I will have access to them. At no time will you be identified in any way. A report of the study will form part of the PhD thesis and may be submitted for publication or presented at conferences. Results of the study will only be reported in summary.

Any person who has concerns or complaints about the conduct of this research can contact the Manager of Ethics and Biosafety Administration, University of Sydney, on (02) 5351 4811.

If you agree to participate in this experiment, please complete the attached form and return it to me in the enclosed reply paid envelope no later than Friday 3 July, 1998.

Yours sincerely,

Pauline Beston
25.5.98
TEACHER PARTICIPATION FORM

EXPERIMENT IN TEACHER ASSESSMENT OF ORIGINAL MUSIC COMPOSITION

- Addresses and phone numbers are for contact purposes only.
- Other data on page 1 of this form are required for sampling purposes.
- The conduct of the experiment will be confidential and responses will be anonymous.

1. Surname: ___________________________ Given Name: ________________
   Address: ___________________________ (street)
   ___________________________ (suburb) _________ (postcode)
   Phone: (sch) _______________ (home) _______________ (mobile) _______________
   Name of school: ___________________________ (tax) ___________________________

2. Gender:  
   □ Male  □ Female

3. Number of years teaching music in secondary schools: ________________ (yrs)

4. Please indicate the categories most appropriate to your present school:
   □ public   □ private
   □ single sex □ co-educational □ comprehensive □ selective (academic)
   □ performing arts □ music
   □ specialist (specifically) ___________________________
   □ senior secondary □ any other category (specifically) ___________________________

5. Please indicate if you have taught:
   □ HSC Music, 2U Common since 1995
   □ HSC Music, 2U Course 1 and/or 3U (with composition elective students)

Please indicate your session preference from the options over the page

Please duplicate this form as required

1
**EXPERIMENT SESSION OPTIONS**

- To participate in the experiment you are asked to attend **one session only**.
- All experiment sessions will be conducted at the Conservatorium of Music from 24 August to 14 October, 1998.
- Please indicate your session preference with a number, 1 for most preferred, 2 for next preferred etc.
- Please place a cross for any which you are unable to attend.
- Please fill in all boxes with either a cross or a number.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 24 August</td>
<td>4.30-6.00 pm</td>
<td>(Term 3 Week 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 26 August</td>
<td>4.30-6.00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 30 August</td>
<td>4.30-6.00 pm</td>
<td>(Term 3 Week 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 2 September</td>
<td>4.30-6.00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 21 September</td>
<td>4.30-6.00 pm</td>
<td>(Term 3 Week 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 23 September</td>
<td>4.30-6.00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 7 October</td>
<td>9.30-11.00 am</td>
<td>(Vacation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 7 October</td>
<td>1.00-2.30 pm</td>
<td>(Vacation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 8 October</td>
<td>9.30-11.00 am</td>
<td>(Vacation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thursday 8 October</td>
<td>1.00-2.30 pm</td>
<td>(Vacation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday 12 October</td>
<td>4.30-6.00 pm</td>
<td>(Term 4 Week 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday 14 October</td>
<td>4.30-6.00 pm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this research experiment. Please place this form in the enclosed reply paid envelope and return it to me at the following address: Pauline Boston, PO Box 1548, Neutral Bay, 2039 by Friday, 3 July. Alternatively you can fax it to 9904 5702. You will receive confirmation of participation by July 31.

Please duplicate this form as required.
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Approval from the University of Sydney Ethics Approval Committee for the conduct of research
Dr P Dunbar-Hall
Sydney Conservatorium of Music
C41

16 December 1997

Dear Dr Dunbar-Hall

The Human Ethics Committee at its meeting on 8 December 1997 considered your protocol:

Title: A study of the assessment of musical composition from a music education perspective

Ref No: 97/12/40

It was the Committee's opinion that there were no ethical objections to the project being undertaken.

The procedures outlined in the protocol must be adhered to.

Please note:
(i) The Subject Information Sheet and Consent Form must be on University of Sydney letterhead and must include the full title of the research project and telephone contacts for the researchers.

(ii) The standard University policy concerning storage of data should be followed. While temporary storage of audio-tapes at the researcher's home or an off-campus site is acceptable during the active transcription phase of the project, permanent storage should be at a secure, University controlled site for a minimum of five years.

(iii) The following statement must appear on the Subject Information Sheet:
Any person with concerns or complaints about the conduct of a research study can contact the Manager of Ethics and Biosafety Administration, University of Sydney, on (02) 9351 4811.

Approval for the protocol is given on the understanding that you will return the "Report Form - Monitoring of Research", which will be provided by Committee, as a progress report on your research by no later than 31 December 1998.
Approval has been given for one year and renewal is contingent upon the provision of the progress report.

Yours sincerely,

Dr D G Waupon
Chairman
Human Ethics Committee

c.c. Mrs P Beston, 61 Park Avenue, Cremorne NSW 2090
Appendix K

Letter from NSW Board of Studies
Ms Pauline Beston  
61 Park Ave  
Cremorne NSW 2090

Dear Ms Beston  

Schools with HSC Music candidates

Enclosed please find a Mac-formatted floppy disk with a FileMaker 2 database of all schools which presented candidates for HSC Music (2/3 Unit Related and 2 Unit Course 1) for the period 1994 – 1997. Address details are given for each school.

Best wishes with your research – the Board would be grateful to receive a summary of the results when they become available.

