PART 1: Playing the Changes – Chapter 4.26

Re-thinking planning for a creative music curriculum

Victoria Kinsella
Martin Fautley
Birmingham City University, UK

Abstract

In England, planning for learning can often become solely focused on prescribed products linked to outcome-focused objectives. This leaves little room for teacher or learner creativities. In order to conceptualise breaking away from the rigidity of school planning processes, this chapter sets out some recommendations that take giant steps towards a greater understanding of musical learning that gives value to creativities. It describes a four-year partnership project between schools, music organisations and young people 'at risk' of low attainment, disengagement or educational exclusion, and explores a dichotomy between viewpoints of planning for *learning* and planning for *doing*, for activity. On one hand is the schools' approach to planning, which is challenged by systems of regulation, on the other are music organisations' perspectives on creative activity, including pedagogical content knowledge and learning outcomes. This creates tensions and challenges for the development of creative learning and partnership working. The chapter discusses how the projects navigated these various competing perspectives, and through collaboration developed joint understandings of the role of planning for creativity for a creative and engaging curriculum.

Introduction – rethinking planning

The notion of planning in music education is relatively undertheorized in England. We have a number of texts from the USA which offer guidance (inter alia Shaw, 2020; Wacker, 2020, Shorner-Johnson and Moret, 2015), but in England, with the exception of material intended

for pre-service teacher training (Capel, Leask, & Turner, 2009; Fautley & Savage, 2014; Philpott, 2000, 2007 (2nd Edition); Savage, 2013), the main sources for thinking about music teacher planning often tend to be governmental documents (e.g. (DfE, 2013, 2021). These, however, tend to involve discussions of *what* to teach, sometimes *how* to teach it, but seldom do they venture to ask questions as to *why* music should be taught; neither do they normally address another *why* question, that of why certain musical things should be taught, and others should not. This accords with Mantie's observation that

> …much thinking and planning in music education tends to focus on what seems "practical" and pragmatic, eschewing deeper questions…(Mantie, 2019, p. 41)

In England at least, this seems to be a common problem. Planning is required, of course, for curriculum delivery, this includes long, medium, and short term construction of schemes of work, and for organising resources. As Ofsted, the arms-length governmental inspection organisation in England observed,

> School music curriculums set out pathways for progression that enable pupils to develop their musical knowledge. (Ofsted, 2021, p. 5)

It is right and proper that this is where school teachers place the greater amount of their curricular thinking, as the daily production of lesson materials will be what consumes their interactions with each group of children and young people. It is important to note at this juncture that there are very few method or text books for music in the lower secondary school, most teachers create their own plans and schemes themselves. What goes into these teacher plans, or why certain things are taught, is seldom investigated, as Anderson (2021, p. 722) observes,

> Music teacher rationales for the sequencing of the topics they have chosen to include in their curriculum is an under-developed area of music education research literature.

Indeed, as Anderson (2021, p. 723) goes on to say, “Music specialists receive limited opportunity to develop their thinking in curriculum design”. Planning for a creative curriculum comes under this category, and that is the locus of attention for this chapter, which sets out to lift the lid on planning, and to problematise these issues, involving the difficult ‘why’ questions, including those of how creativities in classroom music education can be conceptualised and operationalised. Whilst the thinking reported here has developed from practices, and those practices are described in some detail herein, nonetheless we hope that this chapter is also able to deconstruct planning, and discuss some of its components in order for it to be reassembled in new, novel, and creative ways. We are taken with a phrase from the title of this handbook, ‘understanding creativities’, and we wish to contribute to these understandings, and so not only do we deconstruct, but we also *re*-imagine, and *re*-construct, so that music educators, wherever in the globe they are located, can hopefully *re*-think their own curricula in the light of these discussions.

Creative curriculum – why this is an issue

Music education exists in a variety of forms in and across locations. There is no singular phenomenon which can account for all of its difference multiplicities. Writing from an American perspective, Jorgensen (1997, p. 2) observed,

> This variety of examples of music education causes us to wonder how it might be defined globally to transcend its traditional equation in the West with music in elementary and secondary schools.

The fact that there are so many types of music education means that treating them all as a singularity is concomitantly problematic. The variation in types means that there is also a variety of approaches, and, within those approaches, an equally wide variety of the musics that are deemed important or significant enough to be included. We know that there are

hegemonic issues with the contents of music curricula in many places (Fautley, 2021; Spruce, 1999, 2001; Wright, 2017; Wright & Davies, 2010), and it is fundamental here to observe that the issue of curricula inclusion of topics or musical examples is not a value-free enterprise. Whilst in some performance-based contexts of music education it may seem relatively obvious what such a curriculum should involve, nonetheless, there is far more music than it is possible to include in any time span for teaching and learning music; what this means therefore is that much more music will be *excluded* than included, so any decision to include something automatically excludes whole swathes of other things.

