

**Exploring the Use of Music to Support Children with Special
Educational Needs and Disability in Mainstream Primary Schools**

Practice, Attitudes and Experience

Mary Christina Mather

Submitted in accordance with the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

The University of Leeds

School of Music

September, 2013

The candidate confirms that the work submitted is her own and that appropriate credit has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

This copy has been supplied on the understanding that it is copyright material and that no quotation from the thesis may be published without proper acknowledgement.

Assertion of moral right:

The right of Mary Christina Mather to be identified as Author of this work has been asserted by her in accordance with the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988.

Acknowledgements

I am very grateful to my supervisors, Dr Karen Burland and Dr Luke Windsor, for their practical support, insight, guidance and encouragement throughout this learning process. I was privileged to receive financial support from the Arts and Humanities Research Council, without which I would not have been able to conduct this research.

My considerable thanks go to all participants for their interest in this research and who gave their time to complete the survey and participate in interviews. I am also grateful to the schools who piloted the survey and those who helped to publicise the survey, particularly Diane Paterson, who opened many doors for me. Finally, my deepest thanks go to my family, to my husband Steve, and my four sons, Jonathan, Luke, Finn and Alex, my parents, Robin and Brian, my sister Carol, Jenny and Roger, and my friends, especially Ann, for their love, patience, support and constant encouragement.

Abstract

This thesis explores the use of music to support children with special educational needs and disability in mainstream primary schools in England. Multi-disciplinary research generally identifies the potential of music to support wider learning through the implicit cognitive, sensory and social processes involved in musical learning. Although debate continues about causality, increasing reference is being made to the potential use of music as an intervention in learning support programmes. However, little is known about its use in practice in mainstream primary education. Moreover, few studies have explored educators' experience of using music in this context, nor the factors which may affect its use in this real world setting. Instead, research effort has focussed on intervention outcomes or the identification of a causal relationship.

An exploratory, mixed method study was conducted consisting of a pilot survey of 47 respondents, to provide an overview of existing practice; and 18 semi-structured interviews with educators across a variety of educational, learning support and musical roles in mainstream primary schools. Interviews were analysed using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis. A fluid definition of practice emerged, where music was used explicitly, as an intervention, and implicitly, as a resource; to target and support a wide variety of individual learning needs through a multi-sensory, informal and creative musical approach in learning support settings, classrooms and music lessons. Practice was led by music and learning support specialists, classroom educators and support staff who appeared united by a passion for music, equal access, opportunity, and/or children's needs. Practice was supported by professional knowledge, creative working styles, time and funding that reflected employers' and schools' shared vision, strategic goals and/or ways of working. However, the notion of music as an intervention or resource was not well understood due to the hidden nature of existing practice, a reliance on non-musical interventions and a lack of individual knowledge and institutional endorsement. More broadly, the use of music appeared affected by individual musical confidence, knowledge, external pressures on schools and institutional attitudes towards music. Nevertheless, participants were willing to use music as an intervention and resource but this required evidence of efficacy, time, training, resources, funding and endorsement.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	iv
Table of Contents	v
Preface	xii
Chapter One Learning Support Provision in England	1
1.0 Introduction	1
1.1 Developing Inclusive Mainstream Education in England	1
1.2 The Nature of Individual Needs in the Mainstream Primary Setting	4
1.3 The Challenge of Identifying Individual Needs	4
1.4 Mainstream Learning Support Provision	5
1.4.1 Best Practice Starts in the Classroom.....	5
1.4.2 A Graduated Approach.....	6
1.4.2.1 TA-Led Support.....	7
1.4.2.2 Early Intervention Programmes.....	7
1.4.2.3 A Creative Approach to Supporting Individual Needs.....	8
1.5 Meeting Individual Needs at a Time of Change	10
1.6 Summary	11
Chapter Two Music as a Resource for Learning	12
2.0 Introduction	12
2.1 A Multi-dimensional Experience	15
2.1.1 Musical Interest as a Starting Point for Learning.....	16
2.2 Identifying and Isolating the Wider Potential of Music	17
2.2.1 Music and the Brain	17
2.2.2 Music and Auditory Function	18
2.3 The Impact of Auditory Function on Other Learning	20
2.3.1 The Importance of Early Auditory Learning.....	21
2.3.2 The Impact of Disrupted Auditory Function.....	22
2.4 Musical Learning and Cognitive Function	23
2.4.1 Developing Speech, Language and Literacy through Song, Rhythm and Movement	24
2.4.1.1 Speech and Language	24
2.4.1.2 Speech Perception and Phonological Awareness	24
2.4.1.3 Reading Comprehension.....	26
2.4.2 Emotional Comprehension and Emotional Intelligence.....	26
2.5 Physical Development	28
2.6 The Biographical Nature of Auditory Function	29

2.7 Nature Versus Nurture	30
2.7.1 Underlying Cognitive Abilities.....	30
2.7.1.1 Music and Intelligence	31
2.7.1.2 A Durational Effect of Music Training	32
2.7.2 Mediating Factors	33
2.7.2.1 General Intelligence and Executive Function.....	33
2.7.2.2 A Schooling Effect	35
2.7.2.3 Personality Traits.....	35
2.8 Identifying a Causal Relationship.....	36
2.8.1 Methodological Issues	36
2.8.1.1 The Challenge of Identifying a Causal Relationship.....	37
2.8.2 Evidence of a Causal Relationship	38
2.9 A Holistic View	39
2.9.1 Environmental Influences	40
2.9.2 Pedagogical Factors	41
2.10 The Social Context of Musical Learning.....	42
2.10.1 Emotional, Social and Personal Development and Group Music-Making	42
2.10.1.1 The Shared Affective Motion Experience Model	43
2.10.1.2 Developing Empathy through Rhythmic Group Music-Making.....	44
2.10.1.3 Exploring Mood and Emotion through Rhythmic Group Music-Making.....	44
2.10.1.4 Communication, Joint Attention, Cooperation and Interpersonal Skills.....	45
2.10.1.5 Self-Regulation.....	46
2.10.1.6 Self-Esteem and Confidence	46
2.11 School Music Education Programmes.....	48
2.11.1 Music is an Existing Resource in Schools	49
2.11.2 The Challenge of Equal Access to High Quality Music Provision.....	49
2.11.3 Addressing the Challenge of Equal Access to Music	50
2.12 Music as a Learning Support Resource or Intervention	52
2.12.1 Musical Education, Training, Learning, Therapy or Intervention?	52
2.13 Summary	54
Chapter Three Research Aims, Approach and Method.....	56
3.0 Introduction	56
3.1 Research Rationale, Aims and Research Questions.....	57
3.1.1 Research Rationale.....	57
3.1.1.1 Calls for Equal Access and Early Intervention.....	57
3.1.1.2 Music as a Learning Support Intervention - A Lack of Research	58
3.1.1.3 A Personal Curiosity.....	59
3.1.2 Research Aims and Questions	59
3.2 Research Scope and Focus.....	60

3.2.1 Mainstream Primary Education.....	60
3.2.2 A Specific Learning Support Intervention and Resource.....	61
3.2.3 Fieldwork Boundaries	61
3.3 Research Approach	62
3.3.1 An Exploratory Approach	62
3.3.2 A Mixed methods Approach	62
3.3.3 Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis.....	64
3.3.3.1 A Phenomenological Approach.....	65
3.3.3.2 A Hermeneutic Approach	65
3.3.4 Reflexivity.....	67
3.4 Method.....	68
3.4.1 Ethical Approval	68
3.4.2 Online Survey.....	68
3.4.2.1 Survey Aims	68
3.4.2.2 Survey Set-Up and Pilot	68
3.4.2.3 Recruitment of Survey Respondents.....	69
3.4.2.4 Population Sample and Exclusions.....	70
3.4.2.5 Questionnaire Design and Areas of Enquiry	70
3.4.2.6 Survey Data Analysis.....	71
3.4.2.7 Survey Findings	71
3.5 Interviews	72
3.5.1 Interview schedule.....	72
3.5.2 Semi-Structured Interviews.....	73
3.5.3 Interview Protocol.....	74
3.5.4 Recruitment of Interview Participants.....	74
3.5.4.1 Recruitment of Interview Participants from the Survey	75
3.5.4.2 Recruitment of Additional Interview Participants.....	76
3.5.4.3 Contextual Interviews.....	77
3.6 Classroom Observations	77
3.7 Data Analysis.....	79
3.7.1 Applying Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA)	79
3.7.1.1 Reading	79
3.7.1.2 Noting	79
3.7.1.3 Coding of Emergent Themes	80
3.7.1.4 Clustering.....	81
3.8 Summary	82
Chapter Four The Use of Music to Support Children with SEND in Mainstream Primary Education.....	84
4.0 Introduction	84

4.1 A Question of Terminology	85
4.2 An Overview of Practice	87
4.2.1 Purpose.....	87
4.2.2 Resources.....	89
4.2.3 Delivery	91
4.3 Tailored to the Needs and Interests of the Child.....	93
4.3.1 Music as a Bespoke Learning Support Intervention.....	93
4.3.1.1 Using Rhythm and Song to Develop Language Skills.....	94
4.3.1.2 Developing Cognitive and Social Skills through Singing.....	99
4.3.2 Resource-Led Interventions.....	106
4.3.3 Commercial Packaged Musical Interventions	108
4.3.4 The Role of the TA (Including HLTA and LSA)	111
4.3.5 In the General Classroom or Mainstream Specialist Unit	112
4.3.5.1 To Develop Emotional Literacy	112
4.3.5.2 To Stimulate the Auditory Nerve	113
4.3.6 Summary of Explicit Practice	114
4.4 Tailoring Music to School or Teacher Needs.....	114
4.4.1 Music as a Curriculum Resource	115
4.4.2 Using Music to Contextualise Learning	119
4.4.3 Using Music as a Classroom Tool	120
4.4.4 Using Music to Provide a Positive Learning Environment	122
4.4.5 School Music Education: An Inclusive School Resource.....	124
4.5 In the Class Music Lesson	126
4.6 Outcomes.....	130
4.6.1 Explicit Versus Implicit Outcomes.....	130
4.6.2 Unexpected Outcomes	130
4.7 Opportunities and Challenges.....	131
4.7.1 Opportunities for the Child	131
4.7.2 Challenges for the Child	132
4.7.3 Opportunities for the Educator.....	134
4.7.4 Benefits of Collaborative Working.....	134
4.7.5 Challenges for the Educator.....	136
4.7.5.1 The TA.....	136
4.7.5.2 A Lack of Teacher Participation.....	137
4.7.5.3 A Lack of Time	137
4.7.5.4 A Lack of Specialist SEND Music Training	138
4.8 Summary	138
Chapter Five Individual Differences	141
5.0 Introduction	141

5.1 Overview	141
5.2 Common Characteristics	143
5.2.1 Passion.....	144
5.2.2 Research, Knowledge and Child-Led Practice.....	145
5.2.3 A Pioneering and Creative Working Style	147
5.2.4 Ownership	148
5.2.5 A Question of Motivation	149
5.3 The Impact of Professional and Musical Identities, Training, Knowledge and Confidence	152
5.3.1 Differences in Musical Identity, Training, Knowledge and Confidence	154
5.3.1.1 Differences in Musical Identity	155
5.3.1.1.1 Negative Musical Identities	156
5.3.1.1.2 Positive Musical Identities	159
5.3.1.2 Different Professional Transitions.....	164
5.3.2 Continuing Professional Musical Development for Non-Specialists.....	169
5.3.2.1 The Music Specialist as a Musical Trainer.....	170
5.3.3 Continuing Professional Development for Music Specialists.....	173
5.3.4 Summary	173
5.4 Educators' Musical Confidence and Practical Skills	174
5.4.1 Planning Musical Learning	174
5.4.2 Finding Suitable Resources.....	176
5.4.3 Managing Musical Learning	178
5.4.4 Desire Versus Reality.....	181
5.5 Overcoming Barriers	183
5.5.1 Experiential Learning Opportunities.....	183
5.5.2 The Importance of an Open Mind	184
5.6 Differences in Knowledge, Training and Confidence in using Music with Children with SEND	186
5.6.1 A Lack of Understanding about Music as an Intervention and a Resource	188
5.6.1.1 A Lack of Practice-Based Evidence	189
5.6.1.2 A Lack of Access to Research Knowledge.....	190
5.7 A Certain Type of Practitioner	191
5.8 Specialist or Non-Specialist?	193
5.9 Summary	194
Chapter Six Environmental Differences	196
6.0 Overview	196
6.1 Support	199
6.1.1 Support for Music as an Intervention.....	200
6.1.1.1 Shared Strategic Vision	200

6.1.1.2 Shared Vision, Ways of Working, Learning and Understanding.....	202
6.1.1.2.1 Relationships and Partnership Working	206
6.1.1.3 Trust and Respect	207
6.1.1.4 External Endorsement	208
6.1.1.5 Financial Support.....	210
6.1.2 Support for Music in Learning Support Provision and Practice	214
6.1.2.1 The Influence of National Policies	215
6.1.2.2 A Reliance on Ready-Made Interventions	215
6.1.2.3 Fixed Ways of Working	216
6.1.2.4 The Influence of the Learning Support Specialist.....	219
6.1.2.5 A Need for Leadership and Shared Vision.....	221
6.1.2.6 The Role of the Music Specialist.....	222
6.1.3 Support for Music as a Learning Support Resource	223
6.1.3.1 School Musical Identities, Vision and Ethos.....	224
6.1.3.2 External Pressures on Schools.....	225
6.1.3.3 Musical Leadership in Schools.....	227
6.1.3.4 A Need for Musical Training	228
6.2 Time and Freedom	229
6.2.1 Increasing Prescription.....	229
6.2.2 A Fear of Ofsted	230
6.2.3 The Place and Value of Music in the Curriculum.....	231
6.2.3.1 Time for Music	233
6.2.3.2 A Lack of Time for Planning, Collaboration and Evaluation	235
6.3 Evidence	237
6.3.1 Justifying Music as an Intervention	238
6.3.2 Increasing Financial Accountability in Music	240
6.3.3 A Lack of Access to Data about Children with SEND.....	241
6.3.4 The Challenge of Generating Evidence	242
6.3.5 The Challenge of Assessing Musical Learning	243
6.3.6 New Methods of Assessment.....	244
6.4 Access.....	247
Chapter Seven Discussion and Conclusions	251
7.0 Introduction	251
7.1 Key findings	251
7.1.1 Practice.....	252
7.1.1.1 Purpose	253
7.1.1.2 Delivery and Resources	254
7.1.1.3 A Certain Type of Practitioner	255
7.1.1.4 Motivations for Practice	256

7.1.2 Opportunities and Challenges	256
7.1.2.1 Opportunities for Children.....	256
7.1.2.2 Challenges for Children	257
7.1.2.3 Opportunities and Challenges for Educators	257
7.1.3 Key Affecting Factors	259
7.1.3.1 The Invisibility of Music - Challenge and Strength	259
7.1.3.1.1 A Lack of Awareness and Knowledge.....	259
7.1.3.2 Knowledge, Confidence and Training.....	261
7.1.3.2.1 The Influence of Childhood Musical Experiences.....	261
7.1.3.2.2 A Lack of SEND Music Knowledge.....	262
7.1.3.2.3 Specialist or Non-Specialist?	262
7.1.1.3 Support.....	263
7.1.1.3.1 A Lack of Time, Freedom and School Attitudes to Music	263
7.1.1.3.2 Funding	264
7.1.1.4 External Pressures.....	264
7.1.1.5 A Need for Evidence.....	265
7.1.1.6 A Different Model of Practice	266
7.2 Research Evaluation.....	267
7.2.1 Research Limitations.....	269
7.3 Considerations for future research	269
7.4 Considerations for practice and policy.....	270
List of References	272
List of Abbreviations.....	296
Appendix A – Survey Schedule.....	298
Appendix B - Telephone Interview Discussion Guide	337
Appendix C – List of Participants	348

Preface

Multidisciplinary research in music psychology, music therapy, music education, medicine and neuroscience suggests a positive relationship between the processes involved in musical learning and cognitive, social, emotional and physical development. Music therapists historically, have sought to harness these processes to target and support the development of children with special educational needs and disability¹ in a variety of clinical, therapeutic and special education settings. Such practice and research has yielded a valuable base of largely qualitative, case-study evidence about the wider educational and developmental potential of music.

More recently, studies in music psychology, cognitive science and neuroscience are increasing understanding of the different cognitive, physical, emotional and social processes involved in listening to or making music and revealing their overlap with other areas of learning and development. Consequently, some argue this offers the potential for learning to transfer to other areas of learning, which employ the same or similar processes. Of particular interest is the overlap between the cognitive processes involved in music-making and the development of auditory function, thought to be central to the development of key learning skills. Significantly, auditory function has been shown to be disrupted in children with learning difficulties but responsive to auditory training.

Comparative neurological studies of musically trained and untrained individuals highlight differences in musicians' brain structure and function and reveal musicians' enhanced auditory abilities (for reviews see Hallam, 2010; Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010; Strait & Kraus, 2014). It is suggested that music can lead to cortical changes in the brain through the process of strengthening and fine tuning of neurological connections and networks (Strait & Kraus, 2014). If these changes occur sufficiently early in a child's development they can become permanent, but this requires repeated and active musical engagement over time, as exemplified in the brain scans of professional musicians (Hallam, 2010). Whilst initial comparative studies have focussed on professional musicians, attention has shifted towards studying the effects of

¹ The term 'special educational needs and disability' is sometimes abbreviated to 'special needs' or SEN, and more recently as SEND or SEN/D. The term SEND is used throughout where necessary, unless a different abbreviation is used by a participant or in an older publication.

different types of formal and informal musical training programmes on children in a variety of educational, community and socio-economic settings.

Hallam (2010) and Kraus and Chandrasekaran (2010), in their respective reviews of the cognitive and neurological literature highlight the wide-ranging reported impact of music on intellectual and personal development, particularly in early childhood. Given musicians' apparent enhanced auditory function and performance on a range of auditory-cognitive tasks, Kraus and Chandrasekaran highlight music's potential as an auditory training programme and use such evidence to call for all children to have equal access to musical learning opportunities through school music education programmes. However, Schellenberg and colleagues criticise the use of such evidence to justify the place of music within school curricula, pointing out weaknesses in the research literature. They note that much of the evidence base to support the above argument relies on correlational rather than causal evidence, where the direction of identified positive associations between music and other learning remains uncertain. They dispute notions of a special relationship between music and particular domains of learning (Schellenberg, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2011a, 2011b; Schellenberg & Peretz, 2008; Schellenberg & Winner, 2011; Schellenberg & Weiss, 2013; Weiss & Schellenberg, 2011) such as spatial skills or social and emotional function (Schellenberg & Mankarious, 2012). Instead they argue, through a number of studies, that positive associations between music training and wider learning reflect underlying cognitive abilities, personality traits or the influence of mediating factors or confounding variables (Corrigall, Schellenberg & Misura, 2013; Husain, Thompson & Schellenberg, 2002; Nantais & Schellenberg, 1999; Schellenberg, 2004, 2006, 2009, 2011a, 2011b; Schellenberg & Hallam, 2005; Schellenberg, Nakata, Hunter & Tamoto, 2007; Schellenberg & Weiss, 2012; Weiss & Schellenberg, 2013). Identifying a causal relationship between music and other benefits requires longitudinal randomised controlled trials, which are problematic and expensive to conduct, particularly in educational settings (Bialystok, 2011; Schellenberg, 2006, 2009; Strait & Kraus, 2014). The ubiquity of music and the varied, transient, complex and individual nature of musical interactions, training and experience leads some to question the feasibility of identifying a causal relationship (Hargreaves & Aksentijevic, 2011).

Despite these difficulties, intervention studies are making increasing reference to the relevance of research-led interventions to school learning support programmes and early intervention programmes (Corriveau & Goswami, 2009; Hillier, Greher, Poto &

Dougherty, 2012; Overy, 2000, 2003, 2010; Rabinowitch, Cross & Burnard, 2013; Wan, et al., 2011). This is important as one in five children in mainstream education has a special educational need or disability (DfE, 2011a). Early identification and intervention as part of learning support provision in schools are key priorities in mainstream education and are considered effective in maximising children's life chances (Allen, 2011; DfE, 2012; Ofsted, 2010). Even when taking Schellenberg and colleagues' important critique of the literature into account, the considerable body of empirical and qualitative research and practice-based evidence investigating the wider potential of music suggests music may make a valuable contribution to meeting these wider educational aims in a variety of ways. However, aside from similar studies in special education (Ockelford, 2008; Welch, Ockelford & Zimmerman, 2001) and limited studies in mainstream education (Mather, 2007; Overy, 2000, 2003, 2010) little is known about the specific use of music in mainstream learning support settings in England. This is important to understand if intervention-based research studies are to translate effectively into educational practice. As Hallam points out, for musical learning to be effective it must be "enjoyable and rewarding", which has "implications for the quality of the teaching" (2010, p. 269). Music education research in general highlights how pedagogical approach, educators' musical confidence, music educators' lack of knowledge about the needs of children with SEND and attitudes towards music in schools can affect access to musical learning opportunities. Thus, there appears to be a need for a practice-based perspective to complement the existing literature and inform the calls for a wider use of music in these learning contexts.

This thesis builds on my own research conducted as part of a Masters programme, which explored the use of a multi-sensory music programme in a mainstream learning support setting (Mather, 2007). The study investigated how music might support the development of short and long-term on-task behaviour amongst a group of Year 9² pupils attending a learning support group in a mainstream international school. The project consisted of five 30 minute weekly sessions of multi-sensory group music-making involving simple rhythmic, imitative music games to support the development of short term on-task behaviour through the development of attentive listening and watching skills in pairs or whole group work (Skill Acquisition Phase). Hand-held percussion instruments and visual aids, such as hoops and scarves, were used to

² Aged 13-14 years old.

externalise the pulse and rhythm and express physical and emotional responses to the music. Active musical listening and expressive movement were linked to learning support goals in literacy support work to stimulate a wider experience and use of descriptive vocabulary. As participant researcher, I led these group music sessions, whilst an independent observer, the head of the learning support unit, made observations of participants' on-task behaviour in music sessions using an observational snapshot sampling method. The Skill Acquisition Phase was followed by the Composition and Performance Phase. Participants composed a rap on a subject of their choice, using adjectives linked to their literacy work in the learning support programme and musical skills learnt in the previous five weeks. Participants recorded their raps over a backing track composed by participants using sound loops from the Garage Band³ software programme. Raps were presented at a special performance five weeks later. The programme was designed to be as accessible as possible and required no prior musical knowledge or training on the part of the participants.

In a post-study questionnaire, the head of the learning support unit was positive about the project, but felt the musical approach was "too specialised" (p. 52) and would be difficult for learning support teachers to implement due to their lack of musical skills. Moreover, reactions to the project amongst staff in the unit and the school suggested that the use of music in learning support practice was not common in mainstream education. The lack of research in this context makes it difficult to assess the reliability of the findings of the Masters research project without further study. These initial findings and this apparent gap in the literature led to my interest in identifying other examples of practice within mainstream learning support provision and a desire to explore the attitudes and experiences of music specialists, educators, learning support specialists and support workers. In so doing, I hoped to go beyond my own experience to gain a better understanding of the factors that might support or inhibit the wider use of music in this specific context.