Yours sincerely

Andrew Goodyer  
Chief Project Officer  
14/9/1997
Appendix L

Judges’ numerical scores for three compositions in three assessment procedures: ACERF Impression (Green), Global (Blue), and Specific (Red) sessions.
Judge's numerical scores for three compositions in three assessment procedures (*ACERF Impression* (Green), *Global* (Blue), and *Specific* (Red) sessions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>'Impression' (Green)</th>
<th>'Global' (Blue)</th>
<th>'Specific' (Red)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling</td>
<td>Les</td>
<td>Test Tube</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Conference paper and publication:
Composition experiences of music teachers in secondary schools

Pauline Beston

Abstract
Composition has recently been given a more significant role in the secondary music curriculum in NSW. Changes in the syllabus requirements may cause problems for teachers in teaching and assessment of composition. Music teachers were surveyed to investigate the present situation. This paper reports on one question in the survey. This question was concerned with the personal composing experiences teachers had. Results show teachers have widely different experiences and opinions on this topic.

Background to the study
Prior to 1995, the mandatory component for Composition in New South Wales required candidates undertaking the Higher School Certificate in 2 Unit (Common) 3 Unit Music to complete exercises in Harmony and Melody writing at the time of the examination. With the publication of syllabus documents in 1994, the Composition component now requires candidates to submit an original composition representing the Mandatory Topic - Music 1970 Onwards (NSW Board of Studies, 1994).

This change reflects the evolution which has taken place in the application of composition in music education not only in New South Wales, but in other states of Australia (Burnard, 1995, Van Ernst, 1993), in Great Britain (Paynter, 1982, 1992) and in the United States (Reimer 1989, Webster, 1990). With this evolution the purpose of composition in music syllabuses has expanded so it is perceived as an artistic activity which not only initiates instruction and demonstrates learning, but further encourages personal expressive experiences with music, and induces 'artistic knowing' (Reimer, 1992). It involves both process (the course of action) and product (the musical outcome). The process is complex, involving time, effort and a variety of calculated procedures and effective strategies.

While many aspects of the teaching and assessment of composition have yet to be explored, teachers are required to have the skills, knowledge and ability to deliver support and guidance to students in this artistic and complex responsibility. Anecdotal evidence and personal experience in the secondary music classroom suggest that there may be teachers who are unprepared and insufficiently skilled for the complexities of teaching and assessment in this area of the curriculum.

Survey
An investigation of teaching and assessing original composition in NSW secondary schools was undertaken through the distribution of a survey in term 1 of 1998. The survey was administered to 562 secondary schools throughout NSW. Two hundred and and twenty-eight music teachers responded (representing a 40.57% response rate). The purpose of this investigation was to explore teachers' backgrounds in composition - their personal experience, training and teaching experience. It also explored teaching practice, procedures, criteria and strategies used in assessment of composition during and on completion of the writing process. This paper presents the findings of one question in the survey - teachers' personal experience in composition. It investigates and discusses identified composition contexts and categories. The paper concludes with observations of trends in data provided.

Survey question into the composing experiences of secondary teachers in NSW
The question was designed to provide information for data analysis to show:

(i) if teachers have written original compositions
(ii) the range of composition experiences teachers have and
(iii) teachers' opinions on what constitutes composition.

The question was in two parts. The first part required respondents to specify whether they had any experiences as a composer. Four examples were supplied for the purpose of prompting teachers in possible composing experiences. Examples were: (i) writing for a rock or church group; (ii) writing for a school performance; (iii) performing in a jazz ensemble; and (iv) publishing works. Teachers were required to tick a 'yes' or 'no' response. Teachers who ticked 'yes' were then asked to supply details.
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Results
All two hundred and twenty-eight respondents answered this question. Results showed that 160 respondents (70%) answered 'yes'. Sixty-eight respondents (30%) answered 'no' (see Figure 1 Pie Chart).

Figure 1:

In responding, five respondents who neglected to tick either box proceeded to provide details. These details were analysed, placed in appropriate categories and included in the 'yes' responses. One response placed a tick between the boxes. This was similar to five other responses which ticked 'no' and then described details of arranging experiences. This issue will be discussed later in this paper.

There was diversity in responses. Some consisted of a single comment related to a particular event, eg 'musical (short) for primary school'; related to style, eg 'rock and jazz'; or quantified composition experiences. Three responses indicating little experience - 'in a small way', 'limited experience writing original pop/rock songs and advertising jingles', and 'but very little' were at the opposite end of the spectrum to - 'composing theatre music scores for community theatre company; composer in residence'. Other responses gave specific details of a broad range of genres and styles of music, eg 'film documentary scores for Film Australia; music theatre; published chamber and symphonic works; original music and arrangements for school choir and instrumental ensembles'. Comparison of responses was problematical due these dissimilarities. To ensure accurate reporting, data was analysed in two ways:

(1) composition contexts and
(2) composition categories.

1 - Composition contexts
Composition contexts are the environments in which compositions were composed and/or performed. There are four composition contexts:

(i) Pre-service
(ii) Education
(iii) Community and
(iv) Publication.

Analysis by context is validated in one response which suggests motivation to compose is generated by personal and/or professional necessity: 'I don’t feel a personal need to compose and only do it when it fills a practical need'. Categories are cumulative rather than exclusive and respondents in the later categories often indicated they composed in earlier contexts. Results are shown in Figure 2 Pie Chart.
A small number of teachers (N=9) indicated they had composition experiences only during pre-service training. Respondents had composed pieces as assignments in courses in tertiary institutions. Courses were both major and elective studies. Two respondents had written and arranged pieces for performance by university vocal ensembles and instrumental groups. Compositions in jazz/rock, contemporary and electronic styles were cited. One comment referred to a public performance of an HSC composition. Some of the responses were: 'Uni assignments - eg 20th century composition, many activities - short non-notated composition with a variety of focuses', and 'composed a musical at Uni. (unpublished), wrote and arranged several songs for jazz/rock bands'. When correlated with teaching age, eight of these respondents were teachers in the first five years of teaching.

Almost half the respondents who indicated they had composition experiences (N=76) wrote for education contexts. There are two education contexts:

(i) the music classroom and
(ii) extra-curricular activities.