This include/exclude dichotomy is normally only thought about from the perspective of what is to be 'in', there are few examples of people making decisions about what should be 'out'. Whilst there can sometimes be tacit, unvoiced, or unthought views about what should be in, maybe along the lines of Young's (2016, p. 523) observation that "classical music is superior to popular music", nonetheless varieties of this notion are to be found in some curricula constructions. Conversely, there are an increasing number of music educators who are deliberately and purposefully ensuring that popular styles of music are included in their curricula. Possibly taking their cue from Green (1988, p. 119) who noted that "[e]ducators who...support pop as opposed to classical music argue that the former is valuable, accessible, understandable, and relevant to pupils", such teachers argue that using popular styles of music creates "[l]earning that is related to the context and not presented as an abstract method out of context may be more meaningful for the learner" (Jaffurs, 2004, p. 196). These are statements of justifications for teacher decisions for inclusion, but this is not just about pandering to the popular, as Davis and Blair (2011, pp. 125-126) observed, but was about depth of learning and understanding:

> [p]opular music permeates our lives and the lives of our students. Based on our teaching experiences in public and private schools in America and abroad, it seems evident that it is the music most familiar to our students. As music educators, we have both worked to bring popular music into our music classrooms and have discovered that when given the opportunity to engage with popular music in school settings, our K–12 (kindergarten to 12th grade) students have demonstrated sophisticated musical understanding that was previously unknown to us.

A battle that music educators face, at least in England, but probably elsewhere too, is that curriculum content is seen as a public affirmation of society's values in a microcosm, and making such decisions can often be about more than just what is going on in any given classroom at any given time. But curricula decisions about what styles, types, and genres to include are not the only matters that are of concern to us here. The notion of a *creative* curriculum is an important one too, and the nature and form of such a curriculum, viewed through the lens of the English school system, is the subject to which we now turn.

Re-thinking Planning for a Creative Curriculum

Music education in England has been in state of flux for a number of years. There is curriculum music in school, specialist instrumental and vocal tuition delivered by visiting teachers, music organisations providing a range of activities on a targeted basis and independent music teachers who teach various aspects of music in various domestic and independent settings. In 2011, the English government outlined a National Plan for Music Education (NPME) to join up provision across a range of music making and music learning aspects of provision. The plan stated:

> The best model for Music Education includes a combination of classroom teaching, instrumental and vocal music tuition and input from professional musicians. Partnership between organisations is the key to success. (DfE & DCMS, 2011, p. 13)

One of the stated purposes of the NPME was to address what was seen as the problem of variability of music education in England:

> Music education is patchy across the country and change is needed to ensure all pupils receive a high quality music education (DfE & DCMS, 2011, p. 7)

In response to the national plan, in 2014, Youth Music funded 'Exchanging Notes', a four-year action research programme that brought together new partnerships between schools and music education providers who normally work in out-of-school settings[1]. The main aim of the project was:

> 'To ensure that young musicians at risk of low attainment, disengagement or educational exclusion achieve the best musical, educational and wider outcomes through participation in a pioneering music education project; and to develop new models of effective partnership-working between schools and out-of-school music providers' (Kinsella et al 2019, p. 15)

Prior to Exchanging Notes, Youth Music published *Communities of Music Education* research by Saunders and Welch (2012). The aim of this research was to identify how formal

[1] Details of the exchanging notes project can be found at: https://youthmusic.org.uk/exchanging-notes, and the full project report is to be found here: https://www.bcu.ac.uk/education-and-social-work/research/birmingham-music-education-bmerg/research-projects/youth-music-exchanging-notes.

and non-formal providers work together to ensure quality of access to music education for children and young musicians. Findings suggested that there are distinct pedagogies employed in formal versus non-formal music education settings, and those children and young musicians' interpretations of the input, output and outcomes in those contexts differed. It was suggested that the translation between settings needed more in-depth exploration. How can these pedagogies join up and what is the impact of this for children and young musician's musical engagement?

The Exchanging Notes project and associated research explored this question, and throughout the four years tensions and dichotomies between various viewpoints of planning for *learning* and planning for *doing* were brought to the fore. There were significant differences between schools' approaches when compared with music organisations towards planning. In the first few years of the project, these dichotomies caused tensions and challenges for the development of creative learning processes and practices. However, partnerships managed to navigate these varying perspectives, and through collaboration developed joint understandings of the role of planning for creativity in a creative and engaging curriculum.

In-School Music Education

The main focus of the Exchanging Notes work took place with secondary school age students, which means these were young people in key stages 3 and 4 (KS3 and KS4) aged between 11 and 16. For schools in England, the principal policy driver is the National Curriculum. In the National Curriculum, music is a compulsory subject. However, over time the National Curriculum has become increasingly less specific and prescriptive. The National Curriculum at KS3 (ages 11-14) does not delineate or imply any form of pedagogy to go with the range of content that is outlined, neither does it specify how the curriculum should be

organised. As a result, a number of different ways of curriculum organisation and teaching its various aspects have emerged.

A further policy driver impacting school music is the way in which assessment backwash can influence teaching and learning. This is where teaching at KS4 (ages 14-16) has a backward-facing effect on what is taught and learned at KS3. Colwell notes the concerns with this approach stating:

> "…standards reflect value choices about what is most important for students to learn and what constitutes mastery of that knowledge. But different constituencies have different ideas..." (Colwell, 2007, p. 6).

What this can result in is "teaching to the test," which occurs where high-stakes assessment systems place considerable weight on assessment results. The consequences being a narrowing of the curriculum, and learning opportunities, as teaching becomes focused solely on final assessment; this is known as "assessment backwash." (Fautley & Colwell, 2012:488). We also know that backwash from KS4 affects curriculum construction back in KS3, which means that the requirements of aspects of western classical music required for examination purposes affects what is taught and learned lower down the school. But it is not just that western classical music exerts undue influence upon the curriculum, it is the tacit assumptions of value which go with this view. As Spruce and Matthews (2012, p. 119) argue:

> …despite the introduction into the music curriculum of music from a much broader range of musical traditions and cultures than hitherto (including musical traditions and cultures from within our own society) the musical values inherent in western art music continue to be promoted as self-evidently defining 'good' music and consequently 'high status' musical knowledge, resulting in the alienation of many pupils from the formal curriculum … despite the introduction into the curriculum of music from other traditions and cultures to try to address such alienation – the way in

> which these musics are typically presented sustains and reinforces rather than counters the western art music rooted conception of high status music knowledge.