This thesis explores the use of music to support children with special educational needs and disabilities in mainstream primary education in England through a largely qualitative but mixed methods approach. The study has two research aims: firstly to

³ Available from: <http://www.apple.com/uk/ilife/garageband/>

identify practice; secondly, to explore educators' experiences of using music in this context and their perceptions and attitudes towards such practice. Given the lack of prior research in this area these aims were explored through three broad research questions:

- 1) Is music used to support children with SEND in mainstream primary education as a specific learning support resource? If so, how, where, by whom and for what purpose?
- 2) What are the challenges and opportunities for educators and children in using music in this context?
- 3) What are the key issues that promote or inhibit the use of music in this context?

As a prelude to the interviews, an online pilot survey was conducted of 47 respondents working in a variety of educational, music and learning support roles and settings in mainstream primary schools in England, to provide a first view of practice and attitudes. These findings were then explored in depth in 18 semi-structured interviews, of whom seven participants were recruited from the survey and eleven post-survey. Interview data was analysed using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA) (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009; Smith, Jarman & Osborn, 1999). IPA aims to generate a systematic understanding of individual experiences and exploration of the meaning individuals assign to these experiences, taking account of the context in which individuals live and work. This was deemed a suitable method, given the study's aims to explore educators' experiences and perceptions about their musical practice in the mainstream primary education context, particularly, as educators do not work in isolation but within a wider political and social context.

Primary education was chosen as the research context for this study for two reasons. Firstly, as outlined above, early identification and intervention are seen as best practice in addressing and providing for the needs of children entering mainstream education. This is the same context where research suggests music might make a positive contribution. Secondly, music is a statutory foundation subject in the primary National Curriculum (Education Reform Act, 1988), which is taught to every year group with more opportunities for cross-curricular use compared to secondary education, which at the time of the research was only compulsory until the age of 14 and taught as a separate subject.

This research comes at a time of considerable change in music education and also mainstream education and provision for special educational provision generally, as part of government reforms. The National Plan for Music Education (NMPE) (DfE, DCMS, 2011a) emphasises how all children including those with special needs must have equal access to music. Newly formed regional music hubs in England are required to provide evidence of how they intend to ensure or provide equal access and opportunity to music for all children as part of their funding applications from the Arts Council of England (ACE). Consequently, music provision for children with SEND can no longer be considered a specialist area within music education, but a priority for all music providers that presents both opportunity and challenge.

The thesis starts by providing an overview of learning support provision in mainstream primary education in Chapter One, to provide context for the remainder of the thesis. Chapter Two reviews multi-disciplinary evidence, identifying the underlying processes involved in musical learning and auditory function and associated wider impacts on cognitive, social and emotional development. The discussion considers whether the observed relationship between musical training and wider learning is the result of nature or nurture, and identifies the methodological challenges involved in determining a causal relationship. The review attempts to broaden the often polarised nature of the debate and its frequent focus on individual instrumental music training to explore the wider impact of musical learning in informal, social and everyday musical learning contexts. The discussion considers the challenges of ensuring equal access to high quality musical learning in schools, especially for children with SEND, and educational attitudes and policies influencing current and future music provision. The chapter positions this thesis in response to a growing recognition of the role pedagogical approach, learning setting and other educational factors may play in determining wider outcomes of musical learning, and the need to explore these issues in the complexity of real world settings.

Chapter Three outlines the methodological approach for the thesis, examining its merits and shortcomings. The results of the online survey (Mather, 2013) are summarised briefly in Chapter Three as a prelude to the main discussion of the Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis of interview data presented in Chapters Four to Six. Chapter Four explores the use of music as an intervention and resource through a series of case studies in specialist learning support settings, the general classroom, class music lessons and wider school life. Educators' accounts provide insights into their

experience of using music in support of children with SEND in these contexts and the opportunities and challenges such practice presents to them and their pupils. The discussion highlights the challenge of identifying and defining musical practice in the specific context of learning support provision, given that much practice was hidden in participants' existing practice and appeared to be influenced by participants' understanding and perceptions of such practice. These perceptions are explored in more depth in Chapters Five and Six, which identify individual and environmental differences between participants, which participants felt motivated or inhibited their musical practice in this research context. The findings of this thesis are summarised in Chapter Seven, where the limitations of the research are considered and suggestions for future research, practice and policy are made.

Chapter One

Learning Support Provision in England

1.0 Introduction

In order to provide context and situate this research study, this chapter examines the different settings and models of learning support provision that have evolved to address and support the wide range of individual learning needs within the mainstream classroom, and the key principles that underpin current best practice. The discussion draws on evidence from the research literature, policy documents and practice guidelines.

1.1 Developing Inclusive Mainstream Education in England

The development of inclusive education has become a social and educational priority nationally and internationally. This has been led by international campaigns for human rights and social justice. This expectation is enshrined in international law, expressed in the Salamanca Statement and Framework for Action on Special Education: “Those with special educational needs must have access to regular schools, which should accommodate them within a child-centred pedagogy capable of meeting these needs” (UNESCO, 1994, p. viii).

Consequently, many parents want their child to be educated in mainstream schools alongside their peers, based on an expectation that their child’s needs will be met in the mainstream setting. However, meeting a wide range of individual needs inclusively in mainstream education with limited resources in a competitive educational market is both a key priority and challenge for educators and policymakers. Nonetheless, it is now considered a moral and educational priority for educators to identify and meet children’s needs early on in their school lives to ensure equal access and opportunity to learning. As school performance is primarily measured by children’s individual educational progress and attainment, children experiencing difficulties have become a priority group in education and the subject of considerable targeting and monitoring. Consequently, it is still the case that children are subject to considerable categorisation based on their needs or differences, despite efforts to move away from the child deficit

model of the past, discussed below, and focus on the learning environment and teaching practice as potential barriers to equal access and opportunity. Space does not permit a detailed review of the development of inclusive education in mainstream schools (for a review see Dyson & Milward, 2000). However, it is worth noting certain key points in the development of inclusive education to provide context for this study and to identify the key principles and terminology that characterise learning support provision today.

The 1870 Elementary Education Act marked the first attempt to provide for children with a range of poorly understood disabilities and learning difficulties through a system of physical segregation, containment and remedial action, now commonly referred to as “the child deficit model”. The Handicapped Children Act (1970), introduced into law the idea of education for all, followed by the Warnock Report (1978), which introduced the concept of “special education” to the UK:

[special education] extends beyond the idea of education provided in special schools, special classes or units for children with particular types of disability, and embraces the notion of any form of additional help, wherever it is provided and whenever it is provided, from birth to maturity, to overcome educational difficulty. It also embodies the idea that, although the difficulties which some children encounter may dictate WHAT they have to be taught and the disabilities of some HOW they have to be taught, the point of their education is the same.

(pp. 6-7)

These changes increased the proportion of children requiring some form of support in their school careers from 2% to 20% virtually overnight (Dyson & Milward, 2000); a figure, which has remained largely constant ever since.

The Education Act (1981) introduced three new concepts. Firstly, the idea of integration. Secondly, the notion that special educational needs occur on a continuum. Thirdly, these needs should be defined in relation to the performance of a child's peer group and/or a child's ability to access a school-based provision, rather than any inherent fault of the child. These concepts continue to determine present definitions:

The term “special educational needs” is used if children have a learning difficulty, which calls for special educational provision to be made for them. A ‘learning difficulty’ means: they have a significantly greater difficulty in learning than the majority of children of the same age; or they have a disability

which prevents or hinders them from making use of educational facilities of a kind generally provided for children of the same age in schools within the area of the local education authority; they are under compulsory school age and fall within one of the definitions above or would do so if special educational provision was not made for them.

(Ofsted, 2010, p.15)

Today, children entering primary school may arrive with an identified disability or learning difficulty, while others will not have their needs identified until they enter school. Individual needs are now defined within the context of the child's learning environment or in relation to their peers. Thus, some children's needs may not become apparent until they enter the social learning context of mainstream education (Daniels & Hedegaard, 2011).

The Special Educational Needs Code of Practice (DfES, 2001a) is underpinned by five fundamental principles that are considered to be the responsibility of the whole school:

- 1) A child with special educational needs should have their needs met;
- 2) The special educational needs of children will normally be met in mainstream schools or early education settings;
- 3) The views of the child should be sought and taken into account;
- 4) Parents have a vital role to play in supporting their child's education;
- 5) Children with SEN should be offered full access to a broad, balanced and relevant education, including an appropriate curriculum for the foundation stage and the National Curriculum.

(p. 7)

As stated above, there is now a greater recognition of the impact pedagogical approach and learning context can play in determining and supporting a child's needs.

Consequently, greater responsibility has been placed on the educator to ensure provision is both inclusive and accessible through the removal of "barriers to learning" (DfES, 2004, p. 12). Nonetheless, provision is still largely driven by the nature and categorisation of children's individual needs, which some argue runs counter to the essence of inclusion; a contradiction that remains an unresolved tension in mainstream provision and support.

1.2 The Nature of Individual Needs in the Mainstream Primary

Setting

As mentioned earlier in the preface, one in five children in English mainstream primary schools have some form of special educational need or disability, of which speech, language and communication needs (SLCN)⁴, moderate learning difficulties⁵ (MLD), behavioural, emotional and social difficulties (BESD)⁶ are the most prevalent, although the range of needs can be much wider (DfE, 2011a). Locally, school populations can vary considerably from this national figure, due to different socio-economic conditions or early identification and intervention programmes that may lead to temporary increases in the number of children with special educational needs in early years.

Having a learning difficulty or disability may also lead to secondary needs, such as a lack of confidence, independence and self-esteem that arguably have as much impact as any identified primary need. These secondary needs reflect a growing concern about individual and societal wellbeing (Ecclestone, 2012). Government educational initiatives such as Every Child Matters (DfES, 2003) have focussed attention on these wider personal and social needs, and the role educators play in identifying and these needs.

1.3 The Challenge of Identifying Individual Needs

As outlined above, the desire to move away from the child deficit model towards a holistic view of the child is characterised by a focus on removing barriers to learning, and providing an inclusive learning environment for all children. Whilst provision focuses largely on identifying and supporting difficulties, children with special needs may also be particularly gifted in other areas, often musically (Miles & Westcombe, 2002; Ockelford, 2008; Oglethorpe, 2002), which if exceptional, are recognised and supported through a school's separate Gifted and Talented Register. However, despite best practice emphasising the need to guard against defining children solely in terms of

⁴ 27.9% of total SEND population in English mainstream primary schools (DfE, 2011)

⁵ 23.3% of total SEND population in English mainstream primary schools (DfE, 2011)

⁶ 18.6% of total SEND population in English mainstream primary schools (DfE, 2011)

their perceived difficulties, in practice, the desire to provide child-centred provision has led to the increased labelling of children.

Ofsted (2010) controversially reported that children were being unnecessarily labelled when poor teaching was the reason for children's learning difficulty. However, the labelling of certain groups of children, such as looked after children or those receiving free school meals, means funding can be prioritised to ensure equal access and opportunity. The Ofsted report noted that parents also felt that labels were seen as the means of acquiring the necessary support they felt their child was entitled to. However, different needs are often interrelated making it difficult to identify a single root cause, which may explain why efforts tend to be focussed on outward signs of difficulties. For example, children classified as having behavioural difficulties may actually have more fundamental cognitive, speech-related needs. Thus, the clear identification of needs is seen as a means of ensuring appropriate individual support in order to maximise a child's abilities and individual potential. This support begins in the classroom.

1.4 Mainstream Learning Support Provision

1.4.1 Best Practice Starts in the Classroom

Differentiation of the National Curriculum in the classroom in response to individual learning needs is still seen as the primary means of providing inclusive education for all children (Hart, 1992). Differentiation allows the teacher to provide for a range of needs through the provision of an inclusive learning environment and pedagogical approach, where potential barriers to learning are identified and removed. Learning can be differentiated in several ways. Firstly, where the same task is set to all children with different outcomes dependent on ability and understanding. Secondly, by task, where different tasks are undertaken by pupils of differing ability. Thirdly, by teacher input, through the use of open-ended questions. However, differentiation is not without its challenges, demanding knowledge of individual needs and time to plan, accommodate and adapt delivery to ensure equal access and opportunity. For some children this in-class support system and strategy of differentiation is welcome. For others, having different work or extra help can be a source of stigma and difference.

Ofsted (2010) nevertheless challenges the need to provide a different pedagogy for children with special needs, arguing good teaching for *all* children is a first priority. McCord and Watts (2006) in their review of methods of support for children in the

music classroom support the notion of “Universal Design for Learning” proposed by Hitchcock, Meyer, Rose and Jackson (2002). Educators are encouraged to review their own use of resources, teaching and assessment methods and ways of working to enable them to be ready and able to accommodate individual needs and learning styles at any time, rather than the time-consuming and potentially stigmatising practice of differentiating learning. Thus, this becomes a way of working, rather than a response to a specific child. Given the focus on pedagogical approach and the definition of children’s needs within the social context of the classroom and their peers, removing barriers to learning is vital if children are not to be wrongly labelled.

Nonetheless, where a child does not make progress in the classroom despite “differentiated learning opportunities, specific behavioural management techniques or the provision of specialist equipment” (SEN Code of Practice, 2001, p. 52), a graduated system of action and intervention is triggered as outlined above. This extra support may take place within or outside of the main classroom.

1.4.2 A Graduated Approach

The concept that individual needs occur on a continuum (Education Act, 1981) is reinforced via a graduated system of action, interventions, individual education plans (IEPs) and on-going assessment. All children are assessed on entry into school to identify specific needs. Assessment is led by the head teacher and a SENCo⁷ in school, supported by a network of external clinical specialists, therapists and external and in-school learning support specialists, Learning Support Assistants (LSA), Higher Level Teaching Assistants (HLTA) and Teaching Assistants (TA)⁸. Where necessary, additional individual support is delivered through early intervention programmes, nurture groups or via one-to-one support, inside or outside of the classroom.

Each school holds a SEN Register of children identified by the class teacher as requiring interventions “additional to or different from those provided as part of the school’s differentiated curriculum offer” (DfES, 2001b, p. 8). Different levels or “waves” of support are provided known as School Action and School Action Plus

⁷ Special Educational Needs Coordinator

⁸ For ease of reference the term TA is used collectively to refer to the Higher Level Teaching Assistant, Learning Support Assistant and Teaching Assistant roles unless this distinction is deemed significant for the discussion.

through to Statements of Special Educational Need for those with the most needs. Individual Education Plans (IEPs) are drawn up for this latter group of children identifying their difficulties, potential barriers to learning and appropriate strategies. However, schools are being encouraged to decrease their reliance on the SENCo and external specialists in favour of a shared responsibility starting with the class teacher in the mainstream classroom as discussed above (DCSF, 2009a; Ofsted, 2010). All schools are required to meet the three principles of the Inclusion Statement:

- 1) Setting suitable learning challenges
- 2) Responding to pupils' diverse learning needs
- 3) Overcoming potential barriers to learning and assessment for individual and groups of pupils

(DfES, 2001a, p. 47)

1.4.2.1 TA-Led Support

TAs provide one-to-one or group support in class or outside the classroom, focussing on particular individual learning needs. The TA role is attracting increasing research attention, as the role has expanded considerably. The TA can play a pivotal role in the daily provision of learning support in and out of the classroom, which may extend to devising activities, delivering intervention programmes and working in liaison with the SENCo, class teacher and learning support and clinical specialists. Their daily contact with the child provides increased opportunities for observation, knowledge and understanding.

1.4.2.2 Early Intervention Programmes

Early identification and intervention have had notable effects in ensuring appropriate provision and support is available at a critical point in a child's education (Allen, 2011). The National Strategies programme introduced in 1997 has led to a series of initiatives and non-statutory guidance to support the drive to improve teaching standards and attainment in schools and ensure equal access to the curriculum (DfE, 2011b). Although the National Strategies provided non-statutory guidance, these early identification and intervention programmes attracted considerable funding, training, resources and monitoring, which have shaped current learning support provision, organisational structures in schools and local authorities and methods of delivery in mainstream schools.

Some question the ethics and benefits of an intervention-based approach, particularly in addressing social and emotional needs, arguing for a more universal approach (Bywater & Sharples, 2012; Ecclestone, 2012; Hitchcock, Meyer, Rose & Jackson, 2002; Ofsted 2010), echoing the earlier discussion about differentiated learning. Keslair, Maurin & McNally (2011) note that early intervention programmes are rarely evaluated because of difficulties in comparing effectiveness of programmes, as children are chosen to participate in them, making it difficult to conduct randomised controlled trials. They note on average schools spend £1,320 per SEN pupil, which they estimate to constitute “30% of the average spending per targeted pupil” (p. 3). Their review concludes that such interventions are not working and call for a different approach. Nonetheless, early identification, intervention and individual support across a wide range of services are generally considered vital in enabling children to have access to the best start in life.

1.4.2.3 A Creative Approach to Supporting Individual Needs

Rix, Hall, Nind, Sheehy and Wearmouth’s (2009) systematic review of 134 international research papers identified the most effective pedagogical approaches in generating social and academic inclusion for children with SEND in mainstream schools; recommendations which appear to reflect many aspects of creative musical learning. They found that most effective practices involved cooperative and peer-group learning via multi-sensory and multi-modal strategies and “direct experiences and realistic problems” (p. 91) that helped to make learning meaningful and accessible. Children worked best in a learning environment where children and educators worked together in “a community of learners” (p. 86), in which they could actively contribute to their learning, participation and sense of belonging within that learning community. This was similarly effective where children were encouraged to identify and document their thoughts, particularly through one-to-one discussion with the teacher, drawing on prior knowledge, interests and understanding. Successful outcomes were linked to educators who involved children in the planning of their learning and adopted a facilitative rather than a didactic role, providing opportunities for “peer scaffolding and dialogue” and “social engagement” (p. 91). The least successful interactions were found to occur where teachers focused on procedural matters, behaviours and general classroom management, often seen by schools as best practice, in response to perceived demands of school inspection agendas.

These findings reflect constructivist models of social learning put forward by Piaget and Inhelder (1969) Bruner (1983) and Vygotsky (1978) and exemplified by creative

learning (Craft, 2000; Miell & Macdonald, 2002; Moog, 1976; Sawyer, 2003) where learners are guided to new understanding through shared interests, active participation, collaborative talk and self-evaluation of learning. Sawyer (2003) highlights the importance of the creative process in children's development through an observational and interactive approach between child and parent. This reflects Bruner's notion of scaffolding and Vygotsky's Zone of Proximal Development. Such an approach has been promoted to educators as part of the Primary National Strategies (DES 2005):

Inclusion will be promoted and learning enhanced for children with SEN and disabilities in an environment where adults and children problem solve and know it is safe to take risks. The ideal environment will be one where children build on what they are good at and where their teachers use effective approaches in both familiar and different contexts and then ensure that children's effort and achievements are recognised by the people that value them - their peers and the significant adults around them.

(pp. 3-4)

Daniels and Hedegaard (2011) adopt a Vygotskian and cultural-historical framework approach, arguing that children's learning needs are defined by the social context of the school learning environment and their development is determined by the practices and activities in which they engage. Thus, children's learning and development are also potentially affected by the institutional structures and working relationships within schools. They also argue for a more holistic approach and challenge schools to "focus on transforming patterns of staff collaboration" (p. 2) in order to achieve this.

The Children and Families Bill (DfE, 2012b), presently progressing through Parliament, legislates for a reform programme following national reviews of SEND provision (DCSF, 2008, 2009a, 2009b, 2010; DfE, 2012a, 2012b; Ofsted, 2010). This wide ranging Bill prioritises a holistic approach to meeting the needs of those with SEND by encouraging all services who support children and families to work together through an individualised "Birth-25 Education, Health and Care Plan". These new developments will be reflected in a new SEN Code of Practice, to run alongside this new legislation. Thus, the evolution of inclusive educational practice, support and intervention continues; driven by a desire to enable all children to identify and realise their potential through a programme of early identification and intervention, good teaching practice and the removal of potential barriers.

1.5 Meeting Individual Needs at a Time of Change

Recently, many government-sponsored initiatives and interventions have come under budgetary pressure, accompanied by a desire to give greater freedom to schools to decide for themselves how best to approach these issues. This is evident in the current promotion of Free Schools and Academies, and the new national primary curriculum (DfE, 2013), which proposes a more local approach to educational provision and support. However, these changes are also occurring in a results-led educational culture where arts, social science and humanities teaching, all potential contributors to the holistic approach promoted in the Children and Families Bill (DfE, 2012b), were at the time of this research perceived to be under threat.

The future of arts subjects within schools remains unclear. This is partly due to the continued focus on “core knowledge” as part of the new primary National Curriculum (DfE, 2013); the rejection of previous curriculum reviews advocating a creative approach to learning; and the withdrawal of funding to the Creative Partnerships⁹ programme, which supported moves toward the development of creative curricula in schools (DfES, 2005). However, the promise of greater educational freedom for schools also potentially offers new opportunities. As discussed in the Preface, the primary priority of the National Plan for Music Education (NPME) (DfE, DCMS, 2011a) is to ensure equal access to musical learning for all children, particularly those with special educational needs and disabilities. For the first time the new regional music hubs must demonstrate equal access to music provision as a basis for funding. Schools and music hubs are being urged to work together to achieve this (Ofsted, 2012a; Ofsted, 2012b). Similarly, the Children and Families Bill (DfE, 2012b) advocates a collaborative approach to providing for children with SEND across all relevant agencies. These different communities and strands of practice share a common goal: namely, to provide inclusive and equitable education for all children. Thus, significant opportunities appear to exist to further develop an equitable and holistic model of learning support provision and practice in mainstream education through greater collaboration and the development of creative practice.

⁹ More information is available at: <http://www.creativitycultureeducation.org/creative-partnerships>

1.6 Summary

This discussion has outlined the key elements of learning support provision. Whilst a graduated approach of support is seen as best practice it has also led to the categorisation of children when a more holistic approach may be preferable.

Differentiation in the classroom, early identification and intervention programmes help children address transitory difficulties and support longer-term issues, but can also risk stigmatising children through their identification, differentiated work and participation in such programmes. Others suggest that children appear to benefit from an inclusive learning environment that recognises both their abilities and difficulties, supported by good teaching and a multi-sensory, multi-modal and facilitative rather than didactic learning environment. The literature suggests good teaching within a creative and accessible context, informed by the child's interests, can contribute to best practice in meeting individual needs. The following chapter considers how music might contribute to these goals, through the holistic, creative and inclusive learning opportunities it appears to offer.