While two respondents commented they wrote exclusively for classroom use, many wrote original material for both contexts. Classroom composition experiences were: Orff-based classroom exercises, pieces for class ensembles, and solos for HSC performance. Respondents described how they used composition in their classrooms - 'I always create melodies for class work to demonstrate a particular composition technique where appropriate', and 'composing for school to demonstrate concepts and ideas'. A third respondent had written 'computer music resources for classes'.

Respondents (N=74) identified extra-curricular musical activities as the main context for composing in education. A wide range of ensembles, genres and events was identified by respondents. Instrumental ensembles for which respondents composed were: band, beginner instrumental group, blues band, chamber ensembles (duets, trios and quartets), chamber orchestra, concert band, jazz band, marching band, orchestra, pop/rock group, string orchestra. Vocal ensembles were: a cappella, barber shop quartet, SATB choir, school choirs (both primary and secondary), and SSA choir. Specific genres and events identified by respondents in composing for extra-curricular contexts were: a cappella/rock pieces, accompaniments, antiphonal fanfares, cantatas, incidental music for plays, integrated arts tour, melodrama, musicals, rock musicals, school plays, school songs, short musicals, and solo songs.

Fewer respondents indicated they composed for community contexts (N=53). There were four community contexts:

(i) church (N=27)
(ii) hobby (N=4)
(iii) performance (N=9) and
(iv) other (N=13)
Many respondents (N=27) composed for services and a variety of music groups associated with a church. Compositions for services were: anthems; choruses; hymns; liturgical music; masses; psalm responses; string music; and wedding music. Respondents who composed for church groups frequently wrote for unusual combinations. A typical response was - 'Arranging and writing for a church group with all kinds of instrumentation; SATB choral arrangements and soft rock songs'. Respondents who wrote in a hobby context described their experiences: 'writing for myself', 'personal interest/hobby', and 'MIDI based pieces for my own enjoyment'. Respondents who composed through performance were often in professional blues bands, jazz ensembles or rock groups. The remaining respondents in this category (N=13) wrote for a variety of community contexts including competitions, youth workshops, and ensembles (some of which were identified as professional). One respondent explained: 'songs and band pieces in jazz, rock and pop styles for a small classic ensemble'.

The final composition context was publication. Respondents (N=22) in this category wrote for professional or semi-professional performance in addition to school and community contexts. All had either:

(i) published scores (N=13)
(ii) recorded CDs of their own material (N= 7)
(iii) written scores for film or video (N= 2).

More remarkable among this group was the individuality of responses, the quantity of works, and the diversity of composing experiences consistently demonstrated within each. While two responses identified the status of the respondents, with one a 'professional freelance composer' and the other a 'composer in residence', three responses will demonstrate the singularity of composition experiences of respondents in this category: (i) 'Recording contracts WEA and EMI. Publishing Chappells (1973-1985). Active composer. Member APRA. Ambisonic compositions, digital; (ii) 'Works performed at ISCM Concerts, on Polish radio. Have written music for school productions.' and (iii) 'Created 11 song albums (MIDI, guitar and vocal)'. One respondent provides a summary of the composing experience of respondents identified in this category in; 'rock music when young - you name it, I've done it'.

2 - Composition categories
Composition categories are classified according to the skills inherent in composing activities. There are four categories which respondents identified:

(i) Arrange
(ii) Create
(iii) Arrange and Create
(iv) Improvise

The first three categories are exclusive and the final category is cumulative. Results are shown in Figure 3 Pie Chart.

Figure 3:
Compositions in the 'arrange' category were arrangements, orchestrations, rearrangements, and transcriptions of pre-existing music. Arrangements were often substantial, and for a wide variety of performing groups. The response - 'as an arranger for school band and choir, also for a school musical, rewriting for band', was typical.

There were conflicting opinions on the status of arrangement in relation to composition. Many respondents do not consider arrangement a branch of composition. Five respondents (previously mentioned) who ticked 'no' to the initial question described arranging experiences. Six respondents qualified the term with 'only'. 'But only arranging......', and 'arranging only......', suggests that arrangement of pre-existing music may not share equal status with original composition. The remaining respondents clearly identified this activity and perceived arranging as a distinct branch of the domain.

Compositions in the 'create' category were original pieces. The number of respondents (N=39) who wrote original music was similar to those in the previous category. Compositions cited ranged from ballads to symphonic works, and were in many styles. Some were digital, but most were acoustic. All music cited, apart from jazz and rock, was 'western' in origin. One notable exception was an 'Indonesian gamelan'.

Almost half the respondents who compose both arrange and create original music (N=76). The response - 'I write or arrange most of my choir music, plus I've written musicals, anthems for church choirs, string music etc' exemplifies comments.

Some respondents (N=9) indicated they composed through improvisation. One respondent, who played professionally, explained the skills involved: 'musician in bands for 30 years - arranging, writing, improvising, soloing and harmonizing'. Others improvised at the piano.

Conclusions

Results have implications for aspects of teaching and assessment of composition. Many respondents are capable composers. They write in a broad range of genres and place a strong emphasis on traditional western art music. Compositions in jazz and rock styles are not uncommon. Less evident in the responses was music in non-western styles, and limited reference was made to electronic composition.

There is no common definition or interpretation of the term 'composition'. While many composition areas were cited, including arranging, improvising, and transcribing, there were varying implied opinions on the status of each area. Perceptions of some respondents suggest that arranging holds an inferior status to other forms of composition.

There is little evidence of the use of improvisation in composition. Improvisation was utilised by some performers, but seldom mentioned by respondents in other applications. While there is no suggestion that improvisation is not being used by teachers in classrooms, the absence of references to composing through improvising in responses might suggest a dependence on notation and the printed score.

In drawing further conclusions, it is necessary to examine numerical data further. The number of respondents who indicated they composed original music is calculated by combining 'create' (N=39), 'arrange & create' (N=76), and 'improvise' (N=9) categories. The total (N=124) indicates half the respondents to this question of the survey had composed original music. Conversely, half the respondents had not composed original music.