This is one of the issues which we address throughout this chapter.

In the English context, music lessons that take place as a normal part of the school day are the places where all pupils, regardless of external musical interests or aptitude, encounter musical teaching and learning. For this reason, it is important that this curriculum construction maximises opportunities for all pupils. This takes us towards a different question, this being 'what is the purpose of compulsory music education for all?'. Whilst this form of questioning has resonances with the discussions of hegemony which we have had so far in this chapter, and to which we return again later, nonetheless this is a live and problematic area for many music educators. As Toyne (2021, p. 104) worriedly observes,

> Music is perhaps the only school subject where an understanding of its place within the current educational landscape is essential before one begins to ask what should be taught and how it should be taught. Teaching classroom music can be a lonely, bewildering and overwhelming experience, exacerbated by the conflicting opinions from government ministers, university music departments and professional musicians, let alone the music education world on social media, about the role of music in schools.

For music teachers in England, this is the daily reality of their lived experience. Thinking about these issues affects the ways that creativity, and creative curricula are conceptualised, and operationalised. Not only is the music teacher, as Toyne observes, worrying about the subject's place in the educational landscape, they are trying to construct valid and meaningful

curriculum musical experiences for all their pupils. But, as we observed earlier, it is not only in schools where music education takes place, and so it is to those aspects of this are happening away from the classroom that we now turn our attention.

Out-of-School Music Education

In addition to schools and music education hubs[2], there are a range of other organisations working with children and young people in music in England. In many instances members of these organisations visit schools and other settings regularly and provide tuition, performance, and composing opportunities in a range of musical activities. Some of these organisations would classify themselves as community musicians, however it is important to note that in the context of Exchanging Notes, the breadth, range, and scope of the research was such that we were working with more than a reductive notion of 'community music'. The organisations were musical and education providers in their own right, with different areas of foci, different pedagogic traditions and outlooks, and different philosophies and conceptions of working with schools, hubs, and, importantly, children and young people. However, whilst it is the case that not all of the organisations self-identified as community music, or as community musicians, nonetheless it is useful to briefly explore some key aspects of community music to help situate the differences in planning between schools and out of school organisations.

> Defining 'community music' is notoriously problematic, as David Price observed:
>
> …community music often defined itself in oppositional terms. We didn't quite know

[2] In England, "Music Education Hubs are groups of organisations – such as local authorities, schools, other hubs, art organisations, community or voluntary organisations – working together to create joined-up music education provision, [and] respond to local need…" (Arts council, n.d.)

> what we were, but we were sure that we were *not* formalized education, nor were we anything to do with the dominant ideology. (cited in Bartleet & Higgins, 2018, p. 330

Higgins observes that there are general characteristics which community music can be said to involve:

> …community music may be understood as an approach to active music making and musical knowing outside of formal teaching and learning situations. By formal, I mean music that is delivered by professionals in schools, colleges, and other statutory organizations through formalized curricula … community music is an intentional intervention, involving skilled music leaders, who facilitate group music-making experiences in environments that do not have set curricula. Here, there is an emphasis on people, participation, context, equality of opportunity, and diversity. Musicians who work in this way seek to create relevant and accessible music-making experiences…(Higgins, 2012, p. 4)

Measures of success for these organisations are therefore very different to those of schools. By presenting both the in-school and out of school music approach to teaching and learning we hope to exemplify the differences and the challenges that this project faced. At the heart of the issue is the development of shared planning processes, which value the formal and informal. The various individual projects which as a whole made up Exchanging Notes needed to engage in open thinking and challenge existing orthodoxies in order to take giant leaps towards a greater understanding of creativities. In order to understand the complexities of planning for a creative music curriculum we will first explore key notions of creativity in English policy and then their impact on music education in England.

Implications for Creativity in Schools

The implications of considerations concerning creativities for music education, both in and beyond the classroom, that need to be taken into account, also in some cases require a number of different factors to be reconciled. One of the things we know is that creativities encompass a range of responses. In the UK, a report by the National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education (NACCCE, 1999) was influential in framing stances on creativity in the classroom, and established into common parlance a number of the terminologies now associated with creativity. Chief amongst these were 'teaching creatively' and 'teaching for creativity'. Teaching creatively, they said:

> "… involves teachers using imaginative approaches to make learning more interesting, exciting and effective." (NACCCE, 2000, p. 6)

Whereas teaching for creativity entails:

> "…teachers developing young people's own creative thinking or behaviour, and includes teaching creatively." (NACCCE, 2000, p. 6)

Whilst music is sometimes thought of as being an inherently creative subject in its own right in the classroom, nonetheless, there are key competences which learners need to both acquire, and participate in (Sfard, 1998), in order to make progress. What this entails, in essence, are the differences between the acquisition of knowledge and skills, what might be called *convergent* thinking, and then *divergent* thinking, or what is often thought of as a creative response. For learners in music, this means that there are differences between doing something which new and creative for them, for example on playing a diatonic xylophone the learner sweeps the beaters up and down the instrument, or constructs a musical phrase built on playing alternate notes, creating a pattern built on intervals of major and minor thirds. Whilst the teacher will have heard this many, many times, this is a new *and creative* response for the individual child who is making these patterns. As Boden observed:

> If Mary Smith has an idea which she could not have had before, her idea is P-creative – no matter how many people have had the same idea already. The historical sense applies to ideas that are fundamentally novel with respect to the whole of human history. Mary Smith's surprising idea is H-creative if no one has ever had the idea before her. (Boden, 1990, p. 32)

Although the notion of an idea being original is recognised by many music teachers, it still needs pointing out that creativity comes in many forms, and is not just for exceptional pupils.