Chapter Two

Music as a Resource for Learning

2.0 Introduction

Listening to or making music alone or with others can be a multi-sensory, enjoyable and individually meaningful experience, engaging mind, body, spirit and senses through a complex web of conscious and instinctive intentions, actions, interactions and emotions. Evidence from multi-disciplinary research and therapeutic and educational practice suggests that in these different ways, music may have a wider impact on cognitive, social and emotional and personal development, relevant to the range of individual learning needs of children with SEND highlighted in the previous chapter. This has led to suggestions that individual learning needs might be targeted and supported through a child's musical development.

Since the 1950s, music therapy practice has sought to harness the wider potential of music in order to meet both musical and non-musical goals in a variety of individual and group clinical, educational and community-based settings. Such research has provided important, largely qualitative, case-study evidence of positive therapeutic outcomes of musical engagement and experience and its wider impact on individual cognitive, social and emotional development (Bunt, 1997, 2002; Bunt & Hoskyns, 2004; Pavlicevic, 1997). However, explaining such experiences and isolating the factors that affect and drive such wider benefits is often difficult to quantify, as music is transient, individual and context-specific.

Over the last forty years, psychology, neuroscience, medicine and sociological research interests in music have provided significant empirical platforms to further explore the processes involved in musical learning, experience and engagement, and its potential impact on human experience and development. Cognitive and neurological studies comparing individuals with and without musical training are helping to identify with greater clarity the impact of active and passive musical engagement on brain structure, function and human development at critical points over the lifespan or following injury or disease. Of particular interest is the finding that musicians demonstrate superior auditory skills through their enhanced ability to discriminate, process and respond to key elements of sound, such as pitch, timbre, melodic contour and timing. Significantly, these same auditory processes have also been shown to be central to the

development of key learning skills such as reading, writing, emotional understanding and associated physical and social behaviour. This is important, as auditory function has been shown to be disrupted in children with learning difficulties but responsive to auditory training. This potential overlap has led some to argue that music can act as a valuable auditory training programme to support the development and transfer of auditory skills to other key areas of learning, facilitated by the plasticity of the brain (Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010).

Reflecting the multi-disciplinary interest in the wider potential of music, music is increasingly being used in a variety of everyday therapeutic, rehabilitative, medical, clinical, special educational and community settings (DeNora, 2000; MacDonald, Kreutz & Mitchell, 2012; Welch, Ockelford & Zimmerman, 2001). Researchers are turning their attention to examine the wider effects of school music education programmes (CUREE, 2011) and in particular their potential as a vehicle to deliver auditory training to children on a mass scale, leading to calls for all children to have equal access to music education programmes within schools (Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010). More specifically, increasing reference is being made within the literature to the use of music as part of early intervention or learning support programmes to support and target individual and collective learning needs (Hallam, 2010; Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010; Mather, 2007; Ockelford, 2008; Ockelford & Markou, 2012; Overy, 2000, 2003, 2010; Rabinowitch, Cross & Burnard, 2013; Wan et al., 2011). However, some are critical of those who use such evidence to justify the place of music in school curricula, highlighting concerns over the difficulties of identifying a causal relationship and methodological difficulties among other issues outlined below (Corrigall, Schellenberg & Misura, 2013; Schellenberg & Peretz, 2008; Schellenberg & Weiss, 2013; Schellenberg & Winner, 2011; Weiss & Schellenberg, 2011). Indeed, research also indicates that wider benefits attributed to music are not automatic and depend upon a number of factors.

As outlined in the Preface, considerable debate exists amongst researchers about whether positive outcomes associated with music derive solely from musical training or reflect the effects of underlying genetic pre-dispositions in relation to cognitive and auditory function or the consequence of music's effect on other mediating factors (Schellenberg, 2004, 2006, 2009, 2011a, 2011b; Schellenberg & Peretz, 2008; Schellenberg & Weiss, 2013; Schellenberg & Winner, 2011; Weiss & Schellenberg, 2011). Despite headline media and academic reports, which often suggest a simple

causal relationship between music and other areas of learning, much of the empirical evidence relies on correlational data where the direction of any relationship has yet to be universally established (Schellenberg, 2011a, 2011c; Schellenberg & Peretz, 2008; Schellenberg & Winner, 2011; Weiss & Schellenberg, 2011).

A lack of longitudinal and random controlled trials restricts efforts to identify a causal relationship between music training and other areas of learning, or whether other mediating factors contribute to the positive effects observed (Bialystok, 2011; Schellenberg, 2006, 2009; Strait & Kraus, 2014). Similarly, methodological inconsistencies across the literature and a lack of definition in the use of the terms “musical training” or “musician” make it difficult to make comparisons across the literature (Schellenberg & Winner, 2011; Robb, Burns & Carpenter, 2011). Indeed, such is the complex and individual nature of musical engagement, its ubiquity and the variety of contexts in which it occurs, some question whether it is possible to identify a causal relationship between musical learning and other learning (Hargreaves & Aksentijevic, 2011).

Although intervention studies are making increasing reference to how music might be used as part of learning support programmes within schools, little is known about the use of music as a learning support intervention or resource in the mainstream educational context, aside from Overy’s research (2000, 2003, 2010), parallel research conducted in special education (Welch, Ockelford & Zimmerman, 2001) and practice based evidence in the USA (Fitzgerald, 2006; McCord & Fitzgerald, 2006; McCord & Watts, 2006; Montgomery & Martinson, 2006; Patterson, 2003). This is important as music education research highlights how factors such as pedagogical approach (Lamont, 2002; Lamont, Hargreaves, Marshall & Tarrant, 2003; Miles & Westcombe, 2002; North & Hargreaves, 2008; Oglethorpe, 2002; Sloboda, 2001), a lack of musical training and low musical confidence amongst educators (Hallam, Creech & Varvarigou, 2011; Hallam, Robertson, Saleh, Burnard, Davies, Rogers & Kokatsaki, 2007; Hennessy, 2000; Holden & Button, 2006; Reid, 2009; Wilson & McCrary, 1996) and attitudes towards music in schools (Hallam, 2012; Hallam & Hanke, 2012; O’Toole, 2009) may negatively affect access to musical learning and thus any wider benefits, particularly for children with SEND (Drake Music, 2012). Indeed, the quality of school music learning in schools in England was found to be highly variable (Ofsted, 2012b) with only a third of primary schools considered to be good or outstanding. Thus, whilst school music education programmes may be seen as a quick and effective way to ensure

all children have access to the reported wider benefits of musical learning, such evidence suggests that this is not as simple as it may at first appear.

This chapter considers these issues in more depth, reviewing a wide range of empirical, theoretical and qualitative research and practice-based evidence which describes and explains how music might support individual cognitive, emotional and social development, and its relevance within the mainstream learning support context. The challenges of identifying a causal relationship between music and associated benefits are considered, identifying the role genetic, environmental and other mediating factors may play in affecting wider potential outcomes of musical engagement, particularly in real-world educational settings.

2.1 A Multi-dimensional Experience

MacDonald, Kreutz and Mitchell (2012), in their introduction to a review of research about the use of music to encourage and support health and wellbeing, provide a succinct set of descriptors that act as a helpful starting point to consider the different ways in which music may act as a valuable resource to support a range of cognitive, social, physical and emotional developmental and learning needs, and which reflect the multi-dimensional and holistic nature of musical engagement and experience (pp. 4-6). They describe music as “ubiquitous”, facilitated in particular by the advance of technology. Music is “emotional”, expressing feeling, evoking past memories and associations and affecting and regulating mood, but is also “ambiguous” in meaning, allowing for freedom of interpretation and expression. They suggest music is neurologically “engaging” with positive effects on other functions through the plasticity of the brain, but also “distracting” in directing attention away from pain or anxiety through an immersion in music. They describe music as “physical” requiring “stamina, coordination and dexterity”, noting its value as a multi-sensory rehabilitative tool in clinical and therapeutic settings. “Music is social” and “communicative”, linking communities and individuals together in shared musical experiences of self-expression without the need for language, which they argue lies at the heart of the therapeutic relationship and experience. Finally, music is seen as capable of affecting “behaviour and identities”. Music’s ability to engage and shape behaviour and identity is particularly significant in an educational context as music has been shown to be important to the majority of children and young people, with 90% of 7-19 year olds

surveyed in England reporting that they enjoyed listening to music (Youth Music, 2006).

2.1.1 Musical Interest as a Starting Point for Learning

Research in music psychology describes how music defines individual and collective social identities through a shared representation of musical taste, ideas and self-expression (DeNora, 2000; MacDonald, Hargreaves & Miell, 2002; MacDonald, Miell & Wilson, 2005; Overy, 2012). Similarly, infants and young children are attracted to music, moving and singing along as part of early caregiving and early years educational provision (Trehub et al., 2004; Trevarthen, 2000; Young, 2003, 2005, 2008). As children become older, musical interactions can become more formalised through school or instrumental musical learning and where musical experiences may support or discourage further active musical involvement and affect future musical identities (Lamont, 2002; O'Neill, 2002; Sloboda, 2001; Tarrant, North & Hargreaves, 2002). In adolescence, even in the absence of active music-making, music remains a powerful force in shaping individual identity, friendship groups and self-expression (MacDonald & Miell, 2002; Tarrant, North & Hargreaves, 2002; Zillman & Gan, 1997).

Music's ability to affect mood and emotion, and the role of individual musical preferences, expressed in individual and collective musical identities cannot be underestimated. Indeed, they appear to lie at the centre of much of this discussion, acting as critical mediating factors in relation to musical benefits associated with cognitive, emotional and social development in creating a positive, engaging and individually relevant learning environment in which to address other learning. Koelsch and Stegemann (2012) suggest that music is "special - although not unique" (p. 441) in its ability to simultaneously engage all aspects of human social function, vital for human survival, learning and interaction in a variety of individually meaningful ways and which they argue provides one explanation for the emotional power of music. As outlined in the Preface, Hallam (2010) points out that musical experiences need to be enjoyable and rewarding if music is to have any wider effect, particularly in supporting the development of self-esteem and intrinsic motivation. This raises questions about the quality of teaching and personal interest as possible mediating factors, which are discussed later.

Importantly, greater recognition is being given to the creative and artistic talents, interests and identity of children with SEND, particularly as some children demonstrate

musical talent that deserves nurturing and developing in its own right (Drake Music, 2012; Esperson, 2006; Fitzgerald, 2006; Lapka, 2006; McCord & Fitzgerald, 2006; Miles & Westcombe, 2002; Ockelford, 1998, 2000, 2008; Oglethorpe, 2002). Indeed, it is a key priority of the National Plan for Music Education (NPME) (DfE, DCMS, 2011a) that educators should ensure the identification of all children's musical needs and that they should all have equal access to musical learning opportunities in schools and in the community. However, some argue it is even more important that children with SEND have access to high quality music-making opportunities, because multi-disciplinary evidence suggests that music can provide a significant and individually meaningful platform or gateway through which to scaffold and target other learning needs.

2.2 Identifying and Isolating the Wider Potential of Music

As outlined in the Introduction to this chapter, research highlights the wider therapeutic, educational and clinical potential of music. This has led to a desire to identify and isolate more precisely the different cognitive processes involved in musical learning, experience and engagement, in order to ascertain whether a causal relationship exists between music and observed wider benefits or whether such benefits are derived or mediated by other factors.

2.2.1 Music and the Brain

Cognitive psychologists have sought to explore the effects of musical training through comparative studies of musicians and non-musicians through intelligence and other cognitive tests. More recently, advances in brain scanning technology are helping to increase understanding of brain structure, function and development over the life span. Such research is revealing the brain's capacity to respond to training through the strengthening and fine tuning of neural connections and networks, through a process known as synaptogenesis, commonly referred to as brain plasticity (Hallam, 2010; Strait & Kraus, 2014).

Comparative neurological studies of musically trained and untrained individuals reveal differences in musicians' brain structure and function that reflect specific aspects of instrumental performance, the length of time spent in active musical training and the ways in which such learning has taken place (for reviews see Hallam, 2010; Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010; Strait & Kraus, 2014). Researchers suggest that if such training

occurs sufficiently early on in development, such changes can become permanent, but this process of cortical change takes considerable time (Hallam, 2010). Underpinning these observations is the concept of learning transfer. Salomon and Perkins (1989) argue that learning transfer occurs in two ways: either through low transfer, when similar automatised skills are employed; or via high transfer through conscious thought and reflection. This notion is important to this discussion as researchers note the similarity between processes involved in musical and non-musical learning, particularly in relation to auditory function, suggesting opportunities may exist for learning transfer to occur across different areas of related learning via a child's musical development (Hallam, 2010; Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010; Patel, 2012; Strait & Kraus, 2014).

2.2.2 Music and Auditory Function

Good auditory function has been shown to be critical for speech and language development, reading, writing, social and emotional understanding and associated physical and social behaviour. However, auditory function has also been shown often to be disrupted in children with learning difficulties (Bradlow, Kraus & Hayes, 2003; Cunningham, Nicol, Zecker, Bradlow & Kraus, 2001; Hayes, Warrier, Nicol, Zecker & Kraus, 2003; Wible, Nicol & Kraus, 2004) but responsive to training with transferable benefits to other related learning (Gaab, Gabrieli, Deutsch, Tallal & Temple, 2007; Nicol & Kraus, 2005; Russo, Hornickel, Nicol, Zecker & Kraus, 2010; Russo, Nicol, Zecker, Hayes & Kraus, 2005; Warrier, Johnson, Hayes, Nicol & Kraus, 2004).

Comparative, neurological studies highlight musicians' superior auditory discriminatory, processing and analytical skills, evident in their ability to outperform non-musicians on a range of auditory performance and cognitive tasks (for reviews see Hallam, 2010; Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010; Schellenberg, 2011b; Schellenberg & Moreno, 2010; Strait & Kraus 2014). Studies in both cognitive psychology and neuroscience have initially focussed on the study of professional musicians with a lifetime of musical experience and training. Increasingly, such research has expanded its focus to investigate the effect of musical training in childhood, and the impact of short-term musical training and education programmes, therapeutic interventions and rehabilitation programmes on aspects of cognitive, social and emotional development. For example, intervention studies indicate that musicians at various stages of training, age and socio-economic background outperform non-musicians in verbal memory (Ho & Cheung, 1998; Ho, Cheung & Chan, 2003), sensory processing (Pantev et al., 2003), spatial reasoning (Hetland, 2000), IQ (Schellenberg, 2004), spatial ability (Bilhartz,

Bruhn & Ohlson, 2000; Costa-Giomi, 1999; Costa-Giomi, Gilmour, Siddell, & Lefebvre, 2001; Hetland, 2000; Portowitz, Lichtenstein, Egorova, & Brand, 2009; Rauscher, 2002; Rauscher & Hinton, 2011; Rauscher & Zupan, 2000) and mathematical ability (Spelke, 2008). Very recent research investigating the long term effects of musical training over the lifespan suggests the effects of very limited musical training in childhood can last throughout an individual's life and may mitigate the effects of ageing later in life in respect of auditory abilities (White-Schwoch, Woodruff Carr, Anderson, Strait & Kraus, 2013).

Such evidence lies at the heart of calls for music training to be made available to all children through school music programmes (Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010). However as already alluded to, Schellenberg and colleagues warn of the dangers of using such evidence to justify the use of music in schools, pointing to methodological difficulties and the correlational nature of much of the evidence base, such that the direction of any association between music and other learning has yet to be established (Schellenberg, 2011a). Instead, they suggest such differences reflect underlying genetic cognitive and personality differences amongst musicians and the influence of mediating factors (Corrigall, Schellenberg, & Misura, 2013; Husain, Thompson & Schellenberg, 2006; Nantais & Schellenberg, 1999; Schellenberg, 2004, 2006, 2009, 2011a, 2011b; Schellenberg & Hallam, 2005; Schellenberg, Nakata, Hunter & Tamoto, 2007; Schellenberg & Peretz, 2008; Schellenberg & Weiss, 2013; Schellenberg & Winner, 2011; Weiss & Schellenberg, 2011).

The following part of the discussion considers both sides of this debate, looking firstly at the nature of auditory function in more detail, its importance in the first few months of life and longer-term involvement in the development of key cognitive, emotional and social skills. The discussion considers the contribution music can make both in supporting auditory development and related learning and the different factors that may influence or cause the reported wider benefits of musical learning. However, this review also seeks to widen the debate beyond the effects of formal instrumental music training on which much of the evidence is based, to consider the impact of informal and social musical learning opportunities, where music may provide a positive learning environment to explore and develop key skills through the disguise of enjoyable music-making.

2.3 The Impact of Auditory Function on Other Learning

Recent research has revealed how cognition and auditory function are inextricably linked with consequent effects on written and verbal communication, social interaction, understanding and other learning that extend beyond the mere processing of sound (Kraus, Strait & Parbery-Clark, 2012). Auditory function describes the different processes involved in the perception, discrimination and processing of auditory stimuli (hearing), which require memory and recognition (listening) in order to make sense and draw meaning from sounds. While hearing relies on a bottom-up process of unconscious detection of auditory stimuli, so listening relies on top-down process of conscious recall and recognition in order to derive meaning from different sounds. This requires previous knowledge and experience. Over time, streams of auditory information become associated with actions and understanding and act as the reference to predict, make sense and respond to sound appropriately. It is a highly sensitive and dynamic multi-sensory process that depends on the accurate detection of auditory, visual and kinaesthetic stimuli coordinated through the vestibular function in the ear. Thus, listening and hearing are separate but interdependent processes, essential for the development of good auditory function and by association, cognitive, physical, social, and emotional development.

Auditory function is known to be central to the development of key skills involved in speech and language development (Goswami, Wang, Cruz, Fosker, Mead & Huss, 2010; Jakobsen, Cuddy, & Kilgour, 2003; Magne, 2006; Wong, Skoe, Russo, Dees & Kraus, 2007); literacy (Corriveau & Goswami, 2009; Ziegler & Goswami, 2005), memory (Chan et al., 1998; Ho et al., 2003) and emotional understanding (Banai, Hornickel, Skoe, Nicol, Zecker, & Kraus, 2009; Goswami, 2010). Auditory function has also been shown to be a predictor of future reading ability (Corriveau & Goswami, 2009). These are all areas that correspond to key priorities in mainstream learning support provision outlined in Chapter One.

Critical to the development of auditory function is the ability to rapidly distinguish similarities and differences in signal-based cues such as timbre, harmonics, frequency, pitch and volume over time and in space, through the identification of repeating or sequential patterns that require attention and involve both working and semantic memory. Parsing these similarities and differences from a stream of sound relies on the ability to identify silence as well as sound. Trevarthen (2000) observes that it is these

millisecond gaps which help to group different elements of the signal into identifiable, predictable patterns of information required for speech and language, reading, spelling, numeracy, emotional understanding and motor control.

2.3.1 The Importance of Early Auditory Learning

Auditory perception develops before birth and is fully functional between 24-28 weeks gestation (Lecanuet, 1996). As a consequence of auditory learning that takes place in utero, centred on the regularity of the mother's heartbeat and physiological functions (DeNora, 2000), new-borns are able to detect their mother's voice and have been shown to respond to other environmental and musical sounds heard whilst in the womb (Lecanuet, 1996). New-borns learn the fundamentals of speech and language through the recognition of prosodic elements in the instinctive sing-song style of communication between parent and infant known as motherese (Fassbender, 1996; Lecanuet, 1996; Papousek, 1996; Trehub et al., 1997).

Motherese is characterised by repetitive, rhythmic intonation, undulating pitch sounds of short durations with the melody conveying the message; the latter of which is one of the first elements infants learn to discriminate (Trehub, Bull & Thorpe, 1984).

Rhythmic regularity helps the infant to synchronise their sounds to their parents in "protoconversations" that are fused to a shared inner beat (Trevvarthen, 2000, p. 197). By six months old, infants can discriminate emotions in others through vocal, physical and tactile cues and can discern differences in tonality, tempo, pitch and timbre.

Trevvarthen acknowledges that whilst parent and child are not making music in the traditional sense, he argues it is through the rhythmic and social nature of these early 'musical' exchanges that a child learns fundamental discriminatory skills, centred on what he describes as the Intrinsic Motive Pulse (IMP). Trevvarthen argues that IMP is at the heart of human innate musicality, driving individual actions and awareness and making music "meaningful, memorable and above all shareable" (p.158), by linking actions to emotions associated with specific objects, people and events. Singing lullabies or nursery rhymes, rocking, clapping or bouncing on a parent's lap appear to support this cognitive and social development, helping to develop a sensitivity to beat and metre perception in the first year of life. However some evidence suggests this may be an innate skill evident in newborn infants, a few days old (Honing, 2012). This is a key issue, raised in the Introduction to this chapter, as to whether such auditory sensitivities are the consequence of nature or nurture, discussed further below.

Trevarthen (2000) argues that withdrawal of the early interactions between mother and child outlined above or an inability to lock on to the inner beat can lead both infant and mother to exhibit negative emotions and distress. Sensory or physical impairment, social deprivation, postnatal depression or poor quality childcare may also hamper or deprive a child of these vital early social interactions with potential longer-term ramifications for cognitive development, health and wellbeing discussed further below. Nevertheless, singing, movement and rhythm, simple and innocuous as they seem, appear to be at the heart of the complex processes involved in auditory learning that shape how we think, react, learn and interact with the world.

2.3.2 The Impact of Disrupted Auditory Function

As outlined above, research suggests that children with learning difficulties are often associated with disrupted auditory function or auditory processing disorder (Bradlow, Kraus & Hayes, 2003; Cunningham, Nicol, Zecker, Bradlow & Kraus, 2001; Hayes, Warrier, Nicol, Zecker & Kraus, 2003; Wible, Nicol & Kraus, 2004). Auditory function is vulnerable to disruption as the brain continues to develop into late adolescence.

Echoing Trevarthen's theories, early auditory deprivation is also thought to derive from exposure to excessive noise in the Neonatal Intensive Care Unit (NICU) at a critical point in an infant's auditory development, outside the normal protection afforded by the mother's womb. Such deprivation is thought to "alter brain structure and subsequently account for some of the hearing, language and attention deficits often seen in NICU graduates" (McMahon, Wintermark & Lahav, 2012, p.19).