While this researcher is not implying that effective secondary music teachers are required to be composers (and the example of Nadia Boulanger is sufficient to banish this suggestion), it is appropriate that teachers have experienced expressing themselves musically. The ability to compose may assist them in developing a methodology appropriate to teaching. Nadia Boulanger recommended:

A teacher should be able to compose. He should have a technique of his own, a wealth of knowledge and a definite way of thinking. Have the courage to have an opinion. (Brown, 1982)

Without personal experience in composing, teachers are dependent on other resources, such as pre-service training, in-service experience, informal advice from colleagues, and trial and error.
solutions. Further research in this area will investigate other resources teachers use in acquiring skills to teach composition in secondary schools in New South Wales.
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Conference paper:
An investigation and analysis of music teachers' training in Composition, Composition teaching and Composition assessment.

Abstract
The research in this paper reports and describes secondary music teachers' sources of training in composition, teaching composition and assessing composition. The question of training in these three categories was included in a survey which was distributed to five hundred and sixty-two secondary schools in New South Wales in 1998. Clear differences emerged in numbers of respondents who identified specific sources of training in each category. Music training institutions were identified as the major source of training in composition. In contrast, training identified by most respondents in composition teaching and assessing categories was associated with other sources which were not music training institutions. Descriptive data provided evidence of the value placed on composers' advice; the power of assessment in determining change; and the influence of the New South Wales Board of Studies in guiding change.

Introduction
The importance of composition in secondary music curricula in New South Wales has increased in recent decades. A dramatic change to composition practice in curricula occurred in 1994. At that time the newly introduced Year 12 Music Syllabus required students in Course 2/3 Unit (Common) Music to submit a recording and score of a two minute original composition (New South Wales Board of Studies, 1994). A process diary was required to show evidence of each composition's development.

The change in examination format was accompanied by different approaches in assessment procedures. Two assessment procedures were used to evaluate student compositions. In the first procedure, music teachers in schools rated their students' process diaries. Syllabus documents provided guidelines to teachers in assessing diaries, which included evidence of 'background listening, decision-making processes, the development of compositional skills, performance considerations, students' reflections on the composition, evidence of technology processes, and students' appraisals of their compositions' (ibid, p36). The second assessment procedure rated the submitted composition primarily by observation of the submitted score and sound recording. External examiners, nominated by the New South Wales Board of Studies marked each composition (ibid, 37).

Assessment changes heralded unambiguous signals to teachers concerning composition teaching and learning. Fundamental were changes in definition, focus and application of composition in music curricular. Prior to 1994, assessment structures provided by syllabus documents had reinforced the concept of composition as bimodal (Dunbar-Hall, 1999). The first mode was traditional, compulsory, largely uncreative, and based on harmony and melody writing skills. In this mode, the teacher functioned as instructor and tutor.

The second mode, optional in syllabus documents from 1965, was creative and generated original music (NSW Board of Studies, 1965). In this mode, composition was a process which results in the production of a new composition product. The 1999 syllabus document re-confirmed this interpretation of composition with the following: 'The term 'composition' applies to original works. The composition should be of a musically substantial nature and should reflect an understanding of the stylistic features of the topic it represents.' (NSW Board of Studies, 1999, 76).

With this clarification of definition, the focus in developing composition strategies moves to problem solving, decision making, creative, critical and higher order thinking. Of primary importance to teachers in the delivery of the curriculum, composition is now a pedagogical tool, equal in importance to listening and performance, in its ability to teach music. In teaching composition, the teacher functions less as an instructor and more as a guide, facilitator, coach or motivator.

Assessment strategies introduced with the syllabus change in 1994 broaden the music teachers' role to include that of critic. Swanwick (1988 and 1998) considered that assessment was fundamental to the teaching process, and both teaching and assessing were synonymous - 'to teach is to assess, to weigh up, to appraise' (Swanwick, 1988, p149). Swanwick identified the feedback provided to students which enhances learning as the most valuable purpose of assessment. A second purpose of composition assessment is to report results to a field wider
than the immediate classroom. In the Higher School Certificate, judgements are formal and reported to parents, schools, and education bodies as well as to individual students. Teachers' decisions on appropriate strategies, methods, and criteria used are important to ensure both types of assessments are accurate, fair and result in improved student learning.

Background to the Study
While it is generally accepted that composition in the curriculum is desirable, reservations concerning teacher preparation in its classroom implementation and assessment have consistently been observed (Moore, 1990; Paynter, 1982; Pilsbury & Alston, 1996; Jeanneret, 1990; Simmonds, 1988). In the United States, it was noted that music teachers entering the profession have higher levels of expertise in performance ability while improvisation or composition skills are generally undeveloped (Moore, 1990). In the United Kingdom, teachers were observed to be limited in their level of training in composition (Paynter, 1982), and a New South Wales study found creative composition was a neglected aspect in pre-service music teacher education (Jeanneret, 1990). In an early study in composition assessment, Simmonds (1988) considered teachers who participated in his study were limited in their decisions by a narrow range of opinions and tastes. A more recent study in composition assessment suggested that teachers need training if their judgement is to accurately reflect value in composition (Pilsbury & Alston, 1996).

The purpose of the study
The purpose of this paper was to investigate the following:
1. what sources of training in composition, composition teaching, and composition assessment teachers in New South Wales secondary schools identified they had;
2. teachers' perceptions of composition and its role in the Higher School Certificate curriculum; and
3. factors which have influenced secondary music teachers in acquisition of training in composition, its teaching and assessment.