Issues related to understanding creativities and value in the classroom can create dilemmas for classroom music educator, because a further series of constructs needs to be overlaid on these matters of creativity too. These are issues of hegemony and axiology; what is valued by the society in which the musical learning is taking place, and what is privileged, overtly or tacitly, in the curriculum being delivered.

Creativity, Hegemony, and Axiology

In the UK and elsewhere there is a long-standing issue as to what should be taught and learned in classroom music lessons (*inter alia* Benedict & Schmidt, 2012; Spruce & Matthews, 2012; Toyne, 2021). The place of what can be termed 'classical music' as a shorthand has been central to these discussions for many years. As German music education researcher Kertz-Welzel observes:

> There have been various music education approaches promoting classical music as the core content of music education, describing its value and meaning for students. Some powerful attempts at securing the place of classical music in schools happened at a time when popular music became more important for young people, particularly in the 1960s and 1970s. Music teachers needed a rationale for 'saving' their students from

> the immorality that was supposedly promoted in popular music and from manipulations of the music industry. (Kertz-Welzel, 2020, p. 81)

Back in the 1970s British musicologists Shepherd et al (1977) were writing about similar issues when they entitled their book "Whose music". For children and young people in schools today these issues continue. Indeed, a common problem for classroom music is squaring the axiological requirements of that which they are *required* to teach, with what they feel would be appropriate for their pupils to *learn*. What this means is that the school music classroom becomes a place where these contestations are played out on a daily basis.

What is true in the school music classroom, however, can be less so in out-of-school settings. Freed from curricular restraints, whether these are real, perceived, or involve taken-for-granted assumptions, music organisations working with the at-risk youngsters described herein were at liberty to devise programmes which could *begin* with the interests of the participants concerned, and then take the young people on to progress in directions of their own choosing. Creativity for the individual young people involved in Exchanging Notes here arose from their musical journeys, this means that where the young people needed to know or be able to do things, this was addressed as and when appropriate. There was no set curriculum and no formal assessments. This is a very different way of working from the classroom. But does it need to be? This is now explored in this chapter in terms of partnership working.

So, what does this mean for partnership work?

One of the key aspects of Exchanging Notes was to explore the interrelationships in and between various typologies of music education as it happens in schools, and those used by non-school based music education providers. As has been noted in previous sections, one of the issues with regards to music in English schools and the National Curriculum that is in operation in them, is the apparent curricular emphasis on the 'canon' of western classical

music. This can mean that despite attempts of the education establishment to devise a syllabus which presents music as a subject for all, it can end up serving only a few, and can be perceived by some pupils as being elitist, and by others as being insufficiently challenging (Wright, 2002, p. 240). However, in contrast, the movement in music education towards informal and non-formal styles of music teaching and learning has been expanding through such work as that of community music, and championed by Lucy Green (2002; 2008) who emphasises the importance of student-centred pedagogy. Unlike school-based music education that chooses the material to be studied, breaks it down, then deliver the skills needed to achieve set attainment outcomes, informal learning practitioners support personalised learning objectives set by each individual learner themselves.

This presents an important distinction, that of planning for learning, which of necessity takes place in advance of lessons and learning encounters, and planning by knowing that the teacher or session leader will need to react as learning unfolds. This is explored in greater detail by Folkestad:

> …the basic criteria of formal and informal learning situations found in the literature might be briefly described as follows. In the formal learning situation, the activity is sequenced beforehand. That is, it is arranged and put into order by a 'teacher', who also leads and carries out the activity. However, that person does not necessarily have to be a teacher in the formal sense, but a person who takes on the task of organising and leading the learning activity, as, for example, one of the musicians in a musical ensemble. Moreover, this position does not have to be static, although this is commonly the case. The informal learning situation is not sequenced beforehand; the activity steers the way of working/playing/composing, and the process proceeds by the interaction of the participants in the activity. It is also described as 'self-chosen

> and voluntary learning'. However, as learning can never be 'voluntary' in its true sense – it takes place whether or not it is intended or wanted…what is in view may rather be described as self-chosen and voluntary activity. (Folkestad, 2006, p. 141)

We want to emphasise here is that there is not a simplistic division of pedagogies with classical equalling formal and pop being informal. Instead, as Saunders and Welch (2012) noted, what has occurred in schools can be characterised in two main ways, firstly the performativity agenda has tightened its grip, and, secondly, Music Education's position in schools has become increasingly endangered. These two issues have had and are continuing to affect the ways in which classroom music teachers in secondary schools both conceptualise and operationalise their day-to-day practices, with creativity and creative process often being put aside.

So far in this chapter we have considered a range of the issues that are affecting the construction of curricula in England, along with the ways in which working with young people using non-formal modalities can have beneficial effects. We now move to a more detailed disentangling of these various strands with respect to the ways in which rethinking planning for a creative curriculum can be effected, and what this entails.