As outlined above, auditory function is a complex process involving bottom-up and top-down processing, such that disruption can occur in a variety of ways at different points, requiring a multi-disciplinary approach to diagnosis and support (Bamiou, Musiek, Luxon, 2001; Chermak, 2001). In contrast to deaf children who experience hearing loss, children with processing difficulties may have perfect hearing. Such difficulties may be manifested in a number of other ways. For example, poor recognition of the incoming signal leads to storage of a poor representation in short and long term memory that in turn results in a mismatch and inability to recognise, predict and recall previously inaccurately stored signals. A lack of synchrony between the ears can lead to difficulty with speech, word recognition and manipulation, rhyming, and sound segmentation (Oglethorpe, 2002), or blending sounds (Bregman, 1993), which can impact upon spelling, reading and literacy. Poor auditory function may be evident in a range of difficulties that appear outwardly less connected to auditory function, namely a lack of

attention, poor handwriting or general clumsiness, through a lack of spatial awareness or poor motor coordination. Misunderstanding instructions as a result of missing emotional cues in the signal, or difficulty in distinguishing the teacher's voice from another in a noisy classroom, all may impact on social behaviour. Over time constant mismatching slows the process of recognition and recall and leads to the individual being in a constant state of catch-up, which can be exhausting, demotivating and debilitating, leading an individual to withdraw. Alternatively, such mismatching can lead the brain to be in a constant state of alert, seeking information to resolve the mismatch, which can lead to an inability to concentrate, to sit still or act appropriately. Nevertheless, auditory function is known to be plastic and has been shown to be responsive to training (Gaab, Gabrieli, Deutsch, Tallal & Temple, 2007; Hayes, Warrier, Nicol, Zecker & Kraus, 2003; Nicol & Kraus, 2005; Russo, Hornickel, Nicol, Zecker & Kraus, 2010; Russo, Nicol, Zecker, Hayes & Kraus, 2005; Warrier, Johnson, Hayes, Nicol & Kraus, 2004), with transferable benefits to other learning. It is here where it is argued music may be able to make a positive contribution in supporting the development of good auditory function through the development of similar cognitive and sensory processes involved in both musical learning and auditory-based learning.

2.4 Musical Learning and Cognitive Function

As outlined above, even in its simplest form, music-making and musical interactions provide opportunities to develop auditory-cognitive skills through an increasing sensitivity to, and rapid recognition and recall of the different elements of sound through musical ways of working (McAdams & Bigand, 1993). Imitation, repetition, rehearsal, improvisation, and performance in informal and formal musical learning contexts provide opportunities in which auditory discrimination can be explored and developed, and through motor control and emotional intent, achieve the desired musical performance (Kraus, Strait & Parbery-Clark, 2012). Repeated rehearsal moves information retained in short term memory for recall and into long term memory where skills become automatic and habituated (Snyder, 2000). Expert musicians use structural auditory cues to memorise, recall and predict large quantities of multi-sensory information (Williamon, 2002) through a process known as chunking where information is grouped optimally in units of $7 (\pm 2)$. These structures are evident in musical metre, phrasing, loudness, timbre and articulation (Snyder, 2000). It is therefore unsurprising that musicians demonstrate enhanced auditory function (Hallam 2010; Kraus &

Chandrasekaran 2010; Schellenberg, 2009; Schellenberg & Weiss, 2013; Schellenberg & Winner, 2011; Weiss & Schellenberg, 2011), an ability that appears to increase with the length of musical training (Patel & Iverson, 2007).

2.4.1 Developing Speech, Language and Literacy through Song, Rhythm and Movement

2.4.1.1 Speech and Language

As outlined above, the foundations of speech and language development are laid down in utero and in the first few critical months of life. Language development depends on the ability to extract key elements within a stream of speech over time (François, Tillman & Schön, 2012). The ability to segment speech has been shown to improve when language is sung rather than spoken (Schön et al., 2008), which may explain why singing when coupled with rhythm is considered helpful in the rehabilitation and development of speech fluency in non verbal children (Wan et al., 2011). Wan and colleagues (2011) showed significant improvements in speech output with transferable benefits to other language development in previously non-verbal autistic (ASD) children when words were sung to a simple intonation of a minor third and a corresponding drum beat, in a programme called Auditory-Motor Mapping Training (AMMT). The authors suggest the simple nature of the intervention lends itself to use in supporting language development in the mainstream classroom and particularly as an early language development intervention for children with ASD.

Speech and music have similar acoustical elements involving rhythm, melody/pitch, phrasing, timbre and volume, such that there appear to be considerable overlaps between music and speech processing (Besson & Schön, 2001). Patel (2012) explains through his OPERA hypothesis how musical training enhances speech encoding through this overlap of neural networks for speech and music. He notes the need for five conditions to be present for this transfer of learning to occur: overlap, precision, emotion, repetition, and attention (OPERA).

2.4.1.2 Speech Perception and Phonological Awareness

Good sound and speech encoding is also vital for phonological awareness, the precursor to reading, spelling and handwriting. Being able to discern accurately consonant from vowel, or sounds that rhyme or sound different, impacts on the ability to reproduce the sound orally; cognitively, when reading or spelling matching letters and words to these sounds; and physically, when reproducing a written representation of the sound onto

paper through the coordination of hand, eye and ear. Hallam's wide-ranging review of intervention studies (2010) highlights correlations between early musical skills, phonological awareness and early reading skills (Anvari, Trainor, Woodside & Levy, 2003), tonal memory and reading age (Barwick, Valentine, West & Wilding, 1989) and music instruction and reading readiness scores in children classed as slow learners (Nicholson, 1972, as cited in Hallam, 2010, p. 273), and music instruction and standardised reading scores (Butzlaff, 2000). However, importantly, Hallam (2010) also notes that other studies found no differences between those receiving musical intervention and standard reading interventions (Bowles, 2003; Kemmerer, 2003; Lu, 1986; Montgomery, 1997, as cited in Hallam, 2010, p. 273).

Nevertheless, other studies indicate that musical training can develop the auditory skills that support phonetic perception (Meyer, Elmer & Jäncke, 2012) enabling musicians to demonstrate better speech encoding (Patel & Iverson, 2007, Tallal & Graab, 2006). This is evident in eight-year-olds with no previous musical experience, following an eight-week period of musical training (Moreno & Besson, 2006). Musicians also appear more sensitive to the different component elements involved in auditory function as a result of their training, such as pitch (Magne, Schön & Besson, 2006; Schön, Magne & Besson, 2004), timing, melodic contour and harmonics, supported by advanced auditory working memory and superior attention skills.

Likewise, these skills have also been observed in children who received Suzuki musical training from the age of five (Meyer, Elmer, Ringli, Oechslin, Baumann & Jancke, 2011). A longitudinal study over two years, comparing children receiving 45 minutes weekly of Kodály musical training to children participating in a painting programme, isolated the effect of musical training as the reason for the music group outperforming the painting group in their ability to extract words from a flow of syllables (François, Chobert, Besson & Schön, 2013). These studies employed music pedagogical approaches that are multi-sensory in nature and rely on and encourage development of aural, visual and motor skills. Although the quality of sensory coding appears to increase with the length of musical training (Wong, Skoe, Russo, Dees & Kraus, 2007), these intervention studies and others (Anvari, Trainor, Woodside & Levy, 2003; Gromko, 2005) suggest that the observed wider effects of musical training are not confined to professional musicians, but achievable over shorter time periods, compatible with the school calendar.

Children with language difficulties have also been shown to have difficulty with timing involved in speech (Tallal & Gaab, 2006). Children with developmental dyslexia across different mother tongues exhibit poor phonological awareness thought to stem from rhythmic processing difficulties (Goswami et al., 2010), and are often unable to tap in time to a paced beat (Corriveau & Goswami, 2009). Research has demonstrated that musical rhythm training was associated with improvements in spelling in dyslexic children through a fifteen-week musical intervention programme conducted in mainstream primary education (Overy, 2003, 2010).

2.4.1.3 Reading Comprehension

Reading development depends not just on sound encoding and fluency but also on language comprehension (DCSF, 2009b). Language comprehension in turn depends on understanding and the ability to infer meaning from contextual information, which a phonics-based approach alone cannot provide, thus a combined approach is required. Children who find it difficult to infer meaning from language may require different interventions to phonological-based difficulties. The ability to remember text relies on recognition, recollection and familiarity. Recollection is strongest when allied to a strong experience of 'remembering' and is enhanced when information is processed semantically; where relationships between words are identified or when meaning is encoded to a word (Mirandola, Del Prete, Ghetti & Cornoldi, 2011).

Mental imagery training can help overcome verbal memory difficulties, (DCSF, 2009b). Music can provide important opportunities for children to contextualise abstract concepts and infer meaning through active and meaningful explorations of, and engagement with sounds and associated emotions or language that in turn support the development of mental imagery and auditory function (Kraus & Hornickel, 2012). However, some contextual information is known to derive from specific cues within the auditory signal, impacting not just on cognitive function in relation to reading or language comprehension, but also on emotional understanding, social communication and behaviour.

2.4.2 Emotional Comprehension and Emotional Intelligence

Learning to discern specific cues in the auditory signal also allows important emotional information to be conveyed that generates understanding of another person's emotional intention or reaction (Banai, Hornickel, Skoe, Nicol, Zecker & Kraus, 2009; Goswami, 2010). It also allows one sound to be distinguished from another, such as a teacher's

voice in a noisy classroom (Parbery-Clark, Skoe & Kraus, 2009a, 2009b). Consonant sounds are particularly vulnerable in noisy situations. The brain uses the onset and timing of these sounds to predict the rest of the word based on a redundancy model evolved to process large amounts of information quickly from key identifiers. Thus, discerning speech in noisy situations relies on good working memory in order to retrieve the correct information. This process incurs a neurological delay, which can impact on a child's ability to attend accurately to and comprehend someone speaking (Kraus, Strait & Parbery-Clark, 2012).

Difficulty discerning these cues, particularly in an educational setting, may have a number of ramifications. Words may lack context or meaning; a child may not understand a teacher's instructions; or they misinterpret the teacher's tone of voice, leading to confusion and behaviour that might be misinterpreted as misbehaviour or an unwillingness or inability to listen or cooperate, when an underlying auditory-cognitive difficulty may be the cause. Musicians are better at both perceiving emotional cues and speech-in-noise regardless of age or length of musical training. The latter ability is thought to arise from musicians' enhanced auditory working memory resulting in a shorter delay in retrieving the correct information (Parbery-Clark, Skoe & Kraus, 2009a, 2009b; Kraus, Strait & Parbery-Clark, 2012; Zendel & Alain, 2012).

The ability to discern, understand and regulate actions in response to the emotions of others and oneself is also known as emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995).

Schellenberg posits the idea that as the art of musical performance involves learning to express emotions, those with musical training will demonstrate higher levels of emotional intelligence (Schellenberg, 2009, 2011b; Schellenberg & Mankarious, 2012). However, he notes that research studies including his own research (Resnicow, Salovey & Repp, 2004; Schellenberg, 2004, 2006, 2011b) have failed to find evidence of an association between musical training and emotional intelligence and that any benefit is confined to intellectual abilities (Schellenberg, 2011b; Schellenberg & Winner, 2011) discussed further below.

Nevertheless, in a Test of Emotion Comprehension (TEC) musically trained children scored higher than non-musicians after demographic variables were taken into account, but significantly, this effect disappeared when IQ was held constant (Schellenberg & Mankarious, 2012). The musically trained group had higher levels of IQ than non-musicians. Indeed, a difference of one SD in IQ scores separated the two groups, the largest IQ difference reported in comparative studies. As a consequence Schellenberg

and Mankarious argue “the large effect size implicates a substantial role for pre-existing differences, with high functioning children more likely to take music lessons” (p. 889). This is an important conclusion, which is discussed further below.

Nevertheless, Schellenberg and Mankarious (2012) also note the visual and language-based nature of the TEC and suggest a purer measure might reveal a positive relationship between music training and emotional abilities. Schellenberg (2011b) suggests that studies using auditory based forms of testing might also yield different results, given musicians’ superior performance on listening tasks particularly in identifying emotional cues in speech, discussed above. However, Schellenberg and Mankarious also highlight the role group music-making might play, noting the need for careful listening and attention to emotional details when playing in an ensemble setting, citing Kirschner and Tomasello’s tapping study (2010) as evidence, which is discussed further below. To support this view, Schellenberg and Mankarious note that participation in social, non-musical activities such as sport is predictive of performance in the TEC. As their own study was largely centred on individual music lessons, Schellenberg and Mankarious suggest future research might consider the effect of different musical settings and the use of auditory-based measures of emotional comprehension.

The capacity to pay attention, listen and comprehend instructions is a crucial gateway to learning. Such evidence suggests musical training may help to develop the key auditory discrimination skills required to discern relevant speech cues, although this requires further research. On a more simple level, Ockelford (2000) recommends simplifying the auditory chaos of the classroom, particularly for those with the severest needs, by using a small range of musical cues to focus attention, signal class routine or the transition from one activity to another through simple intonations or songs, or use of instruments. Using music in these simple ways can provide an interesting context to focus and develop this critical skill through opportunities for arousal that music offers (Jonides, 2008), discussed below and further in Chapter Four.

2.5 Physical Development

The discussion so far has highlighted the importance of auditory function in the development of key cognitive, emotional, social and personal skills and how song, rhythm and movement can provide opportunities to support this development. In

keeping with findings from clinical and therapeutic practice particularly in neuro-disability, Hallam (2010) reviews a number of studies that indicate improvements in physical accuracy, endurance, ball skills, physical coordination, and gross and fine motor performance when children are engaged in rhythmic music programmes or instrumental learning. However, children with physical disabilities risk being excluded from movement-based musical activities. Nevertheless, considerable advances in music technology mean children with physical disabilities are able to access similar opportunities for musical participation and learning, self-expression and enjoyment alongside their peers with greater independence (Drake Music, 2012). As Ockelford (2000) points out, being able to move and respond to music, even in a very limited manner, provides important opportunities to respond and react to music.

2.6 The Biographical Nature of Auditory Function

Understanding of the interrelated effects of auditory function on learning is still in its infancy. However, it is already clear that perception of an auditory signal is just the start of a multi-sensory, embodied, emotional and social process, which has the potential to impact on a wide range of cognitive, emotional, social and physical learning that affects our understanding, behaviour and sense of belonging. Similar to the rings of a tree, reflecting growth patterns and prevailing environmental conditions, so auditory function is biographical in nature. Auditory function reflects what has been learnt and how it has been learnt (Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010). Hallam (2010) makes a similar observation noting how individual learning biographies:

...reflect the available learning opportunities and influences within the prevailing culture. As we engage with different musical activities over long periods of time permanent changes occur in the brain. These changes reflect not only what we have learned but also how we have learned. They will also influence the extent to which our developed skills are able to transfer to other activities.

(p. 270).

Hallam (2010) and Kraus & Chandrasekaran (2010) in their respective reviews of the literature concerning the effect of music on intellectual, social and emotional development, conclude that observed differences between musicians and non-musicians occur as a consequence of enhanced sensory, cognitive, spatial and auditory skills, developed to a level of automaticity through musical learning that leads to transfer of

learning in other related areas. However, as discussed earlier and above, Hallam (2010) notes this depends on the extent and nature of musical engagement and crucially, on the similarity of processes and level of skills. Nevertheless, despite a growing body of evidence highlighting musicians' enhanced auditory abilities and capacity to outperform non-musicians on a range of cognitive tasks, others take issue with the notion that music training alone accounts for these differences.

2.7 Nature Versus Nurture

There is general agreement that musicians have good auditory skills and that instrumental training can cause cortical changes in brain structure relevant to aspects of instrumental performance, particularly amongst professional musicians. Nevertheless, Schellenberg is critical of neuroscientists' "obsession" with plasticity (Schellenberg, 2011c, p. 310). He finds musicians' superior auditory skills unsurprising given the auditory nature of musical training (Schellenberg, 2009). Notably, this view is also shared by leading auditory neuroscientists (Strait & Kraus, 2014). However, where neuroscientists point to the wider potential of musical training to strengthen neural connections and shared processes involved in both music and auditory-based learning, Schellenberg and colleagues, as alluded to above, argue that musicians' superior auditory skills and superior cognitive performance reflect underlying genetic predispositions in cognitive function and personality traits as the following discussion now explores.

2.7.1 Underlying Cognitive Abilities

Schellenberg concludes from his own research and other related studies discussed below, that musicians appear to be a distinct group of high functioning individuals who are more likely than others to take music lessons and succeed at music because of their pre-existing cognitive abilities (Schellenberg, 2004, 2006, 2009, 2011a; Schellenberg & Mankarious, 2012; Schellenberg & Peretz, 2008; Weiss & Schellenberg, 2011; Schellenberg & Winner, 2011; Schellenberg & Weiss, 2013). Schellenberg argues this is evident in their above average performance in school grades compared to those without music training (Schellenberg, 2006, 2009, 2011a, 2011b), their good listening skills (Schellenberg, 2006, 2009, 2011a; Schellenberg & Winner, 2011), musical aptitude (Schellenberg, 2011b; Schellenberg & Peretz, 2008) and/or personality traits (Corrigall, Schellenberg & Misura, 2013; Schellenberg, 2011a). On the basis of these

studies and reviews of the literature, Schellenberg (2009) argues that these individuals are likely to perform well on any cognitive test. He concludes that:

with one “exception” (Schellenberg, 2004), this hypothesis can explain *all* of the relevant behavioural literature, namely why music lessons are associated with so many different outcome variables including FSIQ [full scale IQ], memory for verbal materials, reading ability, motor skills, visuo-spatial abilities and mathematical abilities. (p. 15).

The one “exception” to his hypothesis is a randomised study in which he demonstrated a causal relationship between musical training and IQ (Schellenberg, 2004). Whilst seemingly contradictory to his thesis outlined above, this study provided the starting point for a series of randomised controlled and correlational studies considered below, which, through a process of elimination of possible mediating factors, leads Schellenberg and colleagues to the above conclusion.

2.7.1.1 Music and Intelligence

Schellenberg’s 2004 study, which he describes as the “exception” to his argument, sought to identify the existence of specific associations between music training and aspects of cognitive function and whether music training was confined to intellectual development or led to other cognitive or social aspects of learning. 144 six-year-old children were randomly allocated across four groups, comprising small group music lessons (keyboard lessons or vocal Kodaly classes), drama lessons and a control group who did not receive any lessons in the first year but received keyboard lessons in the second year following the study; and tested for IQ, academic achievement and social function.

Full scale IQ (FSIQ) (an aggregate score of IQ across a number of subtests) increased across all the groups, something Schellenberg notes is consistent with school attendance. However, the music groups had larger increases in FSIQ scores (7 points) compared to the drama and control groups’ scores, which rose by 4.3 points. Although a small to medium effect, Schellenberg observed that such evidence was suggestive of far transfer, where learning occurs between less related domains, which he noted is relatively rare. However, no differences were observed between groups on the academic achievement test, which involved tests on mathematical, reading and spelling abilities. Thus, whilst a causal relationship was established in respect of IQ, Schellenberg argued this was a general effect and did not extend to specific subjects as

some suggest. These findings were supported by later comparative studies of musically trained and untrained children and adults (Schellenberg, 2006, 2011a; Schellenberg & Mankarious, 2012).

Schellenberg (2011a) argues that the 2004 study is the only randomised study to date, which provides “the only convincing evidence that music lessons cause increases in intelligence” (p. 286), noting that other studies such as Rauscher et al. (1997) and Costa-Giomi (1999), which indicated similar results in relation to intelligence had respectively inappropriate or no comparison activities; or had too small a sample to detect changes in FSIQ (Moreno et al., 2009).

2.7.1.2 A Durational Effect of Music Training

Schellenberg (2006) also identified a positive association between the length of musical training and IQ and academic performance amongst musically trained children.

Amongst undergraduates, the duration of playing music regularly in childhood was also found to be predictive of IQ in adulthood and average grades in high school. This view concurs with very recent research by Strait and Kraus (2014) that effects of music training extend into later life and may mitigate against cognitive decline in old age. Similarly, a correlational study found the length of musical training amongst a group of six to nine year olds was positively associated with the ability to identify a missing word in a sentence or paragraph (Corrigall & Trainor, 2011).

Nevertheless, Schellenberg disputes the logic of his finding of a durational effect. He argues on this basis, given the number of years professional musicians spend training, “professional musicians should be geniuses, which is patently untrue” (2011a, p. 285). Schellenberg asserts that the relationship between music training and IQ is not valid when professional musicians are compared to non-musicians, citing two studies where non-musicians outperformed musicians on a general intelligence test or showed no difference (Brandler & Rammsayer, 2003; Helmbold, Rammsayer & Altenmuller, 2005). On this basis, Schellenberg argues that professional musicians are a distinct group who may differ in personality but not in intelligence when compared to non-musicians. Schellenberg acknowledges these findings conflict with his earlier findings of a causal and durational relationship between music and IQ (2009). However, he notes other studies found no differences in intelligence between musicians and non-musicians (Bialystok & DePape, 2009; Schellenberg & Moreno, 2010), leading Schellenberg (2011a) to conclude that such gains are made when music is studied in addition to, rather than instead of other activities.

Schellenberg (2006, 2009, 2011a) concludes that as a positive association between music lessons and academic performance exists even when general intelligence is controlled, “children who take music lessons for relatively long durations of time tend to be particularly good students” (2011a, p. 285). He suggests that pre-existing differences in IQ may affect whether a child takes up music lessons; particularly if the child comes from a well educated family who can afford instrumental lessons, differences which are then further enhanced by musical training.

2.7.2 Mediating Factors

2.7.2.1 General Intelligence and Executive Function

Schellenberg and colleagues hypothesised that underlying factors, such as general intelligence (*g*) or executive function might mediate the causal relationship identified between music and intelligence (Schellenberg, 2004, 2006). General intelligence underlies performance on cognitive tests, of which 50% of its variance depends on genetic factors. However, in a comparative study of 40 musically trained and untrained undergraduates (Schellenberg & Moreno, 2010), the untrained group outperformed the musically trained group on the Raven’s Advanced Progressive Matrices test, a measure of *g*, which potentially rules out this hypothesis. Notably, the musically trained group performed better on pitch perception tests, confirming previous studies, which identify the advanced listening skills of musically trained individuals.

Similarly, it was hypothesised that executive function might be enhanced by music training with consequent effects on other areas of learning as it is positively correlated with IQ (Hannon & Trainor, 2007; Schellenberg 2009; Schellenberg & Peretz, 2008) Executive function involves a range of skills including working memory, decision making, the ability to concentrate, think ahead, make decisions and form judgments, to cope well under pressure and remain focussed.

In a comparative study, 106 9-12 year olds were tested on IQ and measures of executive function (Schellenberg, 2011a). Musically trained children once again had higher IQs (10 points or 1 SD) compared to untrained children. Although IQ was predictive of performance on executive function tests, surprisingly, no effect was found between music training and executive function, with one exception occurring on the digit span test. As this test falls within the battery of IQ tests Schellenberg suggests this anomaly may reflect the gains in IQ observed in the musically trained group. He also notes that it is possible to have good IQ but poor executive function, for example, following a

brain injury or evident in children with autism or ADHD. Thus, it may be the same for musically trained participants, who appear to have normal executive function but above average intelligence. Schellenberg points out that the large difference observed in relation to IQ in the above study is so high that it cannot be accounted for by environmental factors and must therefore reflect genetic factors. However, other studies indicate a role for executive function (Bugos et al., 2007, Bialystok & DePape, 2009) but Schellenberg suggests such evidence is inconclusive, pointing to methodological difficulties with both studies.