Method
The present study was included as a three-part question in a survey which was designed to investigate perceptions, procedures and values used by New South Wales secondary music teachers in composition assessment. The survey was distributed to 562 secondary schools throughout New South Wales in term 1 of 1998. Two hundred and twenty-eight music teachers responded (representing a 40.57% response rate). The question asked teachers to identify their source of training in each category - composition, teaching composition, and assessing composition. Respondents were asked to indicate their source of training from the following - 'none', 'pre-service', 'in-service', 'post-graduate', and 'other'. The final category was included to elicit training which may have been unorthodox and informal. Respondents were asked to provide qualitative data which elaborated on the identified responses following each sub-section. Results from quantitative data in each part of the question was recorded and tabulated. Qualitative data was coded and classified.

Results
Results to the three sections of this question are reported below. Table 1, shows quantitative data from the first section, sources of training and/or background in composition.

Table 1
Sources of Training in Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Respondents' Training in Composition</th>
<th>Nil</th>
<th>Pre-Service</th>
<th>In-Service</th>
<th>Post-Graduate</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many respondents identified more than one training source in composition. The most preferred source was 'pre-service' (n=156) followed by 'in-service' (n=65). Some respondents considered they had no training in composition (n=33) while small numbers of respondents identified 'post-graduate' and 'other' sources of training.

To ascertain more data on respondents' perceptions of training appropriate to composition, respondents were asked to provide further details of their composition training. The one hundred and eighty nine responses were classified into the following: personal experiences, training institutions, training courses, composition classes, in-service courses, theory classes, composition mentors, and perceptions of inadequacy of training courses. Each classification is listed below in decreasing order of frequency. Percentages are provided to provide comparisons between classifications and with Table 1.

Table 2
Details of Sources of Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Training</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Pre-Service</th>
<th>In-Service</th>
<th>Post Grad</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>personal experiences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40 (21%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institutions</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38 (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>courses</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>composition classes</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-service courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20 (11%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>theory classes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>16 (8%)</td>
<td>113 (60%)</td>
<td>34 (18%)</td>
<td>15 (8%)</td>
<td>11 (6%)</td>
<td>189 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons between both Table 1 and Table 2 confirm that both sets of data show similar results. In descending numerical order, comments identified training in the following categories in both tables: 'pre-service', 'in-service', 'none', 'post-graduate', and 'other'.

Experiences at formal training institutions predominated categories of training. Specific New South Wales institutions were repeatedly identified, for example the Sydney and Newcastle Conservatorium of Music, the University of Sydney and the University of New England. The Australian Music Examinations Board was also identified as a source of training. Most frequent courses mentioned were: Diploma in Music Education, Diploma of the State Conservatorium of Music, and the Bachelor of Music Education. Classes in composition within formal courses were identified, while less respondents mentioned theory classes in harmony, counterpoint, musicianship and orchestration. Individual composers who mentored respondents prior to and while teaching were identified. These were: Don Banks, Nigel Butterley, Anne Boyd, Anne Carr-Boyd, George Dreyfus, Richard Meale, Peter Sculthorpe and Martin Wesley-Smith.

A significant amount of training was less formal and undertaken through in-service courses or by individual, personal experience. Comments categorised under personal experience suggested respondents had developed their own composing style through practical application of skills learnt at institutions. Two examples illustrate: 'No formal training other than tertiay course. However, have done extensive work in recording studios working with various composers'. The second example also mentions training at an institution: 'Discussions with other musicians, self taught, composition at conservatorium'. For some respondents, courses were inadequate in preparation for composition, as the following example demonstrates: 'Sydney Conservatorium composition class - fugues, four part harmony and one in-service - more theory than practice'.

The second section of the question asked respondents to identify their training and/or background in teaching composition. Table 3 shows quantitative results to this question.
Table 3
Sources of Training in Teaching Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Training in Teaching Composition</th>
<th>Nil</th>
<th>Pre-Service</th>
<th>In-Service</th>
<th>Post-Graduate</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major source of training in teaching composition identified by respondents was 'other' training (n=88) followed by 'in-service' training (n=81). 'Pre-service' training was selected by less than one quarter of respondents (n=64). 'Post-graduate' training responses were infrequent (n=11). A number of respondents considered they had no training in teaching composition (n=47).

To ascertain more data concerning respondents' backgrounds in training in teaching composition, they were invited to provide further details. One hundred and twenty-six respondents provided more information. This was less than the details provided in the first part of the question which suggested that respondents had no further information supplementary to that which had been provided earlier. Data from responses was coded and classified into eight categories. These gave details of: in-service courses, formal courses, mentors, personal experiences, discussions, inadequacy of courses, institutions, and private tuition. Classifications are listed in Table 4 in decreasing order of frequency. Percentages for totals are included to enable comparisons to be made.

Table 4
Details of Sources of Training in Teaching Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Training in Teaching Composition</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Pre-Service</th>
<th>In-Service</th>
<th>Post Grad</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>in-service courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27 (21%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal courses</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mentors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>21 (17%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal experiences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20 (16%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 (15%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12 (9%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private tuition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 (1%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>7 (5%)</td>
<td>33 (26%)</td>
<td>36 (29%)</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
<td>44 (35%)</td>
<td>126 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons between Table 3 and Table 4 show that both sets of data, quantitative and qualitative, produced similar results. In decreasing order, respondents considered training in teaching composition was provided in the following categories: 'other', 'in-service', and 'pre-service'. The final two categories, 'none' and 'post-graduate' show a slight divergence between Table 3 and Table 4.

'Other' sources of training were the most frequently identified. A strong emphasis was on contact with composers and colleagues. Respondents identified fifteen individual composers as mentors in composition teaching. Specific ways in which composers guided respondents were through lectures, consultations, demonstrations, and in the performances of new compositions. Four responses indicated that composers taught the composition component of Higher School Certiﬁcate courses in schools. In contrast, training from colleagues was mainly through networking which enabled respondents to conference, discuss, compare strategies and exchange views.