Research Methodology

The study reported on here used a mixed-methodology approach, including lesson observations, interviews and perception surveys with teachers, music leaders and young people, as well as statistical analysis of young people's attainment and attendance. These methods offered insight into educational development, practice and pedagogy through gathering multiple perspectives to understand the backdrop of the wider socio, economic, political and historical nature of learning contexts (Engeström 1999). For this chapter, we

have chosen to focus on the interview data with the in-school teachers and the outside of school music organisation music leaders, as they provided rich narratives of experience. This is important for this book *Giant Steps: Understanding Creativities in Music Education*, as it is through examining these voices that we gain insight into the giant steps they had to take to develop new creative planning processes. Interviews were conducted three times per year, over four years, with 61 music leaders and teachers, 45 young people and 8 headteachers and music hub leads. In a study that explored partnership, it was important to understand factors that contributed to thought, action and the construction of meaning. Therefore, a modified action research cycle (Carr & Kemmis 1986) was chosen. This posed an interesting methodological variant, in that the results of the research fed back directly into project practices. The data were also debated and critiqued at two annual research meetings, which all projects and funders attended. The project was approved by Birmingham City University ethical board.

Findings

The success criteria which the various stakeholders in music education hold are very different, and this had the potential for creating tensions. In schools, it is attainment and progress that are key indicators of successful outcomes. For music organisations, however, there was a very different imperative, what mattered was engagement. Achieving engagement was something that needed to be worked at, and so music organisations were less concerned with delivery, assessment, and progress, and more with individual children and young people being involved in what was going on. What this meant for Exchanging Notes participants is that they were all coming to the various projects with different 'baggage', different thoughts about what constituted success, and different views as to the primacy of attention for creativities. These underlying paradigms were frequently implicit in both the teachers' and music leaders' practices, and this tacit implicitness sometimes caused friction. Some teachers

were unable to understand why music organisations did not seem overly concerned with learning and progression, and some music organisations could not see why schools were so bothered about planning and attainment, when what mattered for them was getting children and young people involved in engagement. It was the reconciling of these views that became one of the powerful factors of Exchanging Notes, when the teachers and music leaders took on board characteristics from the other. Indeed, this led to more creative pedagogical processes within the classroom.

Rethinking Planning Mechanisms

The first step in this process involved reconsidering planning. Medium and long-term planning was not something that the majority of music organisations had considered, or needed to do previously, compared with teachers, who are monitored by schools on their planning and classroom objectives. However, through collaboration new planning processes emerged. School planning process were often highly controlled, this reduced spaces for creativities due to imposed intentionality outlined by school measurements. Often school and classroom planning would be content-oriented, producing curriculum documents that prescribed in detail what educational content teachers could address during educational work, how much time they could spend on each item, and what activities they could perform. However, in this quote we can see how, over time these processes changed:

> The work put in to creating equity, a sense of equity between leaders and kids cannot be underestimated. It has taken us, I would say, near the whole time of the project, four years, to reach a point where I think we listen to the kids, take account of the demands of the curriculum but also are informed and led by the non-formal approach of the music leader. (Music Teacher)

The conditions for a successful new methodology for curriculum planning needed to be carefully considered. Part of the new planning process was the inclusion and involvement of young musicians to ensure that curriculum accounted for their needs, interests, and development. This provided a safeguard against exclusion of both musical genres and ways of being. Importantly, it was not a matter of the dichotomies between formal, non-formal, informal and pedagogy, but creative knowledge building:

> …because we were talking about their music and music they want to do and the music we're bringing to them. They were like 'Yeah, the music is OK but we want to do our own'. They're included in the decision making for what happens in the sessions. They have to have a voice in it and they have to have some say in what is going on. Without that, it's a bit empty. You can make it prescriptive if you feel like it, but it's not necessarily going to suit. (Music leader)

Although school planning and curriculum can often appear to reduce time for creativities in the classroom, it is also the case that music organisations can sometimes be overly concerned with a final performance outcome, and task engagement, and not consider the long, mid and short term outcomes for learning, including the development of creativities over time. With this in mind, the various projects had to consider what they perceived as the framework for creative development. This often started with teacher and music leader identifying their creative processes in collaboration with one another and then negotiating a way forward:

> …the creative process is, seems to be being negated in favour of a very top down educational process. I think creativity for us is about access and I think its access to

> the tactile feeling of something, the tactile experiential kind of process of absorbing information that happens through a creative action. (Music leader)

> I think throughout the project we have both observed creative approaches from each other and also talked about it in reflections. I think for me it has enabled me to take more risks, to try things out and not worry as much if it doesn't go to plan. But I think you also have to bring the kids on that journey otherwise they might feel that they have failed. But that's also part of the process, knowing that failing is not necessarily a bad thing but how you move on from that. (Music Teacher)

In light of these discussions the projects began to rethink the possibilities and spaces within curriculum and planning for creative processes:

> With Key Stage 3, there's no reason why it should be so rigid. That's the choice of that school. You need to give them the core skills to be able to do GCSE if they want to do it, but actually it doesn't need to be that rigid. I think what we have done is more creative and we have really thought about the best way of getting them (the learners) to understand that music is a creative process. (Music leader)

Burnard (2012) suggests that teachers are 'creativity generators', and this was evident in Exchanging Notes. The notion of 'generator' is important here as it does not mean that teachers or music leaders defined outcomes, or even creative processes, but instead helped to generate creative possibility for the pupils. Woods (1995) has previously stated that during creative learning pupils have control over their learning processes, and ownership of the knowledge produced, which is relevant to their concerns. This highlights the centrality of the

pupil in the development of creativity, where emphasis is on the process of learning rather than the creative output. This is a process of creative negotiation which became evident in the practices of the projects:

> In the creative process you're not only responding to your own instincts but you're also having to then negotiate the pupils' instincts. (Music leader)

And this is noted by the young musicians, as expressed here:

> …so (music leader) would like never like take control of it, they would like give us like tips and advice on how to like write about it and like tell us to think back on what it's about and then if we got stuck they would help us, like it'd all flow again and then if we were ever struggling we could just ask them what could do with it so we could put it in and then we'd make up the rest of it. (Young Musician)

Within Exchanging Notes the significance of creative and responsive relationships between teacher, music leader, and pupil was integral. The teachers and music leaders began to change their perception of their responsibility from defined outputs, either assessment or engagement led, towards one of encouraging pupils to become more creative individuals. This was further discussed in a conversation between the researcher and a young musician:

> *Researcher:* What does being creative mean to you?
> *Young Musician:* I think it's like creating stuff from scratch and building up the process and trying to make it better. Not always getting it right but just trying something out and seeing.

Researcher: Do you think you're doing that with the music you're creating?

Young Musician: Yeah. We're progressing every time we're going along. You just get to try things out and see, and then either go with that or not. It's fun and sometimes not so serious too, like, you get time to just play.

When a relationship of reciprocal acceptance and respect was developed, an affective and pedagogical bond was established. This created a creative atmosphere for teaching and learning:

I think it's about that fluidity between doing and learning, through making, learning through thinking and thinking through learning. It's that kind of fluidity that's maybe a little lacking in school. (Music leader)

These new planning and development processes also meant that assessment became more than a simple input-output modality; as Finney (2006, p. 2) notes it is 'far beyond the attainment of task criteria, for completing a task in itself irrelevant to what I am thinking of as a richer learning'. It included the creative impact of music making, alongside the social and cultural:

I guess, because of the rigidity of a system which is so based around structure and evaluation and valuing through a marker system, there actually is a freedom that comes with young musicians with being part of something which is not based around that kind of system. Oh, you got a C, you got an A, you got a merit, and you got a

distinction. You know, it becomes much more about a personalised journey and the value that comes from the self and, therefore, it becomes about you. (Music Teacher)

Discussion - Hegemonically Valorised Creativity

What we see is that in the different types of music education described is that multiple simultaneous creativities are in operation here. The creativity of the young person, the creativity of the approach, the creativity of planning in a novel way, and the creativity of interpersonal music making. All of these creativities are, however, in the instances we are describing, subsumed within a reified notion which treats these variegated creativities as a sort of gestalt. Indeed, what could be said is that it is as though there is a thing-in-itself, Kant's *ding an sich*, which might be labelled as *hegemonically valorised creativity*. What this means is that in some instances – classroom music education being a case in point here – the hegemonic valorisation of the school music education approach is conferred by induction into understandings of western art music and its canon. For those involved in what might loosely be termed more community music focussed projects, no such hegemonic valorisation took place. Instead the music leaders were more concerned with developing with the children and young people a capacity for making the sorts of music that would potentially engage at their own level, and utilise this as a way of working. A potentially oversimplistic but nonetheless valid way of looking at these issues would be to say that a hegemonically valorised creativity based on canonic induction works *on* participants, whereas a hegemonically valorised creativity based on more community music principles works *with* the young people. Of course, this oversimplistic and reductive perspective will cause concerns in some quarters, but even so it is worth considering what the purposes of any music education system are, and this will be but one of the items to think about in that regard, a point which we amplify later in this chapter.

It is important to note that this distinguishing of creativities is not intended to create a hierarchy of valorisation, both are equally valid; as one of the definitions of creativity states, creativity can be thought of as being: "[i]maginative activity fashioned so as to produce outcomes that are both original and of value" (NACCCE, 1999 p.30). What this means is that the *value* of a creative activity leading to a creative product is situated in what might be termed the 'rules' of the community of practice concerned. Clearly a creative output for a string quartet is going to involve different parameters from a creative output for a dubstep track. Indeed, the purposes of the music education to arrive at each of these may not be isomorphic, and in the examples discussed in this chapter it was also the purposes of the intervention that were different as well.

What this means for the notion of a hegemonically valorised creativity is that there are actually different valorisations placed on creativities depending upon the context. Indeed, as we have just observed, axiology of these various creativities is very much dependent upon what the purposes of the creative act are understood to be. Thus a creative response to a composer being commissioned to write a string quartet, for example, are unlikely to be satisfied by that composer baking a cake. This seems so obviously silly an example that some may consider it ludicrous, but 'ludicrous' has *ludic* as its root, and ludic is concerned with playfulness. But, and this is an important point, this playfulness has to be of the correct situationally-dependent sort. The originators of the art movement of Dada saw this, similarly aleatoric music, dependent on the throw of a dice is ludic, but an audience expecting to hear a performance of Beethoven's Appassionata piano sonata do not expect the pianist to arrive with a cut-up set of musical notes that they play in any order that they feel like on the night; or, as the great English comedian Eric Morecambe observed of his own performance of the Grieg Piano Concerto in a 1971 humorous television sketch, "I'm playing all the right notes – but not necessarily in the right order"! The hegemonic axiology therefore is situation and

context dependant, and so curriculum construction needs to bear this in mind. Creativities need to be thought of with relation to this notion.