Nevertheless, a later study by Moreno, et al. (2011) identified improvements in vocabulary knowledge as part of a verbal intelligence test amongst 90% of children aged 4-6 years old after 20 days of training on a computerised music listening programme. However this was not evident in a group following a visual art computerised training programme. In contrast to Schellenberg's study (2011a) these changes were positively correlated with performance on an executive function test. As children were pseudo-randomly assigned to each group to avoid differences in intelligence or prior musical or visual arts training experience occurring between the two groups, the authors claim that this study provides the first evidence of broad transfer between music listening and verbal ability and suggests close cognitive links exist between music and language, due to overlapping processes as Patel (2012) suggests in his OPERA hypothesis, discussed earlier in the chapter. They suggest that the results of the executive function test may be due to the requirements of music training in terms of concentration, control and memory, necessary also for good executive function. Indeed they posit the idea that the improvements seen in the verbal test may have been mediated by enhanced attention and verbal memory, although this might be due to other aspects of executive function which they were unable to test. The research team, which notably included Schellenberg, highlight the short duration of the training and point to other studies demonstrating similar effects on language after training periods of weeks and months, which they believe "confirms the powerful ability of music to induce brain plasticity and broad transfer effects" (Moreno et al., 2011, p. 1429).

This is an interesting conclusion given Schellenberg's earlier criticism of neuroscientists' obsession with brain plasticity and his recently expressed view (2011a) that observed differences are due to genetic factors. The authors also highlight the educational significance of the study's findings, particularly as verbal intelligence is

predictive of academic achievement and that IQ evaluated at age five is strongly related to IQ later in life, the implication being that such short term training boosts verbal IQ at this young age. This study highlights the increasing recognition of critical windows for brain development discussed further below.

2.7.2.2 A Schooling Effect

Schellenberg (2009) raises the possibility of a schooling effect, known to increase IQ especially in small group teaching. He suggests that instrumental lessons conducted outside school resemble a school activity in the need to practice, concentrate, pay attention recognise patterns, develop their memory and motor skills and read music and thus might act in similar ways, boosting IQ and accounting for the increases in IQ discussed above. Although Schellenberg (2009) recognises that the relationship between music and cognitive function may be circular with one affecting the other in a complex, interactive web of underlying mechanisms, he also argues that the findings regarding musically trained children's greater academic performance discussed above, may also reflect a number of personality traits in respect of motivation, concentration, confidence and cooperation.

2.7.2.3 Personality Traits

Corrigall, Schellenberg and Misura's study (2013) confirms Schellenberg's hypothesis above concerning personality traits. The study investigated associations between duration of musical training and demographic, cognitive and personality variables amongst two groups comprising undergraduates and children aged 10-12 years old. In both groups personality variables predicted the duration of musical training even when demographic and cognitive abilities were held constant. Significantly, they found children's cognitive ability no longer predicted training duration when demographic and personality variables were held constant. Of the "Big Five" personality traits investigated, (conscientiousness, openness-to-experience, agreeableness, extraversion, neuroticism), they found that an individual's openness to experience was more indicative of training duration than other variables, including conscientiousness. They highlight the genetic nature of personality variables, although they do not rule out environmental influences in shaping both cognitive abilities or personality, and suggest that musical training itself may act as a mediating factor between personality and cognitive function. Corrigall, Schellenberg and Misura acknowledge the clear causal relationship between music training and changes observed in brain function and structure and improvements in listening abilities with consequent impacts on speech

perception and language processing. Nonetheless, they point out that this relationship is dependent on an individual's motivational state. Importantly, Corrigan and colleagues call for a rebalancing of the debate to take account of underlying genetic factors, which they argue have been underestimated thus far by researchers. Moreover, they point out that virtually all previous studies have failed to account for personality traits, something, which they argue should be, addressed in future research.

2.8 Identifying a Causal Relationship

The discussion has examined the role of auditory function in the development of a range of key learning skills. It has also highlighted overlaps between auditory and musical processes of learning, which some argue offers the opportunity for a transfer of learning to occur between areas employing the same or similar skills. However, as outlined above, others take issue with this view, calling for a greater recognition of the role genetic factors may play in the relationship between music training and wider benefits. Indeed, Corrigan, Schellenberg and Misura (2013) argue "the burden of proof should rest on those who claim systematic far-transfer effects from music lessons to cognitive abilities" (p. 223). Isolating the causes of this relationship is challenging for a number of reasons, which are considered now.

2.8.1 Methodological Issues

Schellenberg is critical of those who intentionally or unintentionally infer a causal relationship between music and other learning, particularly when such evidence is used to justify school music education programmes. As already alluded to, he and colleagues point out that much of the evidence relies on correlational studies or quasi-experimental studies where the direction of any relationship remains unclear (Schellenberg, 2004, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2011a, 2011b; Schellenberg & Peretz, 2008; Schellenberg & Weiss, 2013; Schellenberg & Winner, 2011; Weiss & Schellenberg, 2011). Selective headline media reporting of studies, methodological difficulties and weaknesses and reporting inaccuracies within the literature compound this issue (Bialystok, 2011; Hargreaves & Aksentijevic, 2011; Husain, Thompson & Schellenberg, 2002; Nantais & Schellenberg, 1999; Schellenberg, 2006, 2008, 2009, 2011a, 2011b, 2011c; Schellenberg & Hallam, 2005; Schellenberg & Peretz, 2008; Schellenberg & Weiss, 2013; Schellenberg & Winner, 2011).

The most notable example of such difficulties is the so-called Mozart effect, which reported improvements in spatial skills after a short period of listening to a recording of a Mozart piano sonata (Rauscher, Shaw & Ky, 1993). The initial study was championed by the media as evidence of a direct link between music and other learning, sparking the myth that simply listening to Mozart makes people clever. However, Rauscher, Shaw and Ky's initial study was later shown to be methodologically flawed, with the original journal article containing omissions and inaccuracies (Schellenberg, 2006). Nevertheless, follow up randomised controlled studies demonstrated similar listening effects on spatial abilities however, significantly, this was observed following exposure not just to Mozart but to a variety of other musical and non-musical listening stimuli: notably, piano music by Schubert (Husain, Thompson & Schellenberg, 2002), an audio recording of a Stephen King novel (Nantais & Schellenberg, 1999), pop music by Blur (Schellenberg & Hallam, 2005) and Japanese play songs (Schellenberg, Nakata, Hunter & Tamoto, 2007). The Japanese play song study also demonstrated an increase in the creative processing speed and content of children's drawings created in the Japanese play song condition compared to drawings made in the control conditions. These positive listening effects were shown to be a function of the tempo and mode of the music (major/minor; happy/sad), and significantly, the influence of individual listening preferences. Such findings have educational implications. Choosing music that children prefer to listen to rather than music chosen on the basis of the teacher's preferences might arguably yield more effective and creative work in the classroom. These findings reinforce once again Hallam's assertion (2010), made earlier in the discussion, that musical learning must be enjoyable to be effective in supporting personal development; and they support Sloboda's observation that musical learning in schools must be relevant to children's musical identities and lives outside school if it is to be engaging (2001). Such studies highlight the need for an informed use of music, based on an understanding of the factors, which may affect potential wider outcomes.

2.8.1.1 The Challenge of Identifying a Causal Relationship

Researchers in cognitive and neuroscience highlight the need for randomised controlled studies, preferably through longitudinal studies in order to identify any causal relationships between music and other benefits. However, designing longitudinal randomised controlled studies of this sort are particularly challenging in this research context due to the complex nature and experience of music, ethical considerations

within educational research contexts and financial constraints (Bialystok, 2011; Hargreaves & Aksentijevic 2011; Schellenberg, 2006, 2009; Strait & Kraus, 2014).

Likewise, as the discussion has already suggested, observed differences between musically trained and untrained groups may be affected by confounding variables such as socio-economic status, levels of parental education and participation in extra-curricular activities; or by other factors such as individual levels of intelligence, personality traits, phonological awareness or pedagogical approach, which have not been measured or controlled for within some studies. Schellenberg (2011a) argues that a valid measure of general intelligence or full scale IQ (FSIQ) needs to be measured and held constant if any specific association between cognitive performance and musical training is to be effectively established. Equally, the inconsistent and broad use of such terms as “musician” or “musical training” (Robb, Burns & Carpenter, 2011; Schellenberg & Winner, 2011) have hampered efforts to replicate and compare studies across the literature. The use of such broad terms disguise the myriad of different musical learning approaches, contexts and types of “musicians” that exist in real world settings, discussed further below.

These concerns are increasingly being addressed directly in more recent neuroscientific research. This is evident in more explicit reporting of the limitations of correlational studies within study reports (Strait & Kraus, 2014); and in experimental design, by accounting and controlling for confounding variables ignored by previous studies. Equally, greater reference is being made within the cognitive research community of the need to account for the influence of environmental factors within real world settings, in order to understand the complex relationship between individual and environmental factors and better reflect differences in pedagogical approach as well as different types of musical learning opportunities and musicians (Schellenberg & Winner, 2011).

2.8.2 Evidence of a Causal Relationship

Despite Schellenberg’s criticisms of the literature, he does point to randomised controlled studies where musical training may cause improvements in phonological awareness (Dege & Schwarzer, 2011; Gromko, 2005), which may account for observed gains in literacy-based tests discussed earlier. Thus, it is argued that music itself does not lead directly to gains in literacy but is mediated by facilitating an improvement in a key skill, in this case phonological awareness, which in turn supports literacy development. Similarly, a causal relationship has been identified in relation to literacy

where musical training based on Kodaly, Orff and Wuytack pedagogical approaches led to improvements in the ability to discern pitch changes in speech with associated improvements in reading abilities. When compared to a painting intervention these transferable benefits were specific only to children engaged in the active musical intervention (Moreno, et al. 2009). Schellenberg and Weiss (2013) also identify a number of randomised studies where musical training led to improvements in visuo-spatial skills amongst children with low socio-economic status (Bilhartz, Bruhn & Ohlson, 2000; Portowitz, Lichtenstein, Egorova, & Brand, 2009; Rauscher & Hinton, 2011)

2.9 A Holistic View

This discussion thus far has focussed on the effect of musical training on cognitive function and the challenge of identifying a causal relationship. It has highlighted the methodological difficulties and conflicting evidence that exists within the literature in respect of associations between music training in all its forms and other learning.

Schellenberg's criticisms of the empirical literature are highly pertinent to the identification of a causal relationship between music and other learning, particularly in the design of studies in order to take account of and control for confounding variables. However, his explanation that musical benefits are dependent on genetic predispositions does not take account of empirical, case-study and qualitative evidence in educational, therapeutic and community settings, which highlights (albeit by individual's own accounts or the observations of others) the wider individual and collective impact of music across diverse populations with differing levels of cognitive function, musical aptitude and interest. Such research notes the wider benefits of music are available to all, regardless of social background (Costa-Giomi, 1999), previous musical ability, or stage of life (Burnard, 2002; Fassbender, 1996; Lamont, 2011; Lecanuet, 1996; Miell & MacDonald, 2000; Papousek, 1996; Pitts, 2009; Trainor, Shahin & Roberts, 2003; Young, 2003, 2008). Such a view is supported by evidence from music therapy (Bunt, 2002; Bunt & Hoskyns, 2004; Magee, 2002; Pavlicevic, 1997), school and community-based music projects (CUREE, 2011; MacDonald & Miell, 2002) and special education (Ockelford, 1998, 2008; Welch, Ockelford & Zimmerman, 2001).

Schellenberg's claims that musicians' observed advantages must be "instantiated somewhere in the brain" (Schellenberg, 2011a, p. 296) and are reflective of high functioning individuals, attract criticism for his dismissal of the role learning can play, particularly in brain development and rehabilitation (Bialystok, 2011). Whilst the role of genetic predispositions certainly cannot be ignored, by Schellenberg's own admission, genetic differences only account for 50-70% of individual difference (2009, 2011a), thus the role of other environmental factors or mediating factors cannot similarly be discounted. This may seem obvious, but at times the literature appears polarised by this debate, although there is increasing recognition of each research strand's position and contribution and the need to adopt a more holistic approach.

2.9.1 Environmental Influences

Stewart and Williamon (2008) suggest that the foundations for learning are laid down in early human development. Genetic pre-dispositions no doubt exist at this early stage of life, however, as highlighted earlier, the environmental influence of early proto-musical interactions appear to play an important role in the early development of good auditory function through the social interaction of parent and child. This challenges the notion that good listening skills are solely derived from one's genetic inheritance alone. As neonatal (McMahon, Wintermark & Lahav, 2012) and theoretical research (Trevvarthen, 2000) suggest, being deprived of this early stimulating auditory and arguably, musical learning environment can have a negative impact on a child's cognitive and emotional development.

Despite Schellenberg's criticism of brain plasticity, Schellenberg (2009) and Kraus and Chandrasekaran (2010) in their separate reviews of the literature, each point to research that suggests positive associations between music training and other cognitive abilities are stronger if musical learning occurs at a younger age, preferably before seven years of age. Schellenberg suggests "the possibility of a sensitive period in childhood when music lessons are most likely to lead to non-musical benefits" (2009, p. 7).

Nonetheless, Costa-Giomi's (1999) longitudinal study of the effects of piano lessons over three years indicated that observed musical benefits did not extend beyond the third year, suggesting that there is not just an optimal age at which to start musical training, but also a period over which such musical benefits may have greatest impact. Reflecting this view, research attention is now starting to recognise and consider the influence of pedagogical factors by investigating the nature, frequency and length of

musical training and wider outcomes (François, Tillman & Schön, 2012; Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010; Schellenberg & Winner, 2011),

2.9.2 Pedagogical Factors

This review of the literature has deliberately highlighted how song, rhythm and movement are involved in both musical and non-musical learning, in an attempt to try and tease out the central elements of musical learning from intervention studies involving a variety of musical training. Whilst intervention studies are highly informative in terms of defining the wider impact of music on other learning, historically the nature of training has not been the central focus, leading to uncertainty as to what might constitute the best method or musical approach. Until very recently neuroscience intervention studies provided limited details of the exact nature of musical training in their reporting and earlier studies focussed on professional musicians with a lifetime of intensive, formal and advanced music training experience.

Given the wide variety and quality of musical learning opportunities that exist inside and outside of formal education it cannot be assumed that all musicians receive similar musical training or may achieve the level of training of a professional musician.

Similarly, as Ockelford (2000) highlights, the notion of musical training suggests a set of externally defined skills to be learnt. Much research has focussed on the impact of formal instrumental lessons. However, this is to ignore the influence of school-based music education, which may confer some training benefits, evident in the increasing literature investigating the impact of school music education programmes (CUREE, 2011; Slater, Tierney & Kraus, 2013).

The term “musical training” can also disguise a variety of different musical pedagogical approaches, which may emphasise specific aspects of musical learning. For example, musical pedagogical approaches put forward by Kodály (Choksy, 1981), Orff (Orff & Keetman, 1950), Dalcroze (1916) and Suzuki (1969) focus on aural musical training, which might yield different results in relation to non-musical outcomes compared to musical training focussed solely on notation-based learning for example. Likewise, “musical training” does not necessarily bring to mind spontaneous, cultural and social forms of informal music-making that are gaining recognition for the benefits for health and wellbeing (Saarikallio, 2012). Nor early childhood interactions with parents and caregivers discussed earlier. In this informal musical context, as in a therapeutic context, the musical focus is centred on the exposure, experience and engagement with

music rather than the learning of any instrumental skill. Thus, the notion of “musical training” or “musician” as defined in intervention studies needs to be treated with care.

Isolating the causes and effects of music remains a key research interest, which is particularly useful in informing the wider therapeutic, clinical and educational application of music. Nevertheless, this is difficult given the ubiquitous and complex nature of music and the variety of individual experiences of music and the influence of underlying or mediating factors. Thus, as already mentioned some question whether identifying a causal relationship between music and observed effects is possible or necessary (Hargreaves & Aksentijevic, 2011). Trevarthen (2000) too warns of the dangers of isolating separate processes for analysis; an approach that risks losing sight of music’s joyful, aesthetic qualities and holistic impact.

Patel (2012) notes that other forms of training may lead to similar effects to those noted here. Indeed positive effects can be achieved through auditory listening training programmes that do not involve music (Kraus & Anderson, 2013; Nicol & Kraus, 2005; Patel, 2012). Similarly, it might be argued such effects could be developed just as easily through other artistic or sporting activities or derive from increased adult attention or small group settings (Neville et al., 2009). However, Patel suggests it is perhaps the social, imitative and emotional context of music-making that differentiates music from other training programmes and interventions; in the opportunities it provides for human interaction, which in itself may act as another mediating factor, and the provision of an enjoyable learning context, through which other skills can be explored.

2.10 The Social Context of Musical Learning

2.10.1 Emotional, Social and Personal Development and Group Music-Making

Group music-making appears to offer opportunities to develop key cognitive and social skills and support emotional and personal development in a variety of ways: through imitative musical interactions; the chance to explore and regulate emotion through physiological responses to the musical pulse; or through the challenges and rewards of working with others to achieve a desired sound or performance. This is particularly relevant to this research context as school music programmes are delivered in group settings within the classroom or class music lesson, in contrast to the individual nature

of instrumental lessons outside of school, which is the focus of much of the research outlined above. Nevertheless, group instrumental lessons in school now form an important part of first access programmes in primary music education, which aim to give every child the chance to learn to play an instrument as part of the National Plan for Music Education (NPME) (DfE, DCMS, 2011a). Furthermore, the limited research evidence documenting the actual or potential use of music in the context of learning support provision occurs in a group setting (Mather, 2007; Overy, 2000, 2003, 2010; Rabinowitch, Cross & Burnard, 2013; Wan et al., 2011). However, studies in neuroscience are starting to investigate the effect of the social context of music-making on the brain.

2.10.1.1 The Shared Affective Motion Experience Model

The Shared Affective Motion Experience (SAME) model proposed by Molnar-Szakacs and Overy (2006) builds on the concept of a mirror neuron system within the brain identified by Pacherie and Dokic (2006). The SAME model proposes that musical engagement is not a series of isolated responses to auditory signals but occurs in a social context, which evokes shared emotions, empathy and socially bonding experiences: “Musical auditory signals are processed as a series of intentional expressive motor acts, recruiting similar neural networks in both agent and listener” (Overy, 2012, p. 66). Thus, human interaction through social musical experiences may also be a vital contributor to any musical benefit (Molnar-Szakacs, Green & Overy, 2012; Overy, 2012).

Similar to theories put forward in Trevarthen’s Intrinsic Motive Pulse (IMP) model (2000) discussed earlier, Overy (2012) argues that rhythmic processing is an important constituent to this process through a shared humanly generated pulse, around which individual actions are coordinated. Kirschner and Tomasello (2009) found that children as young as two and a half years old can tap along in time to a humanly generated pulse more quickly and accurately compared to a machine driven pulse. They suggest that this may be due to the social, playful nature of the joint music-making activity or to the desire to move in synchrony with other people through “joint attention” (p. 312). In a follow up study, Kirschner and Tomasello (2010) observed increased levels of cooperation amongst children in a helpfulness task administered after the same joint-music-making activity.

2.10.1.2 Developing Empathy through Rhythmic Group Music-Making

Children with autism have been shown to have disrupted mirror neuron systems and find it difficult to show empathy and lack imitation and motor skills, but demonstrate understanding of emotions in musical contexts (Molnar-Szakacs & Heaton, 2012). Reflecting the theories outlined above, Rabinowitch, Cross and Burnard (2013) demonstrated how empathy might be developed through the processes of entrainment and imitation involved in musical group interaction (MGI), through the achievement of a shared improvisatory, imitative and rhythmic performance or composition goal. The authors note that to the child these are just fun musical games, which they argue could be easily incorporated into a standard musical development programme. In contrast, for the educator, this musical interaction provides an important means of directly targeting the cognitive and social processes that underlie the development of this social skill. Rhythmic social music-making also provides multi-sensory opportunities to regulate and explore emotions, shown to be of particular value to children who have experienced trauma.

2.10.1.3 Exploring Mood and Emotion through Rhythmic Group Music-Making

A developing area of research lies in the study of endocrine and physiological responses to music (Kreutz, Quiroga Murcia & Bongard, 2012), which offer interesting insights into the wider potential of music to regulate individual mood and emotion, particularly in group music-making. Earlier, the discussion considered a series of listening studies designed to explore the so-called Mozart Effect, but in so doing highlighted the role musical mode and tempo play as meditating factors in regulating individual moods and levels of arousal following passive musical listening.

Osborne (2012) describes how he uses the tempo and mood of music to regulate heartbeat, breathing and cortisol production in order to encourage refugee children suffering from Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) to enter into a full exploration of sound, energy, movement and emotion. Osborne argues similarly, that it is the entrainment of individual movements to a shared pulse, including the controlled breathing involved in singing, which helps to target the extremes of sluggishness and hyperactivity often associated with PTSD. A careful choice of musical activities provides children with the opportunity to experience the full range of levels of activity and emotion to counter the effects of trauma, which may also be helpful to children who experience hyperactivity or withdrawal. Osborne's work uses improvisatory, creative music-making techniques and draws on music therapy methodologies that support the

development of musical empathy through reciprocated musical exchanges. The social context of group music-making also appears to offer valuable opportunities to develop interpersonal and communication skills. This is evident in research investigating the impact of musical workshops with adults and children with SEND in community and mainstream learning support settings.

2.10.1.4 Communication, Joint Attention, Cooperation and Interpersonal Skills

MacDonald and Miell (2002) in their review of gamelan workshops for individuals with SEND, note how the social nature of ensemble music-making encourages communication and joint attention through the shared focus on the musical leader. This was evident in observed improvements in joint attention scores and cooperation over the course of the ten-week project.

Similar results were observed in my own mixed methods investigation of a multi-sensory music-making programme with a learning support group of 13 year-olds with moderate learning difficulties in a mainstream international secondary school (Mather, 2007), outlined in the Preface and the previous chapter. Post-study interviews indicated how the group music-making sessions had helped pupils to develop social skills such as teamwork, cooperation, collaboration and negotiation to achieve the desired sound, that was evident in participants' self reports of their learning as Wendy explained:

You have to work together to make a sound. Because if someone plays six beats at the same time as someone plays one beat, it sounds totally weird, you have to work as a group.

(Mather, 2007, p. 41)

Wendy's comment reflects the findings of studies of the group dynamics and verbal and bodily communication between professional musicians performing in ensembles (Murnighan & Conlon, 1991; Davidson & Good, 2002; Williamon & Davidson, 2002). Making music with others requires attentive listening and watching, coordinating individual actions and intentions to a shared pulse, developing key cognitive skills through a multi-sensory approach. The pupils in the learning support study were aware of the musical importance of these skills: "I had to watch and I had to listen to Wendy, if she was doing that beat and I wasn't - was she doing 2 or 1 [beats]?" (Anne) (Mather, 2007, p. 39). In these ways, individuals appeared to be able to directly and simultaneously develop not just musical, but essential cognitive, social and interpersonal skills.

The SAME model proposed by Molnar-Szakacs and Overy (2006), outlined above, offers possible explanations for the observed social learning in MacDonald and Miell's (2002) workshops with individuals with SEND and why Anne, quoted above, was able to develop her ability to discern tempo changes through watching her friends through the social mechanisms of shared rhythmical activity. These examples also echo Trevarthen's IMP theory discussed at the start of this chapter.