'In-service' courses were most commonly identified as sources of training in composition teaching. Organisations which provided in-service training were listed. Those named by multiple respondents are listed
with respondent numbers to show comparisons: Sydney Symphony Orchestra Education Program (n=9); Australian Society for Music Education (n=3); Catholic Music Teachers' Association (n=2); and Musica Viva (n=2). It is interesting that two of the four most popular training sources were commercial art music organisations. Of special importance was the Sydney Symphony Orchestra.

The final section of the survey question asked respondents to identify their training and/or background in assessing composition. Results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5
Sources of Training in Assessing Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Training in Assessing Composition</th>
<th>Nil</th>
<th>Pre-Service</th>
<th>In-Service</th>
<th>Post-Graduate</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Responses Number</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The major source of training in assessing composition which respondents identified was in 'other' (n=82). Descriptions of 'other' training include personal experiences, Higher School Certificate marking, printed advice from the New South Wales Board of Studies, and discussions with colleagues. Many respondents considered they had no training in assessing composition (n=70). 'Pre-service' (n=53) and 'in-service' (n=57) were less prominent sources of training in assessing composition, as was 'post-graduate' (n=6).

To provide further data into assessing composition, respondents were invited to elaborate on their responses to their training and/or background in assessing composition. One hundred and eleven respondents included further information. This was much less than the numbers of respondents who completed the quantitative section of the question. Responses classified in Table 6 are listed in decreasing order of frequency and are: personal experience; Higher School Certificate marking for the New South Wales Board of Studies; in-service courses; New South Wales Board of Studies' printed advice; discussions; institutions; and the inadequacy of training in assessing composition.

Table 6
Sources of Training in Assessing Composition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Training in Assessing Composition</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>Pre-Service</th>
<th>In-Service</th>
<th>Post Grad</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>personal experience</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HSC marking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in-service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>printed advice course</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10 (9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discussions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>institution</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7 (6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inadequate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>21 (19%)</td>
<td>15 (13%)</td>
<td>25 (22%)</td>
<td>3 (3%)</td>
<td>47 (42%)</td>
<td>111 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparisons between respondents' selections in Table 5 and Table 6 show that the 'other' column was predominant as training and/or background in assessing composition. 'In-service' training was valuable in
assessing composition (n=25). Many respondents considered they had no training in assessing composition (n=21).

A large number of respondents designed their own personal assessment strategies. Five comments reflect ideas on assessment of composition prevalent in literature and research. 'Assessment in the form of does it work?' suggests a global treatment. 'I have technical knowledge of styles, and experience, so I am happy with my own criteria,' implicates the respondents had clear objective criteria. 'Common sense and logic prevail, I draw on my own creative sense' considers creativity. 'Assessments are comparative and sometimes subjective, but after objective analysis' provides multiple assessment procedures which include ranking, analysis, and a balance between subjective and objective assessment treatments. The final comment considers notation and sound with: 'I assess on a basis of 1) how it sounds and 2) if it's written, I check if it works'.

Despite an apparent availability of opportunities, many respondents were alarmed by their perceived lack of assessment training opportunities. A comment from one respondent iterates: 'Frightening to consider this one! No in-service! Much needed!' Only small scale discussions with other teachers'.

Data showed the New South Wales Board of Studies has a profound influence on training in assessment of composition. Respondents valued all opportunities to interact with the Board of Studies through first and second-hand Higher School Certificate marking experiences and documentation. Of most value to training in assessment were opportunities to mark Higher School Certificate examination papers. Knowledge gained from any marking experience was disseminated to other teachers at in-service opportunities. Respondents considered some courses in composition assessment were oriented towards procedures for submitted works and marking schemes. These were of less value than personal interaction with examiners. The following quotation reveals these perceptions: 'I've been to a course or two, but I've learnt more through discussion with experienced HSC markers'.

Discussion and Conclusions
The aim of this paper was to investigate three questions related to composition in the curriculum. The first question explored respondents' identified sources of training in composition, its teaching and assessment. When compared, training in composition results are different from the other two areas. This was due to the large numbers of respondents with common pre-service composition experiences at training institutions. A majority of respondents listed courses, institutions, composition and theory classes which confirmed the importance of formal training in the field.

Results in the other two areas under investigation, teaching and assessing composition contrasted with those for composition. In both teaching and assessing, larger numbers of respondents reported 'other' training as the most common. While pre-service, institutionalised training was identified as a significant background in teaching composition, responses were outnumbered by those who identified 'in-service' courses.

In assessing composition 'other' training was again the most identified response and the second most common response was 'none'. Respondents considered they had little training in assessing composition during 'pre-service' and 'in-service'.

The second question which was addressed by this paper concerned respondents' perception of composition and its role in the Higher School Certificate curriculum. To show this, respondents' use of terminology associated with composition was observed. Respondents interpreted the term 'composition' in two ways, which reflects bimodal composition strategies used prior in music curricula prior to 1994. Some respondents used the term synonymously with harmony and counterpoint. In contrast, the opposite view of composition as an accomplishment achieved through creativity and originality was clearly shown.

Many respondents expressed a doubt that composition training through harmony and counterpoint courses was appropriate for current syllabus requirements. Some respondents suggested that such skills were 'inappropriate', 'out of date', and focussed on the tradition of Western music at the expense of different styles such as rock and jazz. This view may account for some respondents (n=33) who claimed to have no training in composition.
Conversely, respondents in the 'personal experiences' class had successfully transferred knowledge gained in theoretical training courses into practice. Multiple practical experiences were evident in all such responses. An example shows how experience supplemented courses in composition theory: 'Member of Arranging Guild of Australia (MAGA), have done extensive work in recording studios working with various composers - little formal training apart from the Conservatorium'.