Discussion

Given what we have just said, it may seem like an oxymoron to discuss planning for a creative curriculum, as pre-legislation of creative activity solely as divergent is unlikely to yield useful or beneficial outcomes. What we are saying instead is that rethinking what school and extra-school curricula involve means taking a fresh stance on what has gone before, and then thinking about re-positionings, re-purposings, and re-planning in the light of these. For classroom music education in schooling, as is the case in England, the National Curriculum is very careful to avoid repertoire, it is about *musicality*, taking this as a starting point, rather induction into a canon, whether that is the canon of western art music, or the canon of pop music, of contemporary rock, or jazz, or whatever. This also speaks to Wallin's observation that

> ...the task of contemporary curriculum theorizing has only begun to imagine a style of thought capable of encountering the curriculum in terms of its unthought, non-identitarian potentials… (Wallin, 2011, p. 286)

What we are suggesting in the notion of rethinking is that it is these as yet unthought potentials that would be beneficial for music educators. Thinking the unthought may seem to be another oxymoron, is fraught with problems, and is no easy task for the often solitary classroom music teacher; yet music moves on, performance practices change and progress, and new compositions and new ways of thinking about composing are to be found. It is

against this backdrop that rethinking planning for a creative curriculum seems to be the first step in creating a music education for the present and the future, not just recreating the past.

Conclusion

This chapter has discussed an intervention programme in England which was designed for young people 'at risk' of low attainment, disengagement or educational exclusion. What transpired, and has been discussed, are ways in which this raised a number of questions concerning music education, its uses and purposes, and the values held systemically and by music education professionals working within a variety of contexts within that system. It has proposed that it is essential to develop shared planning processes that work for the agendas of both in-school and out-of-school providers. By opening up dialogue and constructive critique between providers, new creative planning processes were developed that allowed young people, teachers and music leaders to flourish creatively. Key to this is offering teachers, music leaders, and young people a high degree of agency and autonomy, making less use of prescriptive external mechanisms; relying instead on teachers' and music leaders' professional expertise and abilities.

Hopefully it will be of interest to an international readership as it asks fundamental questions of what music education is for, and who benefits from it.

5 Questions to Consider

1. In your context, are you able to say what the purposes of classroom music education are? Are there, as described in this chapter, competing issues at stake which may need reconciling at the various points of delivery?
2. What creativities are we educating for in classroom music education? Definition?

3. One of the teachers in this study, cited in the text above, said: “the work put in to creating equity, a sense of equity between leaders and kids cannot be underestimated.” Does this have resonances in the ecology of the school system in your country? music education system in which you work? Is there equity, or is there a power imbalance? Why is this? Should there be? Does it matter?
4. What hegemonic assumptions impact music in your context? For example, in this chapter western classical music held great value in music education classroom and the curriculum. What ways could you begin to challenge these assumptions and create opportunities for young people’s voice? How would this affect potential rethinking the curriculum in your context?
5. In what ways do you plan for creativity? Do you offer learners the opportunity to engage in the planning process? Do you offer space and time for creativities?

References

Anderson, A. (2021). Topic choices: Revealing concealed processes of curriculum sequencing in English secondary school Music classrooms. *The Curriculum Journal, 32*(4), 722-740.

Arts Council (n.d.) www.artscouncil.org.uk/music-education/music-education-hubs#section-10

Bartleet, B.-L. & Higgins, L. (Eds) (2018) *The Oxford handbook of community music*, New York, Oxford University Press

Benedict, C. & Schmidt, P. (2012) 'The National Curriculum as manifest destiny'. In Philpott, C. & Spruce, G. (Eds), *Debates in music teaching*, pp. 118-133. Abingdon, Routledge.

Boden, M. A. (1990) *The Creative Mind: Myths and Mechanisms*, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson.

Burnard, P. (2012) Musical Creativities in Practice. Oxford: OUP.

Capel, S. A., Leask, M., & Turner, T. (2009). *Learning to teach in the secondary school : a companion to school experience* (5th ed.). London: Routledge.

Carr, W. & Kemmis, S. (1986) Becoming Critical, Lewes: Falmer Press

Colwell, R. (2007) 'Music Assessment in an Increasingly Politicized, Accountability Educational Environment'. In Brophy, T. S. (Ed), Assessment in Music Education. Integrating Theory and Practice. Proceedings of the 2007 symposium on Assessment in Music Education. University of Florida., Chicago, GIA Publications.

Davis, S. G., & Blair, D. V. (2011). Popular music in American teacher education: A glimpse into a secondary methods course. *International Journal of Music Education, 29*(2), 124-140.

DfE (2011) (Department for Education) ‘The Importance of Music: A National Plan for Music Education’. London, DfE - Department for Education

DfE. (2013). *The National curriculum in England - Framework Document*. Retrieved from London: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-music-programmes-of-study

DfE. (2021). *Model Music Curriculum: Key Stages 1 to 3. Non-statutory guidance for the national curriculum in England*. London: Department for Education.

Engeström, Y. (1999) Activity theory and individual and social transformation. In Engeström, Y. Miettinen, R. & Punamäki R. L. (Eds) Perspectives on activity theory. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 19-38.

Fautley, M. (2021). Curriculum and Assessment in the Secondary School in England–the Sociology of Musical Status. In R. Wright, G. Johansen, P. A. Kanellopoulos, & P. Schmidt (Eds.), *The Routledge Handbook to Sociology of Music Education*. Abingdon: Routledge.