2.10.1.5 Self-Regulation

Winsler, Ducenne and Koury (2011) argue that singing, dancing and music-making provide important cultural tools for self-regulation through motor control (stop/go; fast/slow; loud/soft) and emotional recognition and response. Echoing Moog's (1976) influential research concerning young children's musical self-talk, Winsler, Ducenne and Koury's study found that pre-school children who attended a music and movement programme (Kindermusik¹⁰) demonstrated greater self-regulatory skills in a delayed gratification task through humming or self-talk compared to children who had not participated in the programme. They reported a dose effect, with greater effects seen in those who had participated for the most time in the music programme.

2.10.1.6 Self-Esteem and Confidence

The benefits of music for children on the autistic spectrum are notable and gaining in recognition, as too is their considerable sensitivity, interest and talent in music (Molnar-Szakacs & Heaton, 2012). However, despite a number of qualitative studies reporting increased levels of self-esteem, verbal communication, social interactions and relationships, eye contact and mood regulation from music-making for this group, the research area lacks empirical evidence (Hillier, Greher, Poto & Dougherty, 2011). Hillier and colleagues sought to address this issue in an empirical study of high-functioning autistic adolescents and young adults engaged in an eight-week music programme involving 90 minute composition, improvising and multi-media music sessions. Post-test, they found increased self-esteem, reduced self-reported and parent-reported levels of anxiety and improved social relationships.

Similarly, a quasi-randomised longitudinal study by Costa-Giomi (1999) indicated improvements in self-esteem in a group of disadvantaged children who received piano lessons for three years compared to those who did not have piano lessons. However, an

¹⁰ Available at: <http://www.kindermusik.co.uk/>

experimental study by Schellenberg (2004) where children were assigned to keyboard lessons, a vocal group, drama or a control group who had no lessons, found significant increases in social skills only amongst participants in the drama group. Notably decreases in social skills were observed for children attending keyboard lessons but not for those attending the vocal group. However, as Schellenberg points out (2009), social skills are different to self-esteem.

Qualitative evidence highlights how the experience of musical learning and performance can be transformative, affecting self-concept and motivation and aspiration about future learning through the recognition and satisfaction musical performance in all its forms can bring. MacDonald and Miell (2002) confirm this view, also noting gains in self-confidence and changes in self-perception and identity as a consequence of participation in the gamelan workshops discussed above. This was also evident in the learning support project (Mather, 2007) where Anne, quoted above, who had the greatest levels of cognitive difficulty within the group was unable to tell the difference between fast and slow at the start of the project, five weeks earlier. She reported her pride in her musical achievements:

Yeah well now I feel I can keep in the rhythm and be able to clap the rhythm when you put your fingers up (*finger conducting exercise*) and we had to look. I am really good at doing that because I couldn't do that before. I am really proud of myself.

(Mather 2007, p. 50)

The potential to develop self-confidence and self-esteem through experiences of flow is established in the literature (Csizkszentmihalyi, 2002). Neurological and cognitive studies investigating the impact of music on social and emotional skills such as empathy and mood regulation offer new insights into how music might be used to support such learning and experience through targeted group music-making musical activities or a child's musical development. However, Schellenberg and colleagues' research (Schellenberg, 2004; Schellenberg & Mankarious, 2012) highlights that music's capacity to develop social skills or emotional intelligence is not automatic and may be dependent upon the nature of the musical activity. Nevertheless, Schellenberg and Mankarious acknowledge the potential of the social context of group music-making and recognise that children may enjoy the experience of music lessons, which may make it different or special in this respect compared to other extra-curricular activities.

This is where qualitative research evidence gathered from therapeutic, educational, sociological and clinical settings might make a positive contribution to the debate. It can help to balance quantitative research through its exploration of human experiences of musical engagement in real world settings, where wider benefits may be derived implicitly across a range of learning contexts or more explicitly, as a therapeutic or educational intervention. In so doing it can inform and provide signposts for future empirical research in real world and laboratory contexts. However, this discussion has highlighted the need for methodological rigour and the need to account for a range of mediating factors or confounding variables if the causes of such wider benefits are to be more clearly identified.

This evidence identifies musical “training” as a positive, and in some cases causal, factor in musicians’ superior auditory skills with the potential for wider educational application. This evidence has led to calls for equal access to music provision in schools (Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010) and highlighted its potential use in learning support provision (Mather, 2007, 2013; Overy 2000, 2003, 2010, 2012; Rabinowitch, Cross & Burnard, 2013; Wan et al., 2011). However, as this review has shown this view is not universally accepted and causality remains a key area for research and debate. Nevertheless, taking experimental, empirical and qualitative evidence together, music in all its variety, appears to be an interesting educational resource to consider in the mainstream learning support context. The chapter now concludes by considering calls for its wider application in the light of evidence from music education research.

2.11 School Music Education Programmes

As outlined at the start of this chapter, school-based music education provision is increasingly seen as the means of enabling all children to have access to the wider potential benefits of music and not just the privileged few who can afford private instrumental tuition (DfE, DCMS, 2011a; DfE, DCMS, 2011b; Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010). Moreover, increasing reference is being made to the potential of music as a specific intervention to support and target the individual learning needs of children with SEND as part of learning support provision. Thus, the question of whether music has wider educational benefits is also of considerable interest and importance not just to researchers but also to educators, clinicians, support workers, parents and policymakers.

2.11.1 Music is an Existing Resource in Schools

Music is a statutory foundation subject within the present National Primary Curriculum in England meaning that schools must provide music education. Each primary school's music subject leader is responsible for the delivery and organisation of their school's music education, even if it is provided by an external organisation. Schools may rely on class teachers or the music subject leader to deliver this statutory requirement within the normal classroom or music classroom. Alternatively, schools may buy in music services through regional hubs or employ a specialist music teacher. Peripatetic instrumental teachers provide tuition paid for by parents or subsidies from schools, government, local authorities or regional music hubs. Although music education is seen by some researchers as an important vehicle to deliver access to musical learning opportunities on a mass scale, research evidence noted at the start of the chapter, suggests that equal access to musical learning opportunities in schools remains an issue, particularly for children with SEND (Drake Music, 2012).

2.11.2 The Challenge of Equal Access to High Quality Music Provision

A review by Ofsted of music in primary schools in England (2012b) found good or outstanding music teaching, singing and achievement in only a third of schools, which the report noted was poor in relation to overall school performance. It noted that the use of verbal learning objectives, whilst seen to be adhering to good classroom practice, did not guarantee quality musical learning and criticised the amount of teacher talk in music lessons, emphasising the need for music to be the target language. The Youth Music survey (2006), mentioned at the start of this chapter, revealed that although children enjoyed listening to music, only 37% of children surveyed had made any music in the last three months prior to the survey. More specifically, Ofsted's review noted above found that children with SEND, looked-after children and children receiving free school meals were less likely to take up instrumental lessons or participate in extracurricular music activities, with only 6% of children with SEND learning an instrument compared to 14% of children without such needs.

Music's wider educational and therapeutic potential has arguably received greater recognition in special education settings compared to mainstream education, although a review of music education in special schools in England and Wales showed that both music education and therapy provision was patchy in provision and quality (Welch, Ockelford & Zimmerman, 2001). Ofsted identified best musical practice occurred when

children learnt in small steps through a multi-sensory approach without notation, through good role modelling where instructions were either sung or communicated musically without the need for spoken language, to ensure a good aural understanding of the key objectives for the lesson (2012b). This notion of best practice corresponds to best practice for children with SEND outlined in Chapter One. This is important as evidence suggests notation-based musical pedagogical approaches present difficulties for children with dyslexia (Oglethorpe, 2002).

Similarly, access to musical learning opportunities appears inhibited by music educators' limited knowledge about the nature and needs of children with learning difficulties, which they report affects their confidence and ability to differentiate musical learning (Darrow, 2003; McCord & Fitzgerald, 2006; Wilson & McCrary, 1996). Mismatches between children's musical experiences inside and outside of school can affect children's musical identity and willingness to engage in school music-making opportunities (Lamont, 2002; Lamont, Hargreaves, Marshall & Tarrant 2003; North & Hargreaves, 2008; Sloboda, 2001). The need for musical learning to be relevant reflects the earlier discussion about the need for music to be engaging and enjoyable and the influence of individual preferences.

More broadly, limited musical training opportunities for primary school educators affect the musical confidence and the profile of music in schools (Hallam, Creech & Varvarigou, 2011; Hallam, et al., 2007; Hennessy, 2000; Holden & Button, 2006; Reid, 2009), restricting the availability of musical learning opportunities in school. Similarly, negative attitudes towards music affect its place and value in the curriculum (Hallam, 2012; Hallam & Hanke, 2012; O'Toole, 2009). These findings highlight the challenges facing music education in ensuring equal access to music-making opportunities (Griffiths, 2013; Overy, 2012), particularly to children with SEND. They suggest that access to music is not always equal or of sufficient quality to make an impact as intervention research studies may suggest.

2.11.3 Addressing the Challenge of Equal Access to Music

Over the last decade, national programmes such as Sing Up¹¹ and Wider Opportunities¹² have attempted to address issues of access and quality. Evidence suggests Sing Up has

¹¹ More information is available at: <http://www.singup.org/>

raised the profile and level of school singing in primary schools in England (CUREE, 2011) through a campaign to introduce five minutes of daily singing in schools, supported with online resources, training and support for schools. The Wider Opportunities scheme (increasingly referred to as ‘first access’) is designed to fulfil the government’s pledge through the NMPE to provide every child with the opportunity to learn a musical instrument through subsidised or free tuition (DfE, DCMS, 2011a). However, although it has challenged traditional access routes to instrumental musical learning, its implementation has met with varying degrees of success in terms of musical learning, teaching and school commitment (Ofsted, 2012a; Ofsted, 2012b; Lamont, Leighton Underhill & Hale, 2009).

Sing Up’s Beyond the Mainstream programme, now known as Accessible Learning, has actively sought to develop the concept of equal musical access. This programme focuses on children considered to be at the margins of mainstream education, including children with SEND, looked after children, traveller children and excluded children in pupil referral units. Sing Up has worked with national disability and SEND music organisations to develop best practice through accessible music resources and training for schools and key groups working musically with children with SEND. Similarly, Youth Music (Dickens, 2010; Dillon, 2010) and In Harmony¹³ projects (Lord et al., 2013), based on the El Sistema programme founded in Venezuela, along with local and regional music groups, work with marginalised groups in the community. These collective efforts, supported by commissioned research, evaluation and consultation have expanded and developed the notion of ‘music for all’ in educational and community-based settings, drawing attention to the wider benefits of music-making for cognitive and social development, health and wellbeing and school attainment (CUREE, 2011; Slater, Tierney & Kraus, 2013). Ensuring equal access to music for all children, but particularly children with SEND, is thus now a key priority on national, regional and local music education agenda.

¹² More information is available at: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/tuning-wider-opportunities-specialist-instrumental-tuition-for-pupils-key-stage-2>

¹³ More information is available at: <http://ihse.org.uk/>

2.12 Music as a Learning Support Resource or Intervention

The wealth of empirical, theoretical and case studies of the wider educational and therapeutic potential of music has led researchers to argue that music could be used to support development of key cognitive and social learning skills for children experiencing learning difficulty (Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010; Mather, 2007, 2013; Overy, 2000, 2003, 2010; Rabinowitch, Cross & Burnard, 2013; Wan et al., 2011).

This definition and use however extends beyond traditional notions of music education, where the processes of musical learning are taken for granted by musicians who regard them as necessary skills to perform a particular piece of music. However, as has been shown, critically, these skills and processes appear to be involved in key areas of learning, which educators are seeking to develop and support in children with SEND.

2.12.1 Musical Education, Training, Learning, Therapy or Intervention?

Snowling and Hulme (2011) define a “well founded intervention” (p. 1) as one based on sound theory, knowledge of how skills develop and how best to promote them in children experiencing difficulty mastering such skills. The evidence presented here indicates how a greater understanding of the key sensory processes involved in cognitive, emotional and social development might be harnessed to wider effect through a child’s musical development. However, understanding how best to promote these skills within the non-musical context of the learning support setting or mainstream classroom depends on how processes of musical learning are defined and employed in practice.

As alluded to above, music education or training is normally concerned with the development of musical knowledge, skills and understanding for their own intrinsic value. This discussion suggests a wider purpose and vision of musical learning in mainstream schools. Ockelford (2000) makes a similar assertion, proposing a theoretical model of music education for children with severe, profound and multiple learning difficulties in special education, consisting of two strands: “music in its own right” (p. 200) and “music to inform wider learning and development” (p. 203). He highlights the considerable potential for overlap between educational and therapeutic aims, when use of music extends beyond the therapeutic aim of fostering wellbeing into promoting learning and development; a focus he considers to be more educational in nature. Interestingly, Ockelford suggests, “both therapy and education are distinct from

“training”, which he argues, “is solely concerned with the acquisition of externally determined skills” (2000, p. 215).

Outwardly, music-making in music therapy, education and training may look very similar but in fact may have different objectives, of which the participant may or may not be aware. This raises a number of important questions about how music is thought about, defined and used in different settings, and about who might be best suited to deliver music as a learning support resource or intervention. Indeed, music therapists working in schools report that one of the primary challenges they face is head teachers’ lack of understanding about the different aims of music therapy and education (Bunt, 2003).

Music therapy, historically, has focussed on clinical and therapeutic settings, but is nevertheless gaining educational recognition, such that some English local authorities have given status and funding support to music therapists similar to that enjoyed by educational psychologists (Bunt, 2003). A recent review of UK music therapy research and clinical practice with children in mainstream education (Carr & Wigram, 2009) found that 25% of UK music therapists work in school or educational settings, often in collaboration with other agencies such as social services and child and adolescent mental health services (CAMHS). Importantly, the review identified a need for musical intervention in mainstream education, but which is hampered by lack of research not only in reporting existing work in mainstream settings, but in determining how this might be best achieved.

Interestingly, US music therapists and researchers have called for greater collaboration between music therapists and music educators working in mainstream schools, and between music educators, special needs teams and the families of children with SEND (Fitzgerald, 2006; McCord & Fitzgerald, 2006; McCord & Watts, 2006; Montgomery & Martinson, 2006; Patterson, 2003). Their experiential accounts provide valuable detailed advice as to how this might be achieved in practice and how hurdles of limited time, ways of working and a lack of specialist SEND knowledge and access to individual education plans can be overcome. They also provide inspiring case studies of the positive impact such collaboration can have. Reports from children and parents indicate the influential role music educators play in providing transformative opportunities for often marginalised children to use musical talents and interest alongside their peers in school bands to forge new friendships and develop a sense of belonging and musical accomplishment previously thought impossible. Taken together,

these different distinctions challenge standard conceptions of musical education in mainstream schools. They also provide a useful starting framework to help distinguish the fine line between an explicit use of music to support non-musical learning amongst children with SEND and the implicit outcomes of music-making, education and experience.

2.13 Summary

This chapter has reviewed a considerable body of multi-disciplinary evidence that identifies important overlaps between the processes involved in musical learning and critical non-musical learning skills, through the musical development of auditory function. Collectively, such theoretical, empirical and qualitative research is valuable in increasing and clarifying the processes involved in musical learning and engagement and their relationship to other areas of learning and the factors, which drive or mediate wider benefits. Nevertheless, this review has also emphasised the need for rigour in the design and interpretation of empirical studies. The discussion has highlighted a number of methodological difficulties and the limitations of a largely correlational, empirical evidence base, which restricts the ability to infer a causal relationship between musical training and wider benefits. Moreover, whilst the effect of instrumental music training on specific aspects of brain function appears to be generally accepted, inferences that musicians' ability to outperform non-musicians on a range of cognitive tasks is due solely to the effects of musical training alone continues to be a subject of considerable debate and investigation. Instead, with the exception of the effect of musical training on intelligence where a causal relationship has been identified, it is argued that musicians' superior cognitive performance reflects underlying genetic pre-dispositions, musical aptitude and/or personality traits; or is indicative of improvements or changes in mediating factors such as phonological awareness, levels of arousal and mood, and individual listening preferences, which then lead to improvements in other aspects of learning where causal relationships have been established.

More broadly, research evidence indicates that such benefits cannot be assumed to be automatic and may depend on the choice and accessibility of the chosen pedagogical approach, which may emphasise the development of particular musical skills over others; the nature of the musical learning context; and whether the musical learning occurs in addition to other learning as an extra-curricular activity. Equally, human factors such as educators' musical confidence and knowledge, particularly in respect of

its use in relation to children with SEND, and attitudes towards music's place within the school curriculum more generally may affect access to high quality musical learning opportunities. Thus, there is a growing awareness amongst researchers of the need to take account of a wide range of individual and environmental factors and the need to investigate the relationship between music and its wider potential in real world settings. Qualitative and empirical research evidence investigating the use of music in a range of settings can make a positive contribution to this aim.

This review has endeavoured to adopt a holistic approach across a range of experimental, empirical and qualitative evidence drawn from studies conducted in laboratory and real world settings. It has highlighted how simple songs, rhythm and movement can provide a framework to scaffold the development of essential learning skills, social interaction and self-development through informal interactions between child and caregiver, through social music-making activities or more formally through music education and a child's musical development. Intervention studies indicate how such aims might be achieved over short periods of time compatible with the school calendar as part of school learning support programmes. However, despite such evidence little research attention has focussed on the actual experience of using music in the mainstream learning support setting in England, particularly in primary education where early intervention is a key priority. If the findings of multi-disciplinary research presented here are to be of value to educational practice, it is important to understand how music is used and viewed in this specific real world context, particularly given concerns that such benefits cannot be considered automatic and may depend upon a number of individual and environmental factors.

This is where this thesis hopes to make a contribution. Given the lack of existing research in this area, this study adopts an open mind in its definition of practice, negotiating a path between music therapy, education, learning and training opportunities in schools. It explores through the eyes of primary school educators and music and learning support specialists how music is, or might be, used to support children with SEND in mainstream primary education and their experience and perceptions towards the use of music in this context. The thesis seeks to identify the opportunities and challenges music presents to children and educators, and the factors that may affect its use in this context.

Chapter Three

Research Aims, Approach and Method

3.0 Introduction

The discussion so far has demonstrated the considerable research effort and debate that is focussed on understanding and explaining the processes involved in musical learning, as well as music's impact on brain structure and function and other areas of learning employing the same or similar processes. Nevertheless, there appears to be general consensus that music in its different forms can provide a positive, enjoyable and meaningful learning environment to facilitate, explore and support other learning. However, as already alluded to, despite calls for equal access to musical learning and reference to its potential use in learning support, little is known about the actual use of music as a learning support intervention, and the factors which may affect the use of music in this context.

This thesis aims to address this knowledge gap through an exploratory mixed methods approach in order to gain an insight into the use of music to support the wider learning of children with SEND in mainstream primary educational settings in England. More specifically, the study is concerned with exploring and understanding educators' experience of and perceptions of using music in this context. It seeks to gain an understanding of the factors, which motivate or discourage such practice and the opportunities and challenges such practice presents across the variety of roles and learning support settings within mainstream primary education. This chapter sets out the rationale for this study and its research aims and questions. The methodological approach is outlined and its advantages and shortcomings are discussed, including the challenges encountered. My own position as a music educator and researcher within this research process is also considered. Data collection and analysis procedures are then discussed.

3.1 Research Rationale, Aims and Research Questions

3.1.1 Research Rationale

3.1.1.1 Calls for Equal Access and Early Intervention

Early identification of children's learning needs and intervention is now a key priority for educators in efforts to maximise the life chances of children. As discussed in the previous chapter, school music education programmes are seen as an important means of providing access on a mass scale to the ascribed wider potential of musical learning, particularly for children with learning difficulties (Kraus & Chandrasekaran, 2010). Increasing reference is also being made to the potential use of music in learning support programmes to support and target key educational, emotional and social learning needs of specific groups of children (Mather, 2007, 2013; Overy 2000, 2003, 2010, 2012; Rabinowitch, Cross & Burnard, 2013; Wan et al., 2011). However, as discussed in the literature review, music education research indicates that access to musical learning opportunities in schools is not automatic, particularly for children with SEND. Indeed, the discussion indicated that musical access depends not just on the availability of music learning opportunities but critically, upon the quality of music teaching (Ofsted, 2012b), educators' musical knowledge, confidence and training (Hallam, Creech & Varvarigou, 2011; Hallam, et al., 2007; Hennessy, 2000; Holden & Button, 2006) particularly in respect of children with SEND, the type of pedagogical approach employed (Lamont, 2002; Lamont, Hargreaves, Marshall & Tarrant, 2003; Miles & Westcombe, 2002; North & Hargreaves, 2008; Oglethorpe, 2002; Sloboda, 2001) and more broadly, on attitudes about music's place in the curriculum in mainstream schools amongst head teachers and policy makers (Hallam, 2012; Hallam & Hanke, 2012; O'Toole, 2009).

Empirical researchers are increasingly aware of the need to account for confounding or mediating variables in the design of empirical and experimental studies (Schellenberg & Winner, 2011), especially the role pedagogical factors may play in determining the wider outcomes of musical interaction and engagement in educational settings, as discussed in the previous chapter. As Schellenberg and Winner (2011) point out, the respective terminology and methodology used to describe and investigate the wider impact of formal and informal musical learning are key issues facing researchers in this field. Equally, there is increasing awareness of the need to better reflect the complex nature of musical learning by studying any wider impact across a range of real world

musical learning settings beyond the controlled conditions of the laboratory (Schellenberg & Winner, 2011; Strait & Kraus, 2014).

3.1.1.2 Music as a Learning Support Intervention - A Lack of Research

Little research attention has focussed on the actual practice of music within mainstream learning support provision, aside from Overy's research (2000, 2003, 2010) investigating the use of rhythmic group music-making amongst dyslexic children within a mainstream primary learning support setting; practical examples of its use in mainstream education in the USA (Fitzgerald, 2006; McCord & Fitzgerald, 2006; Watts, 2006; Montgomery & Martinson, 2006; Patterson 2003); my own research outlined earlier and discussed further below (Mather, 2007); and some evidence of music therapy practice in mainstream educational settings (Carr & Wigram, 2009).

More broadly, researchers are investigating the wider impact of such school and community musical programmes on non-musical learning (CUREE, 2011; Lord et al., 2013; Slater, Tierney & Kraus, 2013) amongst populations who historically have not had access to musical learning opportunities. However, such research often documents the impact of instrumental or vocal learning arising from school or community music education programmes. This is valuable in itself but it does not reflect the targeted use of music as suggested by Overy (2000, 2003, 2010), Wan and colleagues (2011), Rabinowitch, Cross and Burnard's research (2013) or my own research (Mather, 2007), where music was used to target specific needs as an actual or potential intervention or resource within a learning support programme. Empirical and qualitative and empirical research in music therapy and special education has increased understanding and knowledge about the therapeutic and targeted use of music with children with SEND, but once again is confined largely to examples within special education rather than mainstream schools (Welch, Ockelford & Zimmerman, 2001; Drake Music, 2012).