The third question under investigation is an examination of influences on respondents in composition, teaching and assessment. Each area reveals different influences. In composition training, respondents clearly identified training institutions as the major influences on their background. In composition teaching, the influence of training institutions was still evident. However, wider influences were evident. These included composers and other teachers. Other influences included commercial organisations such as the Sydney Symphony Orchestra and Musica Viva.

In education, implementing change is difficult. Major forces in ensuring change does occur are the curriculum, and the process of teaching and learning. Forming a bridge between the curriculum and the process of teaching and learning, assessment is a third force which has significant influence in controlling not only what is taught but how it is taught (Broadfoot, 1992; Gasking, 1947). In the present study, the New South Wales Board of Studies was repeatedly identified in responses. Respondents investigated alternative methods in teaching and assessing composition and indicated they were receptive to advice from a variety of sources. This suggests that changes in assessment structures in composition may have been a motivating element in encouraging respondents to explore many opportunities for acquiring skills which will support student learning.

This paper has not attempted to shown that change in teaching practices has occurred. The paper has attempted to explore teachers' perceptions towards composition as its role changes from a theoretical exercise to a pedagogical tool. The paper has shown that significant numbers of respondents appreciate changes to composition and its role in the curriculum and they are resourceful in exploring opportunities to enhance student achievement.
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The multiple purposes of composition assessment in secondary education

Pauline Beston, New South Wales

Abstract
This paper reports on an investigation of music teachers’ perceptions of the purpose of composition assessment in the senior secondary curriculum. Data was collected in a survey distributed to secondary schools throughout New South Wales in 1999. Results show that respondents consider composition assessment is most important for student learning and less valuable in providing support for teaching.

Introduction
Assessment of compositions written by students at secondary school level has recently had a stronger focus in music education research and practice. Both composition and educational assessment have evolved autonomously and in the last decade have become strongly linked in the New South Wales secondary curriculum. From the 1960s composition developed in importance in the curriculum, and is now on a par with listening and performing, and requires equal attention in music classes. The application of composition as a pedagogical tool can foster creative growth, encourage higher level thinking and desirable educational outcomes. Simultaneously with development in music composition has been investigation of assessment practices in education which reflect student achievement, and ways of reporting achievement which encourage growth and improvement.

Along with changing methods and attitudes to assessment, broader perspectives on the purpose of assessment in education have emerged. Traditional assessment, used to promote and select students through grading and classifying, contributed little to the improvement of teaching and learning and often had negative effects on pupil development (Airasian, 1989; Hannen, 1993; Izard, 1991). Nowadays, assessment in education has the purpose of reinforcing the curriculum by integrating teaching with assessment. Broadfoot (1992) identified diverse assessment purposes, by suggesting:

that the interests of students should be paramount; the primary purpose of assessment is to identify strength and guide improvement; that reporting should emphasize progress and growth - not comparisons; that assessment should be fair to all; that it should involve all parties affected; that self-assessment should be the starting point for assessment; that assessment must include the more sophisticated skills now being taught (Broadfoot, 1992, p.7).

In the creative arts and music generally, assessment is seen to serve a variety of purposes. These have been identified as summative, diagnostic, formative, and evaluative (Ross, 1993). Traditional assessments, used for the purpose of making judgements about acquisition of skills and knowledge, provide summative data about a student’s progress. Developments in creative arts have concentrated on ways of tapping into essentially artistic qualities of individuality and invention. Formative and diagnostic assessments,
conducted during or on completion of individual student projects, provide students with support in completing complex projects. Assessed qualities include creative and critical thinking, self-knowledge, domain knowledge, and problem solving. Results from assessments provide teachers with a yardstick to measure effectiveness of personal teaching methods and classroom practices. The latter have been identified as evaluative assessment (Ross, 1993).

Literature in composition assessment similarly identifies that there are multiple purposes for assessment which are summative, formative, diagnostic, and evaluative. Pedagogical purposes have been additionally identified in composition assessment. Summative purposes monitor students' growth, show what has been achieved and what has been attempted (Armstrong, 1994; Roberts, 1994; Swanwick, 1998). Formative assessments support complex composition learning by guiding students through a variety of stages, from the initial impulse through to a final revision (Bunting, 1987, 1988; Harris & Hawksley, 1989; Loane, 1984; van Ernst, 1993). Diagnostic assessment is delicate but essential for composition development. It is generally recommended that diagnostic assessment should be undertaken through questioning and discussion to define where the composition is going and to consider processes (Hanley, 1994; Harris & Hawksley, 1988; Hughes, 1996; 1999; Merrigan, 1997; Paynter, 2000). Evaluative assessment provides composition teachers with feedback on student growth which in turn gives information about the effectiveness of instruction. In composition, Bunting observed that feedback on teaching effectiveness may occur over long periods, often needing a year or more to show results (Bunting, 1987, 1988; Davies, 1986). A final purpose for composition assessment is to assist as part of curriculum reform by prescribing what skills students will demonstrate in public examinations (Dunbar-Hall, 1993, 1999; Gammon, 1996; Gasking, 1947; Paynter, 1982, 1992).

The aim of this research was to investigate music teachers' perceptions of the purposes of composition assessment. A second aim was to explore teachers' perceptions of the relationship between teaching and assessment. The research is part of a larger study which aimed to investigate music teachers' attitudes, practices, and values towards music composition in the senior secondary curriculum.

Method
A request was made to the New South Wales Board of Studies for a list of secondary schools which had submitted students for examinations in music from the period of 1993-1997. The Board of Studies identified 562 schools which conformed to these specifications. A survey was sent to the schools in the sample in March, 1998. Two hundred and twenty-eight music teachers completed and returned surveys, representing a 41% response rate.