Fautley, M. & Colwell, R. (2012) 'Assessment in the secondary school classroom'. In Welch, G. & McPherson, G. (Eds), Oxford Handbook of Music Education, Vol. 1, pp. 478-94. New York, Oxford University Press.

Fautley, M., & Savage, J. (2014). *Lesson Planning for Effective Learning*. Abingdon: Open University Press.

Finney, J. (2006) ‘The possibility of richer learning, poetic thinking and musical understanding’, National Association of Music Educators Magazine , 18, pp. 2–4

Folkestad, G. (2006) Formal and informal learning situations or practices vs formal and informal ways of learning. British Journal of Music Education, 23 (2), pp.135-145.

Green, L. (1988). *Music on deaf ears*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Green, L. (2002) How Popular Musicians Learn: A Way Ahead for Music Education, London and New York, Ashgate.

Green, L. (2008) Music, Informal Learning and the School: A New Classroom Pedagogy, Aldershot, Ashgate.

Higgins, L. (2012) *Community music: In theory and in practice*, New York, Oxford University Press.

Jaffurs, S. E. (2004). The impact of informal music learning practices in the classroom, or how I learned how to teach from a garage band. *International Journal of Music Education*. Retrieved from http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?db=pubmed&cmd=Retrieve&dopt=AbstractPlus&list_uids=16985240476354509576

Jorgensen, E. R. (1997). *In search of music education*. Champaign, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Kertz-Welzel, A. (2020) 'On Hating Classical Music in Music Education'. In Kallio, A. A. (Ed), *Difference and Division in Music Education,* pp. 79-92. Abingdon, Routledge.

Kinsella, V., Fautley, M. and Whittaker, A. (2019) Exchanging Notes Research Report. Birmingham,Youth Music.

Mantie, R. (2019). The Philosophy of Assessment in Music Education. In *The Oxford Handbook of Assessment Policy and Practice in Music Education, Volume 1* (pp. 33): Oxford University Press.

NACCCE (1999) National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education *All Our Futures: Creativity, Culture & Education*'. Sudbury, Suffolk, DfEE.

NACCCE (2000) *All our futures: Creativity, Culture and Education - A summary*, London, National Campaign for the Arts.

Ofsted. (2021). *Research review series: music*. Retrieved from London: https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/research-review-series-music

Philpott, C. (2000). Musical Learning. In C. Philpott (Ed.), *Learning to teach music in the Secondary School (1st Edition)*. London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Philpott, C. (2007 (2nd Edition)). The Management and Organisation of Learning in the Classroom. In C. Philpott & G. Spruce (Eds.), *Learning to Teach Music in the Secondary School*. London: Routledge.

Saunders, J. & Welch, G. (2012) Communities of Music Education, London, Institute of Education.

Savage, J. (2013). *The guided reader to teaching and learning music*. London: Routledge.

Sfard, A. (1998) On Two Metaphors for Learning and the Dangers of Choosing Just One. *Educational Researcher,* 27(2), pp. 4-13.

Shaw, R. D. (2020). Planning and preparation for instruction. In C. M. Conway, K. Pellegrino, A. M. Stanley, & C. West (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of preservice music teacher education in the United States*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Shepherd, J., Virden, P., Vulliamy, G. & Wishart, T. (1977) *Whose Music? A Sociology of Musical Languages*, London, Transaction Books.

Shorner-Johnson, K., & Moret, L. (2015). Curricular planning in music education. In M. R. Campbell and L. K. Thompson (Eds.), Analyzing influences: Research on decision making and the music education curriculum (pp. 21–44). Charlotte, North Carolina: Information Age.

Spruce, G. (1999). Music, Music Education and the Bourgeois Aesthetic: Developing a Music. In J. McCormick & C. Paechter (Eds.), *Learning & Knowledge* (pp. 71). London: Sage Publications.

Spruce, G. (2001). Music assessment and the hegemony of musical heritage. In C. Philpott & C. Plummeridge (Eds.), *Issues in music teaching* (pp. 118). London: RoutledgeFalmer.

Spruce, G. & Matthews, F. (2012) 'Musical ideologies, practices and pedagogies'. In Philpott, C. & Spruce, G. (Eds), *Debates in music teaching,* pp. 118-134. Abingdon, Routledge.

Toyne, S. (2021). Music. In A. S. Cuthbert & A. Standish (Eds.), *What should schools teach? Disciplines, subjects and the pursuit of truth (2nd edition)* (2nd ed.). London: UCL Press.

Wacker, A. T. (2020). Teacher knowledge and lesson preparation in music education: A Review of the Literature. *Visions of Research in Music Education*, 35. Retrieved from http://www.rider.edu/~vrme.

Wallin, J. J. (2011). What is ?Curriculum theorizing: For a people yet to come. *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, *30*(3), 285-301.

Woods, P. (1995) Creative teachers in primary schools. Buckingham: Open University Press.

Wright, R. (2002) Music for all? Pupils' perceptions of the GCSE Music examination in one South Wales secondary school. *British Journal of Music Education,* 19(3), pp. 227-241.

Wright, R. (2017). Sociology and music education. In *Sociology and music education* (pp. 23-42): Routledge.

Wright, R., & Davies, B. (2010). Class, Power, Culture and the Music Curriculum. In R. Wright (Ed.), *Sociology and music education* (pp. 35-50). Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate.

Young, J. O. (2016). How classical music is better than popular music. *Philosophy, 91*(4), 523-540.