Carr and Wigram's review of music therapy practice in the UK (2008) noted the lack of music therapy research in mainstream education and the need to document existing practice and identify examples of best practice. Furthermore, few if any studies have investigated educators' actual experience of using music as an intervention or resource in mainstream learning support provision. This is an important area for investigation, given the research evidence outlined earlier concerning the effect educators' musical confidence, musical identity, knowledge and skills may have on access to music generally, teaching quality and learning outcomes. Equally, educators do not work in isolation but within a political and social context where the attitudes of senior managers,

policy makers within mainstream education and parents may also shape attitudes and access to musical learning opportunities in schools (Hallam, 2012; Hallam & Hanke, 2012; O'Toole, 2009).

3.1.1.3 A Personal Curiosity

As outlined in the Preface, the impetus for this research also stems from my own research conducted as part of a Masters programme (Mather, 2007). As already described the study's main focus centred on the collection of observational data concerning participants' on-task behaviour. However, the study also explored the participants' and the head of the learning support unit's perceptions and experience of the project through post-study questionnaires and structured interviews. However, despite considerable enthusiasm to continue the project, the head of the learning support unit felt that the project needed to be led by a music specialist and was beyond her own musical capabilities. These views were echoed in conversations with learning support specialists within the unit, and with colleagues working as music specialists in other schools who revealed their lack of knowledge about how to support children with SEND in the music classroom despite a willingness to use music. Thus there appeared to be a lack of knowledge across both music and learning support specialists about how music might be best used in the context of learning support provision, which was difficult to verify given the paucity of research in this area. Nevertheless, collectively the qualitative and anecdotal evidence outlined above, echoes the findings of the music education research referred to above and in respect of educators' musical confidence and knowledge generally, and music educators' confidence to teach music to children with SEND (Darrow, 2003; McCord & Fitzgerald, 2006; Wilson & McCrary, 1996). Consequently, this evidence shaped the aims of this thesis in my desire to discover whether these views and experiences expressed by learning support and music specialists were typical. I also wanted to go beyond my own experience to identify other examples of practice and explore other educators' experience of using music in this context.

3.1.2 Research Aims and Questions

This thesis investigates these two strands of enquiry through an exploratory, mixed methods but largely qualitative research approach. The study had two broad aims. Firstly, to explore the use of music across a variety of mainstream learning support contexts, identifying examples of practice as reported by participants. Secondly, to gain

an understanding of the perceptions and experiences of using music in this context amongst the wide range of music specialists, general educators, learning support specialists and support staff working in the different learning support contexts within mainstream primary schools in England as outlined in Chapter One.

These aims were explored through three broad research questions via an online survey and semi-structured interviews:

- 1) Is music used to support children with SEND in mainstream primary education as a specific learning support resource? If so, how, where, by whom and for what purpose?
- 2) What are the challenges and opportunities for educators and children in using music in this context?
- 3) What are the key issues that promote or inhibit the use of music in this context?

It had been hoped to supplement the survey and interviews with classroom observations of practice, however this was problematic and is discussed later in the chapter. An online pilot survey of 47 mainstream primary educators yielded some first insights of existing practice across a range of different learning support, music and general classroom settings and roles. This survey is summarised only briefly in this chapter as a prelude to the thematic analysis, which was the main focus of the study. A detailed account of the survey has been published (Mather, 2013). The semi-structured interviews with senior school managers, classroom educators, learning support specialists and music specialists provide a rich seam of qualitative data that gives voice to educators' experiences of, and motivations for using music in this context. It provides valuable insights into the individual and environmental challenges educators' experience, which they felt supported or discouraged their use of music in this context.

3.2 Research Scope and Focus

3.2.1 Mainstream Primary Education

The study was confined to state funded mainstream primary education, for two reasons. Firstly, as already discussed above and in Chapter One, early identification and intervention programmes are key national educational priorities in learning support provision in primary education, which are of direct relevance to the aims of this study. Secondly, as music provision is a statutory part of the Primary National Curriculum,

either as a specialist subject or as part of the class teacher's responsibilities. This potentially provided opportunities for music to be used both as a targeted intervention within schools' early intervention programmes and more broadly, as a classroom resource as part of schools' learning support provision and schools' statutory music provision. A comparative study was initially considered to explore differences between the use of music in this context in both primary and secondary education. However a lack of interest from secondary schools during the pilot questionnaire and the scale of such a study, whilst interesting, was beyond the scope and resources of this research.

3.2.2 A Specific Learning Support Intervention and Resource

The study sought to identify instances where music was used as "a specific learning support resource" (SLSR) defined in the survey as:

where this might take the form of a specially planned musical learning support intervention in or outside of the main classroom, or where music has been identified as a specific resource to support Individual Education Plans within the normal school day.

However, the research questions and scope were kept deliberately broad for three reasons. Firstly, given the few practical examples and lack of research in this area, it was not clear whether educators would readily identify with the above definition or notion of music as a learning support intervention or "specific learning support resource" (SLSR); a concern which was later confirmed by survey and interview data. Secondly, the broad focus sought to reflect the variety of learning contexts within learning support and music provision within mainstream primary education outlined in Chapter One. Thirdly, this study sought to investigate the use of music across the range of individuals working with, or providing services for this group of children in mainstream primary education in this variety of settings. Agee's (2009) review of developing qualitative educational research emphasises the value of adopting a wide focus at the outset through discovery-orientated questions or goals that become increasingly narrower over the course of the research; an approach adopted in this study.

3.2.3 Fieldwork Boundaries

The initial fieldwork boundaries comprised two local education authorities (LEAs), one in the north of England, the other in the south east of England that were chosen on the basis of their proximity to the university and my home. However, as recruitment of

survey respondents was slow, the geographical boundaries of the study were later expanded nationally beyond the two chosen LEAs.

3.3 Research Approach

3.3.1 An Exploratory Approach

As outlined above, there was little prior research in this specific context to provide direction, and limited knowledge about use of music in mainstream primary schools to support learning support practice. Thus, there appeared to be a need to provide a baseline of new practice in this area as a first priority, from which educators' attitudes and experiences in regard to such practice might be explored further. An exploratory approach was therefore adopted to investigate the use of music in support of children with SEND and individual and institutional attitudes and experiences about use of music in this context.

3.3.2 A Mixed methods Approach

A mixed methods approach was chosen for its suitability in generating both a broad quantitative snapshot and more detailed qualitative analysis of existing practice, perceptions, experiences and attitudes, via the respective use of an online questionnaire and semi-structured interviews and classroom observations, the latter for contextual purposes only. Interview data was analysed using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA), a systematic, qualitative research method (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009; Smith, Jarman & Osborn, 1999). This approach, discussed in more detail below, is founded on the philosophical theories of phenomenology, hermeneutics and idiography, and is concerned with examining individual experiences of a particular phenomenon within the context in which it occurs.

Support for such a mixed methods approach in this research context is found in the PROMISE research project (Welch, Ockelford & Zimmerman, 2001), which adopted a mixed methods approach in its review of musical practice in special education in England. The research team first sent a questionnaire to a random selection of special schools in England in order to gather an overview of practice and attitudes. From this sample, a number of schools participated in further research involving visits and classroom observations. Given the parallel aims between the PROMISE study and this research, this mixed methods approach was felt to be appropriate and informed the design outlined here. Like the PROMISE research project, the intention here was to

follow up interviews with a number of classroom observations to verify and illuminate participants' interviews and practice. However, this was problematic for a number of reasons, which are discussed towards the end of this chapter.

Gorard & Taylor (2004) make the case for mixed methods research in educational research, explaining that whilst quantitative and qualitative approaches each have their own strengths, they are far more powerful when combined to provide “a more coherent, rational and rigorous whole” (p. 4) that has greater impact through the generation of statistical data, important for policy makers, and “stories” that provide illumination of the data and are more easily remembered (p. 7). This is of value here given the wider aims of this research to inform research, practice and policy and the need to explore and reflect the complexity of real world settings and the complex nature of musical interactions and learning opportunities. Johnson & Onwuegbuzie (2004) describe the value of a pragmatic approach in “understanding real world phenomena” and in providing “some agreement about the importance of many (culturally derived) values and desired ends” (p. 17).

Gorard and Taylor highlight the value of a “direct” and “indirect” approach (p. 2) particularly where there is limited background information, as in this research context. Thus, a direct approach would help to develop the desired overview of practice, whilst an indirect approach would provide a narrative and deeper understanding of individual experiences and understanding of the use of music in this context. They point out the growing interest and need for a combined approach in education order to improve the quality of educational research, which has tended to favour generally qualitative methods. However, Smith, Flowers and Larkin (2009) note the value of the particular or idiographic approach, observing that single case studies can provide “detailed nuanced analyses of particular instances of lived experience” (p. 37), which they suggest can, in some instances, provide a powerful means of challenging existing theory or suggest new ways of approaching a subject. They argue that IPA provides a counter to nomothetic evidence, which is concerned with finding statistical significance or correlations, where the individual case cannot be reflected in the analysis. This is reflected in the challenges identified in the previous chapter in trying to both account for and reflect the complex and individual nature of music and the contexts in which it occurs. Smith, Flowers and Larkin note in contrast how individual cases can be brought together for further analysis, arguing that IPA “adopts analytic procedures for moving from single cases to more general statements, but which still allows one to retrieve

particular claims for any of the individuals involved.” (p. 32). Thus, this study seeks to combine both approaches to meet the need to establish a sense of existing practice and a desire to understand individual experiences and perception in more depth, within the different real world educational contexts in which they occur.

Nevertheless, Robson (2002) and Johnson & Onwuegbuzie (2004) identify the major disadvantages of mixed methods studies lie in the potential for conflicting results that require further interpretation, its time-consuming nature and the skills required for both approaches. Gorard and Taylor believe such factors have discouraged its use in education and within doctoral studies in particular. This research has not been without challenge, discussed further below, particularly in respect of the time required to gain access to schools to promote the survey to potential respondents and the nature of IPA itself, in the considerable time required for analysis, reflection and redrafting in the analysis and writing up stages. Smith, Flowers & Larkin (2009) point out that IPA is a demanding process, requiring a range of personal qualities such as commitment, dedication, determination, persistence and rigour, coupled with curiosity, openness and “a willingness to engage with complexity” (p. 55) and the need to rapidly develop new skills. With this in mind, the discussion now considers the nature of the qualitative approach adopted in this study.

3.3.3 Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis

Educators are the gatekeepers to learning opportunities, thus understanding their professional and personal experience of musical learning seems vital in understanding the individual factors, which may affect the use of music in the learning support context. Moreover, educators do not work in a vacuum but are subject to external pressures and attitudes, thus understanding the context in which they work is also important. For these reasons, it was decided to use Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis as a research approach for this study, concerned as it is with the contextual, interpretative study of individual experience in real world settings and the meanings they assign to those experiences in the context of the world around them (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009). Robson (2002) echoes these views. He highlights the need to “view experience and behaviour in context” where “concepts emerge from the data” rather than as facts to be tested (p. 25). Reid, Flowers and Larkin (2005) explain how IPA facilitates the exploration of individual “lived experience” (p. 20) by allowing individuals to recount detailed personal accounts of their thoughts and feelings and associated meanings through semi-structured interviews. In contrast to positivist

approaches, IPA adopts an inductive approach where the participant is the expert and where no prior assumptions are made. Interviews provide a rich source of qualitative data, of which the researcher makes sense through a systematic, iterative analysis process, described in more detail below. IPA generates themes, which, whilst providing an overview, still retain a sense of the individuality of each participant's experience (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009)

Reid, Flowers and Larkin (2005) report the increasing use of IPA in other areas such as in cultural psychology, exemplified by its more frequent use in music psychology. They suggest that its use in comparison studies permits the exploration of one phenomenon from "multiple perspectives [...] to develop a more detailed multifaceted account of that phenomenon" (p. 22). Like Gorard and Taylor, they believe IPA provides "opportunities for applied researchers to integrate research and practice" (p.21) and "is especially suited for researching in unexplored territory where a theoretical pretext may be lacking" (p. 23).

3.3.3.1 A Phenomenological Approach

It is important to understand that IPA is not a method but an approach founded on three strands of philosophy: phenomenology, hermeneutics and idiography. Phenomenology is concerned with the study of an object or everyday experience in its own terms as it occurs in the world. It is a reflective process, where the participant is encouraged to look inward to their perception of objects, rather than merely looking at them and describing them as they occur, as they might in a survey for example. Notably, interview participants in this study expressed how their participation in the study had been helpful in giving them time to consider and reflect on their practice, seeing their practice, and in some cases, themselves in a different way that is evident in the thematic analysis in Chapters Five and Six.

3.3.3.2 A Hermeneutic Approach

Hermeneutics is concerned with interpretation, fuelled by a desire to understand the meaning that individuals attach to everyday experiences and objects within a specific context. Thus IPA is a dynamic, iterative process, through which both participant and the researcher move, where the participant reflects on and interprets their experience while the researcher interprets and reflects on the interpretations of the participant, also known as the "double hermeneutic" (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009, p. 35).

The researcher also exists within his/her own world and thus will most likely bring their own knowledge, understanding and pre-conceptions or “fore-structure” of the phenomenon to the process (Smith, Flowers & Larkin, 2009, p. 25). Smith Flowers and Larkin highlight how such fore-structures and understanding are an important means of selecting and engaging with the participant in the interview process that extend into the analysis and writing phases. However, they note for the researcher, any pre-conceptions may not become evident until the researcher is immersed in the interview or analysis process, and these may change over the course of the reflective period as they engage with the participant’s account through a process of reading and re-reading of interview transcripts, reflection and re-analysis, described as “the hermeneutic circle” (p. 28). Nevertheless, Smith, Flowers and Larkin explain how researchers need to be aware of how their own fore-structure and understanding can interfere with the need for openness and willingness to engage in complexity if they are to avoid bias. They make reference to Husserl’s notion of “bracketing” (p. 13), where the phenomenon is surrounded by imaginary brackets, much like a mathematician brackets part of a calculation in order to give it special attention. They argue that thinking of the process in this way enables the researcher to move away from such pre-conceptions and direct themselves towards discovering the essence of the phenomenon under investigation. Thus, IPA provides an important contrast to the survey, which whilst useful in providing a quick overview of existing practice and initial insights, nevertheless, in its statistical analysis leads to generalisations, which preclude the identification of the individual or idiographic nature of the data and phenomenon under study offered by IPA.

Importantly, there are no specific rules to follow in conducting IPA. Nevertheless, Smith, Flowers and Larkin (2009) provide a highly accessible practical guide to conducting IPA. They observe that an IPA study demands rigour, sensitivity and skill in the design and execution of interviews, enabling participants to feel at ease, building rapport in order to allow the participant to speak freely whilst also remaining sufficiently objective as researchers. In the data analysis phase the researcher is required to be attentive to the participant’s account and how it unfolds, which requires a degree of openness yet completeness in the analysis to avoid the dangers of bias discussed above. However, the key challenge lies in the complexity of experience itself. The process can be daunting in the sheer amount of data generated, the need for careful writing to reflect the nuances of individual experience and patience in the redrafting such writing requires.

As researchers recognise the need to reflect the complex and individual nature of musical interactions and the multiple contexts in which they occur, the IPA approach appears to offer an appropriate means to examine the human elements of such complexity. However, as discussed the researcher needs to acknowledge and reflect upon their own part in the research process.

3.3.4 Reflexivity

As outlined above and in the Preface, this study arises from my own empirical Masters research. My experience as a music educator and researcher inevitably influences this research as the discussion above indicates, motivating my research questions and focus and my broader interest in general educators' lack of musical confidence. Such insight, as Smith, Flowers and Larkin (2009) note, is important in designing studies where the researcher may be sensitive not just to key research questions, but also in anticipating and empathising with the potential needs of participants or the demands of the research context, which may require certain ethical or methodological approaches.

Equally, such closeness has other advantages. It may provide access to participants through key gatekeepers; inform the design of the interview schedule; or help develop rapport with participants through the interview process; or in guiding the researcher in their interpretative and reflective circle during the analysis and writing phase. However, as discussed above, Smith, Flowers and Larkin underline the need for such proximity to be made transparent both in the mind of the researcher but also importantly in the mind of the reader, so that they are able to understand and situate the final analysis within the context of the author's own fore-structures and fore-understanding.

Although this research springs from my own curiosity, research and teaching experience, my actual teaching experience of using music in the learning support context has been limited to one ten-week programme conducted as part of the Masters research. Prior to this study I had no experience of teaching children with learning difficulties or disabilities. Thus, I come to this research not as an experienced SEND music specialist, but as interested music practitioner and researcher. Indeed, this process has also been a learning experience for me as a researcher and practitioner. Nevertheless, my own interest in music and its wider application, my personal experience of the challenges I encountered in delivering and researching the use of music in a mainstream learning support setting have inevitable informed this study and

need to be taken into account in the interpretation of this thesis. The discussion now moves on to consider the method in more detail.

3.4 Method

3.4.1 Ethical Approval

The University of Leeds AREA Faculty Research Ethics Committee (reference number AREA 09-119) granted approval for the procedures and materials used in this study.

Ethical issues are considered where relevant throughout the following discussion. As outlined above, the study consisted of an online survey and semi-structured interviews.

3.4.2 Online Survey

3.4.2.1 Survey Aims

The survey sought to gain a snapshot of existing musical practice in relation to children with SEND in mainstream primary education in England and to identify whether music is used as a learning support intervention or “specific learning support resource” (SLSR) as defined earlier in this chapter. It also hoped to identify the opportunities and challenges music presents in this context to educators and children, and the attitudes and factors, which might influence or affect such practice. The survey also served to act as a vehicle to recruit individuals to participate in the second stage of research of interviews and observations.

3.4.2.2 Survey Set-Up and Pilot

An online hosting domain enabled the questionnaire to be distributed at low cost to educators working in different geographical locations and settings, using a secure link and encrypted data storage, maintaining individual confidentiality and anonymity. However, as Johnson and Turner (2003) highlight, whilst questionnaires provide a relatively fast means of acquiring data from a range of individuals, they also require validation, need to be short in length and may generate missing data or non-responses to multi-choice questions. Equally, open-ended questions may be difficult to analyse, due to vague answers or poor use of language that takes time to analyse. These concerns were noted when designing and piloting the survey.

A preliminary version of the proposed online questionnaire was piloted in June-July 2010 in the south eastern LEA in order to test the questionnaire design, hosting software, the recruitment of respondents and evaluate the questionnaire via respondent

feedback. Responses were only received from two of eight schools invited to participate in the pilot, in part due to its launch towards the end of the summer term. Thus, the pilot survey provided valuable experience of the challenges of recruiting educators to participate in a survey.

3.4.2.3 Recruitment of Survey Respondents

Reflecting the challenges encountered during the pilot survey, the main survey was subsequently launched during the quieter spring term and as directly as possible to schools and class teachers in the south eastern and northern LEAs. Nonetheless, despite considerable efforts, including publicity via electronic weekly schools' bulletin, direct email and personalised letters to primary schools, only 26 complete responses had been received by the end of April 2011. Consequently, the fieldwork boundaries were extended nationally through online networks of professional bodies, educational, music online forums, regional learning support networks and the distribution of flyers at a regional educational conference in the north of England¹⁴. The University press office supported a press release, resulting in publicity by the magazine *Music Education*. By the end of August, the final total of complete responses available for analysis was 47, with almost as many partial responses that were not usable.

Lahmar (2010) reports similar difficulties in gaining access to schools. She concludes that gaining access to schools to recruit teachers, parents and children as participants in educational research is problematic given the time pressures on educators and the need for personal contacts within schools to facilitate educational research, but felt that such challenges could be overcome with persistence. Notably, large scale research studies evaluating educational or music programmes in schools recruit from schools already participating in the programme under review (CUREE, 2011; Lamont, Leighton, Underhill & Hale, 2009). Nevertheless, these experiences highlight the challenges of conducting educational research and the importance of personal contacts and endorsement in developing educational research projects particularly in organising classroom observations, discussed later in this chapter.

¹⁴ The survey was publicised via the following online forums, websites, networks and newsletters: The Teacher Support Network, TES Connect SEND forum; YAMSEN; the SENCo Forum Digest; Sing Up Facebook discussion forum.

3.4.2.4 Population Sample and Exclusions

The survey focussed on the use of music to support children with SEND in mainstream primary schools, excluding individuals working in special schools, secondary education, short stay or pupil referral units, independent schools, those working as instrumental teachers or tutors in private practice or as peripatetic music teachers and community musicians unless they had a role in mainstream primary schools.

3.4.2.5 Questionnaire Design and Areas of Enquiry

As outlined earlier, the survey sought to identify whether or not music was used as a specific learning support resource (SLSR):

where this might take the form of a specially planned musical learning support intervention in or outside of the main classroom, or where music has been identified as a specific resource to support Individual Education Plans within the normal school day

A mixed questionnaire was chosen as an effective research tool to enable quick access to both quantitative and qualitative data through closed and open-ended questions (Robson, 2002). The questionnaire design was informed by the findings of music education research outlined in this and the previous chapter in respect of educator's musical training, confidence and professional and personal music identity. Sections concerned with respondents' musical practice were based on activities within existing music programmes such as the Sing Up initiative and my own music teaching experience and knowledge of different musical pedagogical approaches.

The online questionnaire (included in Appendix A) consisted of 34 questions, refined from the pilot stage, and presented in a variety of formats to generate quantitative and qualitative data across nine areas of enquiry:

- 1) Respondents' educational role and work setting;
- 2) The use of music in respondents' teaching or supporting roles;
- 3) The use of music as a specific learning support resource (SLSR);
- 4) Encouraging and discouraging factors;
- 5) Access to musical learning opportunities within mainstream primary schools;
- 6) Respondents' research awareness;
- 7) Respondents' collaboration opportunities;

- 8) Respondents' musical background, training and experience;
- 9) Final thoughts.

The central part of the questionnaire investigated respondents' individual use of music as a SLSR and their use of music in school practice. Respondents using music as a SLSR were asked to identify the opportunities or challenges such practice presents to themselves as educators and children, and the factors that supported or inhibited their use of music in this respect. Those who were not using music as a SLSR ("No SLSR" group) were asked to identify and rank in order of importance the factors that discouraged them from using music in this way and identify factors that would encourage them to use music in this context in the future.

3.4.2.6 Survey Data Analysis

The survey generated a range of categorical and ordinal data concerning respondents' musical practice, attitudes and experiences, which was triangulated and informed by qualitative data from free response questions.

Quantitative data was analysed using descriptive statistics (SPSS) and chi-Square tests to examine differences between the two groups. However, the small sample size of the SLSR group (only eight out of the 47 respondents) made this latter approach difficult as the expected values often fell below the required five cases for validity. Whilst the small sample limited the scope for statistical analysis, the survey yielded qualitative data that provided valuable first insights about the use of music as a SLSR, the opportunities and challenges it presents and the factors, which motivate such practice, providing rich stimulus for the later interview phase of the study.