Three courses are offered to candidates at the New South Wales Higher School Certificate examination. At the time of the survey these were identified as 2/3 Unit (Related), 3 Unit, and 2 Unit Course 1. Composition is a mandatory component in 2/3 Unit (Related), and an option in each of the other courses. The question related to the purpose of composition assessment on the survey asked: 'In relation to the teaching of
music composition in both 2/3 Unit Related, 3 Unit and 2 Unit Course 1, what is the purpose of assessment? The question was in open format. Three lines were provided for responses. Analysis was conducted by content analysis which involved transcription, examination, coding and classification of all data, then summarising and listing of content.

Results
Data consisted of over three hundred and seventy-six comments from the respondents in the survey. Many respondents considered there was more than one purpose to composition assessment, while a few respondents listed three or more purposes. Collectively, comments were grouped into five categories identified as diagnostic, formative, summative, evaluative, and pedagogical. Most often respondents used common terminology to identify purposes, and terms such as 'grade', 'rank', 'motivate' were reiterated throughout responses. The following table (Table 1) provides a comparative frequency of items identified by respondents, and the collective purposes for composition assessment.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Composition Purpose</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Number of Comments (n)</th>
<th>Total Comments (n)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Summative</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervise</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirm authenticity</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formative</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Set goals</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivate</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-evaluate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meet examination requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The main emphasis in responses was on purposes which addressed student learning. Summative purposes accounted for over half of all comments and were concerned with grading, ranking, supervising, authenticating, or evaluating what students had achieved. Less emphasis was given to formative and diagnostic purposes for composition assessment. Formative purposes were identified in one tenth of the comments, and were directed towards goal setting, motivating and providing early stimulus to students when composing. Diagnostic purposes were identified in one quarter of all responses. Diagnostic support was identified in developmental stages of a composition and was described as: giving feedback, guiding, improving, assisting, identifying
strengths/weaknesses, directing, and advising. Diagnostic purposes concerning the final stages of a composition were identified through editing, revising, refining, and re-writing a completed draft. Self and peer evaluations were mentioned.

Composition assessment which affected teaching strategies and methods, through evaluative and pedagogical purposes, were less evident in respondents’ comments. Evaluative purposes were mentioned in seven comments, while twenty-four comments indicated the Board of Studies dictated the agenda for courses. Respondents suggested that assessment ensured compliance with mandatory regulations. A sample of responses relating to the five composition assessment purposes identified by respondents is presented in Table 2.

Table 2  Purpose of composition assessment - Representative Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summative</th>
<th>Formative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>*To ascertain the development standard</td>
<td>*To measure student progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*To make sure the student doesn’t submit something that is not original</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Composition is a process not an outcome only. The majority of pupils</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>experience considerable difficulty in working out/refining initial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ideas. Direction on techniques is essential for progress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Seen as part of the development of a composition, a point at which you</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>consider/discuss/evaluate the composition and then move on to further</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>develop/change it, as necessary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*To enable students to develop their own composition ideas from having</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gained feedback - is it if only stays you can’t compose, it has not</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been a useful learning tool.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*For my own piece of mind - so I know where they are at, and there’s no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>last minute panic (well, that’s the aim)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Providing the piece is performable and shows integrity and genuine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thought and logical progression, assessment is merely a Board of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studies tool and not an educational tool.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion
Results showed comparisons between respondents’ identified purposes for composition assessment. The most common purpose was summative and this purpose accounted for over half of all comments made. Summative purposes were to grade and rank composition products. Implicit in summative assessment is the importance of a finished product. Many responses suggested little interaction between student products and teaching practice. Some respondents concerned that assessment could authenticate a composition as a product written by a student and not generated from some other source. This suggested little observation, discussion, or interaction with students in the process of writing occurred. Many respondents took a broader approach to the question and indicated that the purpose of assessing a composition provided the opportunity for a demonstration of skills and learning.

Assessment of composition from this perspective is traditional. In traditional methods of composition assessment a teacher additionally accepts the role of a critic. Acting in a dual role, an assessor takes the critic’s view of composition as complex and multi-dimensional. The assessor equally accepts the teacher’s view of student development as a result of cumulative aspects of training and skill development (Swanwick, 1998). Judgements are
then framed against systematic instruction. Swanwick reflected that education is essentially a process of active criticism, enacted through encounter and instruction. In comparing teaching and assessing creative products, Swanwick suggested: 'to teach is to assess, to weigh up, to appraise; in order more adequately to plan for and facilitate a richer response, to accept that arts teaching is arts criticism (Swanwick, 1988, 149).

Purposes which were diagnostic or formative showed respondents approached composition from a different perspective. Assessment from a process perspective involved teachers interacting with students in all aspects of composition development, from earliest stages to completion and beyond. A varied number of activities which were identified in responses showed this interaction, such as: 'encourage', 'challenge', 'foster', 'guide', 'improve', 'assist', and 'advise'. Respondents suggested that varied types of support was offered which might be: practical, emotional, creative, musical, and ongoing through composition processes.

In comparison, composition assessment purposes which affect teaching practice were less evident than student oriented purposes. Comments identified the influence of the Board of Studies in setting guidelines for composition submissions. In conforming to parameters set down in syllabus documents (New South Wales Board of Studies, 1994), several respondents showed a reluctant compliance with mandates. A critical attitude was implied in 'to give the Board (of Studies) something to justify its position', although it was unclear if the respondent who made this comment was concerned with assessment or composition.

Conclusion
This paper was designed to explore teachers' perceptions of the purposes of composition assessment. Responses showed teachers perceived there was a range of purposes to composition assessment. The most common purpose was to make judgements about and to report on student achievement in composition. A second aim of the paper was to explore the relationship between composition and assessment. It is clear that many respondents view assessment and composition as aspects of teaching which are independent from one another. For some, however, they are irrevocably linked. Research and practice in teaching composition, particularly in secondary schools, have provided important insights into teaching and learning in composition. Assessment in composition requires further investigation to explore how integration between the two can further develop for the increased benefit of students and teachers.
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