3.4.2.7 Survey Findings

As the survey is considered as a prelude to the main study, the findings are summarised here in the methodology section, rather than dedicating a specific chapter to the findings (for a more detailed analysis see Mather, 2013).

The survey identified a small number of respondents (N=8) who reported using music as an intervention or targeted learning support resource (SLSR) where learning was linked to Individual Education Plans tailored to individual needs. Music was delivered through an informal multi-sensory approach using songs, chants, rhythm and movement to target and support non-musical aims. This was carried out in small groups in specialist units, in music lessons or learning support provision or as part of one-to-one

work within the classroom, by a variety of educators, including TAs, which was not confined to music specialists.

Music as an SLSR was used for a variety of *explicit* non-musical purposes to target and support cognitive, speech, language and communications needs, social interaction, motor and attentive skills; or *implicitly*, where the learning outcome was less defined or planned, such as exploring emotions or self-expression through musical learning or as multi-sensory stimulus. However, a key finding to emerge from the survey was the similarity between the SLSR group and the No SLSR group in their reported musical practice, levels of musical confidence, understanding of the wider benefits of music particularly for children with SEND and their passionate views about access to music for these children. Yet, importantly, despite these similarities in practice and understanding, the No SLSR group did not relate their musical practice to the definition of music as a SLSR as defined in this survey.

Respondents' free responses in the No SLSR group indicated that they were unaware that music could be used in this way and cited a range of individual and institutional factors, such as a lack of knowledge, confidence and skills; a lack of resources or support; and a lack of time and opportunity; all of which inhibited their potential use of music in the learning support context. Importantly, they saw this definition of music as a SLSR as different to their own practice, whereas for the SLSR group this was an integral part of their work, reflecting perhaps their proximity to children with SEND through their roles and settings, which facilitated such musical practice but also a particular interest in this area of musical learning, evident for some in their pursuit of musical training, research and practice in relation to children with SEND. In these different ways, the survey provides an important prelude to the discussion of the thematic analysis of interview data in the following chapters, in which the use of music as a SLSR is explored further and individual and environmental differences raised by the survey are considered further.

3.5 Interviews

3.5.1 Interview schedule

Interviews followed a similar order and outline of questions to those asked in the questionnaire (Appendix B) in order to explore the initial findings of the survey in more depth. The schedule was structured into five sections:

- 1) Individual role and working context;
- 2) School and children's attitudes to music;
- 3) Participants' musical learning experience;
- 4) Participants' teaching practice and use (where relevant) as a specific learning support intervention or resource (SLSR);
- 5) Wider policy context.

Questions wherever possible were designed to be open-ended to facilitate discussion and avoid prejudging responses. The draft schedule was discussed with my lead supervisor and amended before commencing the interview process.

As already discussed, the interviews sought to explore individual experiences of music practice in relation to children with SEND and the opportunities and challenges such practice presents to educators and children as seen through the eyes of the educator. The interviews also explored participants' perceptions of their own musical training, confidence and identity and the influence these factors might have on their use of music in learning support provision, in music education or within the wider curriculum. The interview also sought to situate these experiences and perceptions within participants' working contexts, examining colleagues' or school perceptions of music provision and attitudes to the use of music in this context. The interview also explored wider issues of relevance to this research focus, such as Pupil Premium funding and equal access to music.

The interview schedule, like the questionnaire, was designed to set the participant at ease from the outset by enquiring about their role, school, the children they taught and so forth, to encourage them to speak. Once this rapport was established the interview moved on to consider the more analytical sections of the interview schedule as Smith, Flowers and Larkin (2009) recommend.

3.5.2 Semi-Structured Interviews

A semi-structured approach was chosen in preference to structured or unstructured interviews for several reasons. Smith, Flowers and Larkin (2009) note that IPA requires rich data collection, and detailed interviews and diaries are often the preferred means of gaining access to such data through the opportunities they provide for participants to "tell their stories, to speak freely and reflectively, and to develop their ideas and express their concerns at some length." (p. 56). They argue that highly structured interviews or

free responses in questionnaires limit these opportunities. They note that semi-structured individual interviews remain the preferred option, given their flexibility and opportunity to adapt questions in response to participants' questions in response to the researcher's perceptions of what is appropriate for each participant. This method enables the researcher to build rapport with the interviewee and allows interviews to be tailored to individual roles and settings.

3.5.3 Interview Protocol

Interviews were conducted principally by telephone although a few face-to face interviews were also conducted. A list of participants is provided in Appendix C. Prior to the interview, participants were provided with written information about the research and a consent form. Interviews lasted a minimum of 30 minutes, with the majority taking 40-50 minutes, consistent with Smith, Flowers and Larkin's estimations of the time required for each interview. Each interview followed the same broad schedule (Appendix B), tailoring where necessary. Each interview was recorded with the participant's verbal and written consent and transcribed verbatim either by myself or by two paid postgraduate music students experienced in transcription. Names or location references that might risk identification were anonymised. Each transcript and recording was given a participant number to preserve anonymity for data storage and analysis purposes.

3.5.4 Recruitment of Interview Participants

The discussion above highlighted the idiographic nature of IPA and the need to examine the phenomena in a range of particular contexts. This is relevant to this study, given the different contexts and forms in which learning support provision occurs in mainstream primary education, outlined in Chapter One. In contrast to the random, probabilistic selection of participants in controlled trials, Smith, Flowers and Larkin (2009) identify the need for a homogenous sample, purposefully selecting individuals to match the research questions "to those for whom the research question will be meaningful" (p. 49); but also for the range of different perspectives each participant may bring, but who nonetheless share a common bond. However, they also note that participants need to reflect the homogeneity of the sample in order to facilitate the interpretation of these different perspectives. For this reason, interviews with key opinion leaders working exclusively in special rather than mainstream education were excluded from the thematic analysis.

Smith, Flowers and Larkin note that the most frequent form of recruitment to an IPA study is through a researcher's own contacts, through referral by key gatekeepers or by what they term as "snowballing" (p. 49) where one contact leads to another. In this study, I had very few personal contacts in education at the outset, having just returned from living abroad. As discussed one of the survey aims was to provide a vehicle to recruit participants from a range of different roles, settings and geographical locations beyond my own experience or limited network. Promoting the survey enabled me to develop contacts with key gatekeepers who opened doors to individuals who worked in mainstream primary schools with children with SEND or who used music in the learning support context. Thus the recruitment processes of referral and snowballing are applicable to this research.

Smith, Flowers and Larkin recognise that the size of sample in IPA is potentially unbounded, defined only by the needs of the study, organisational constraints or the richness of individual cases. However, they point out that practical consideration needs to be given to the time required to interview, transcribe, analyse and bring together a large amount of rich qualitative data. They highlight the tendency of researchers to feel obliged to choose large sample sizes when a smaller number of cases might yield sufficient richness of data. I experienced these dilemmas and challenges, and with hindsight I would choose a smaller sample, confident in the knowledge as Smith, Flowers and Larkin argue, that it is quality not quantity that matters in an IPA study. The discussion now considers the interview process in more detail.

3.5.4.1 Recruitment of Interview Participants from the Survey

25 survey respondents (53% of the total survey sample) registered their interest in participating in further research. Each was emailed an outline of the next stage of research and a consent form. Of this group of 25, only seven respondents (15% of the total survey sample) finally agreed to be interviewed.

Email correspondence with participants prior to the interview revealed they held a variety of roles and worked across the desired range of educational, learning support and musical settings and were united by their work with or responsibility for children with SEND. Moreover, participants' interviews indicated a spread of different practice, reflecting both those who did and did not use music as a SLSR, and those who did not use music at all. Thus the eventual sample of interview respondents was representative of the questionnaire population from which they had been drawn and allowed for a

range of different perspectives to be explored across the common focus of responsibility for children with SEND in mainstream primary education.

3.5.4.2 Recruitment of Additional Interview Participants

Participants were also recruited through the process of “snowballing” referred to above, where one contact led to another. Following conversations arising from the promotion of the survey, two projects were also identified, where music was being or had been used as an intervention to support children with SEND in mainstream primary schools in the east and north of England. Interviews were conducted with the peripatetic teacher leading the eastern England project (A001), and the head of the music service (MS003); and in the case of the northern project, with the national programme leader (A005), the project facilitator (A011) and the vocal leader (A019) responsible for delivering the northern project. A SEND music specialist (A013) involved in a third intervention-based music project identified in the northern LEA also agreed to be interviewed.

Although seeking to avoid self-selection, one of the aims of the research was to identify if music was used as an intervention or resource. As the survey had yielded only a handful of individuals using music in this way, and considering the lack of pre-existing data, it was felt appropriate to include these examples. These examples also made clear how the use of music as a SLSR was being led in some cases by visiting peripatetic music specialists, SEND music specialists working in special education and community musicians, roles and contexts which had been originally excluded from participating in the survey. Thus, it was felt appropriate to gather the views of key individuals within these groups.

Three interviews were conducted with personnel from the music service/arts service in each of the two LEAs through two group interviews: the first with the head of the arts service (MS001a), music service (MS001b), and a SEND music specialist in the northern LEA (MS001c); the second with two music service managers responsible for working with mainstream primary schools in the south eastern LEA (MS002a and MS002b). A third interview was conducted with a SEND music specialist who worked in specialist units within mainstream primary schools for the south eastern music service (A010).

The survey also highlighted the use of music within specialist units attached to mainstream primary schools. Contacts with the SEND music specialist in the northern LEA led to interviews with two individuals, working as an inclusion manager (A017)

and the head of a deaf and hearing-impaired unit (A012) in two mainstream primary schools in the northern LEA.

3.5.4.3 Contextual Interviews

As noted above, interviews were also held with other individuals working in special education to gather background information about the nature of children's needs in general, the type of provision available and in some instances their experience of using music in this context. All received information packs and returned completed consent forms. Some meetings were captured via written field notes because individuals did not wish interviews or practice to be recorded. As referenced above, these interviews were excluded from the IPA analysis as these individuals worked outside the mainstream context. Nevertheless, they informed my understanding of the use of music in the different settings of community music provision and special schools, the musical abilities of children with severe disabilities, and the role of technology in facilitating access to music for this group of children. These issues were of direct relevance to the experiences and use of music reported in the interviews of participants working in mainstream education.

3.6 Classroom Observations

It had been hoped to supplement interview data with follow-up classroom observations, as the PROMISE research had conducted, in order to confirm and inform the analysis. Indeed, provision was made for this via the approved system of consents prior to the study. However, this was problematic due to the pressures on schools, the perceived administrative demands of gaining ethical consent and accessing schools through third parties, in this case via interview participants.

Following my mailing to head teachers to publicise the survey, I was contacted by the head teacher of a primary school in one of the most disadvantaged areas of the northern LEA and England, who was interested in using music as part of their learning support provision within the classroom and in targeted interventions. Following several meetings with the head teacher and music leader, a proposal for a single case study was developed, in which the school's use of music as an intervention would be tracked through classroom observations of individual staff members' practice and children's progress over a defined period of time. The proposal also made provision to explore the experiences of the wider staff through focus groups, diaries and semi-structured

interviews with individuals. Parental agreement was gained for individual children. However, regrettably, as a consequence of the school's high case load of children in challenging circumstances and the consequent pressures on the school, it was not possible to bring the proposal to fruition within the time constraints of the doctoral process. Nevertheless, this does provide an example of how given time, researchers and practitioners might collaborate together in this research and educational context. However, it is also indicative of the real challenges schools face and the time needed to develop such a project.

Arranging observations with interview participants was equally problematic for a number of reasons. Despite reassurances that classroom observations were not to be interpreted as an assessment of participants' teaching practice, some participants expressed individual or school concerns about being observed. Reassurances were given about the opt-out nature of the consent system, such that only those children and parents not wishing to participate in the study would need to return an opt-out form and they would not be observed or included in the data set. This system was deliberately designed to ease the administration burden on schools by asking schools only to circulate the information document and opt-out form to the classes concerned and collect returned opt-out forms. This system was given ethical approval and the ethics committee noted that the proposed system was a good example of an opt-out consent process. Thus, it was particularly disappointing to encounter such difficulties. Participants' reluctance to be observed is perhaps understandable, given that teaching observations are often perceived as stressful events associated with Ofsted inspections, and that my contact with participants was confined to a few emails and a phone interview. As I was reliant on the participant acting as a point of access to their school, and thus on their goodwill and consent for an observation to take place, I felt it would have been unethical to have ignored these concerns and applied directly to the head teacher without the participant's consent. As highlighted earlier, often education researchers evaluating existing programmes are able to contact participating schools directly without recourse to a third party as was the case in this study. This was a particular issue when the interview participant was a peripatetic or visiting teacher, discussed further below.

Despite these difficulties, two observations of practice were conducted with two interview participants: the peripatetic teacher leading the literacy support project in the east of England (A001); and a class teacher /peripatetic teacher in the northern LEA

who did not use music as a learning support intervention or resource (A004). However in both cases they were visiting peripatetic teachers and whilst they were happy to be observed, they were reluctant to ask schools for permission for classroom observation. This was due in part to the perceived load of the administration of the consent process, despite assurances about the opt-out nature of the consent process. As these participants relied on their good relationships with schools as peripatetic teachers, I did not wish to endanger this relationship. Thus, it was agreed with my lead supervisor and the interview participants to ask their schools if I could observe their practice for contextual purposes only in order to inform my understanding of their practice as reported in their interviews. In each case, consent was given on the basis that no observations would be made of individual children or staff and no data collected. The written consent of the participant's employer, the school and relevant staff involved, as well as parents and children in the 'observed' classes was collected, through the approved opt-out system of consent. Again this was particularly disappointing because aside from the observational purpose, the consent process was exactly the same as that required for the collection of observational data. This experience highlights particular methodological challenges that need to be addressed in planning a study where observations of practice may be involved.

3.7 Data Analysis

3.7.1 Applying Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA)

3.7.1.1 Reading

Individual transcripts were read and analysed thematically in the order they were collected as per the guidelines recommended by Smith, Jarman and Osborn (1999) and Smith, Flowers and Larkin (2009). In order to start engaging with the text, each transcript was read through in order to gain an overview of the data, underlining points of interest before starting the actual process of analysis and coding. I also listened to the original recording whilst reading in order to check for errors in transcription and to reacquaint myself with the participant's interview and voice.

3.7.1.2 Noting

Transcripts were printed with two wide left and right hand margins for coding purposes. The left hand margin was used to summarise and describe key aspects of the text, noting anything that appeared to be of particular importance to participants and the meanings

and experiences they ascribed to particular events. Smith, Flowers and Larkin (2009) describe this as the phenomenological focus of the initial analysis, which is followed by a more interpretative and conceptual analysis of the text. In this stage, I noted participants' use of particular language style, or words to describe their experiences, perceptions and understanding and the context in which they occurred. Smith, Flowers and Larkin (2009) note that even at this very early stage, the researcher starts to understand and make sense of emerging patterns of meaning, asking questions of the text and annotating such queries on the transcript for later reference and reflection. It is at this point that researchers start to draw on their own fore-structures and understanding, which Smith, Flowers and Larkin note may be challenged, confirmed or lead to new understanding, discussed earlier. This noting process was repeated at least twice, supplemented later by re-readings of transcripts as new emergent themes were identified, discussed below.

3.7.1.3 Coding of Emergent Themes

The right hand margin of the transcript was used to record emergent themes. These themes aim to summarise the exploratory notes and comments made in the left hand margin of the transcript into succinct statements of a few words or phrases but without losing the complexity of these initial notes. The first transcript formed the basis for the analysis in generating the first set of codes or emergent themes or codes. Emergent themes were collated into a table in the order in which they emerged, which was constantly added to with each analysis of the transcript, noting the participant number and page reference where the theme occurred. As new themes emerged prior transcripts were re-read in order to review the text in the light of these new emergent themes. This reflects another aspect of the hermeneutic circle, referred to earlier, in which I went back and forth to the data, engaging, reflecting and analysing the text in a cumulative and constant process in the light of other participants' experiences and understanding. The final table of emergent themes acted as the source for the next stage of the analysis outlined below, but it also acted as my reference when writing up to compare relevant sections of the text and identify suitable verbatim accounts.

The process of developing emergent themes was a particularly challenging but important part of the IPA process. The challenges lay in trying to encapsulate accurately the essence of the notes and comments made, whilst also reflecting on the meaning and experience of the participant and my own understanding, experience and interpretation. At the same time I needed to be aware of the influence of my own fore-

structure and understanding and a desire to allow the analysis to speak for itself. Nevertheless, Smith, Flowers and Larkin (2009) note that in moving away from the participant's own descriptions to a more conceptual phase of the analysis, the researcher inevitably becomes more involved and thus the analysis should be seen as a collaborative effort between participant and researcher (p. 92). They point out that this is a key element of the hermeneutic circle as the analysis moves from discrete sections summed up in these emergent themes, towards a new understanding at the end of the final writing up of the analysis. At the outset I had no precise sense of where any of these emergent themes were leading, but this gradually became clearer as the latter stages of the process progressed and themes were clustered together, continuing into the process of the final write up itself. Smith, Flowers and Larkin point out that is normal and where novice researchers can benefit from good supervision. I am therefore grateful for the support of my supervisors in reviewing my first attempts at annotation, coding and clustering the data.

3.7.1.4 Clustering

When no more emergent themes were evident across all the transcripts, the emergent themes were clustered into super-ordinate themes. The cumulative table of emergent themes was copied and cut up into separate strips each containing the various transcript references for each emergent theme. These were grouped into tentative super-ordinate themes, imagining the emergent themes were like magnets, drawing each other towards particular clusters of themes in a variety of ways. Smith, Flowers and Larkin call this process "abstraction" (p. 96), where patterns between emergent themes are identified and given a new name, exemplified in this thesis by clusters such as 'training', 'access' or 'identity'.

Clusters also emerged through a process Smith, Flowers and Larkin call "polarization" (p. 97) in which opposing relationships are identified such as 'time' or 'lack of time', which were grouped under the superordinate theme of 'resources'. Super-ordinate themes also emerged through "contextualisation" by role, setting or time line for example, 'past, present and future musical identities'. The emergent themes were then ranked within each cluster according to the number of references made in each theme. This process, known as "numeration" (p. 98) served to highlight more recurring themes, although this was not necessarily an indicator of importance as it might equally reflect responses across a number of similar roles within the sample. Some themes were grouped on the basis of their "function" (p. 98) such as 'self-starters' or 'innovators'.

Equally, whilst themes were grouped within clusters, some emergent themes overlapped with other clusters and this is reflected in the final write up. This highlights the challenge of coding when the destination is not clear, and in hindsight clearer coding in providing more differential descriptors would have been helpful particularly in further distinguishing differences within themes.

I reviewed and revised my first attempt at clustering themes. Smith, Flowers and Larkin recommend that the paper trail leading up to the final analysis needs to be organised in such a way that another person could also review the process, in what they term a “virtual audit” (p. 183) or where such documents could be handed to another person, independent of the study, to verify that the analysis reflects the data from which it is derived. They point out that that the auditor is not seeking to find the definitive analysis as many interpretations are possible. In the case of doctoral research projects, they suggest that it is appropriate for supervisors to conduct “mini-audits” of their student’ work, checking their annotations and coding and analysing a transcript in part with a student, which was the case in this research.

IPA a time-consuming and demanding yet rewarding process. With hindsight and experience I would be more confident to reduce the number of interviews and seek to engage in a deeper level of analysis. As discussed earlier, sample size is something, which Smith, Flowers and Larkin acknowledge can be problematic for researchers sensitive to the empirical need for large sample sizes and acknowledge that novice researchers may not be working at deeper levels involving the microanalysis of words. This IPA study was a paper-based analysis, which Smith, Flowers and Larkin recommend, although they acknowledge the increasing use of computer software packages such as NVivo¹⁵. However, they suggest that such use should be reserved for more experienced researchers and not novice IPA researchers.

3.8 Summary

This chapter has examined the research rationale, aims, study design and methodological and analytical approaches of this thesis. It has highlighted the challenges and the benefits of the methods employed, and presented a summary of

¹⁵ Available at:

http://www.qsrinternational.com/products_nvivo.aspx?utm_source=NVivo+10+for+Mac

findings from the survey as a prelude to the main focus of the study. With this in mind the thesis now moves on to consider the thematic analysis of interview data in detail.

Chapter Four

The Use of Music to Support Children with SEND in Mainstream Primary Education

4.0 Introduction

The following three chapters present the findings of the IPA analysis. The discussion aims to provide a deeper understanding of participants' practice and their different motivations and experiences of using music in support of children with SEND in the mainstream primary context. The discussion explores participants' individual perceptions and understanding of such practice. It examines how these individual attitudes shape and are affected by wider institutional attitudes, practice and priorities in school music provision, education and learning support, and their effect on past, present and future individual musical practice in this context in an attempt to provide answers to the three research questions outlined in Chapter Three.

The present chapter focuses on the first of these questions, examining participants' motivations and use of music, through their own accounts rather than any observation of their practice. From these individual accounts, an initial profile of practice emerges, facilitated by the systematic IPA approach. However, such practice was difficult to identify and define. Only a very small group of survey respondents reported using music as a specific learning support intervention or resource as defined in the previous chapter. In contrast, the survey identified a larger group of respondents who used music for a wide range of non-musical purposes but which, importantly, they did not consider to be directly linked to the support of children with SEND. This evidence appears to confirm anecdotal views about a lack of targeted musical use in learning support settings. However, this simple analysis hides a more complex picture, which was revealed through the semi-structured interviews with survey respondents and other participants who joined the study post survey. The discussion starts by addressing this issue. An overview of the key themes to emerge from this analysis is then provided, which forms the framework for the more detailed review of individual practice that follows.

4.1 A Question of Terminology

When interview participants were probed more deeply about the nature and reasons for the wider use of music in their teaching practice reported in the survey, they revealed this was indeed frequently motivated by and directed towards the needs of children with SEND. Interview data indicates that music was used in three ways. Firstly, as an explicit intervention tailored to individual and collective children's needs; secondly, as a resource to support the curriculum, contextualise learning and provide a positive learning environment in the classroom; and thirdly, musically, where the wider benefits of musical learning were derived as an implicit part of the processes involved in making music. However, significantly, participants did not refer to, or think about their use of music as a musical intervention or specific learning support resource. Instead, they described their practice as a musical *activity* or saw any targeted use of music as part of their normal intuitive use of music, using more vague terms such as "*music helps with...*" or "*I use music to...*". These references to practice were not tied to specific children or needs, as it might be understood typically in an intervention based approach. Nevertheless, a number of interview participants who were identified *post-survey* did make specific reference to their explicit use of music to target other learning; notably, where music was designed as a separate musical learning support activity that outwardly resembled a bespoke version of a packaged learning support intervention. Although even here, participants described their practice as a music *project* rather than as an intervention. Thus, in contrast to the dichotomous response to the survey question, a fluid definition of music as both a learning support *intervention* and *resource* emerges across a variety of mainstream learning support contexts, where music is used more or less explicitly to support and address individual and collective learning needs; and which concurs with best practice in learning support, education and music. These two terms are used now for the rest of this thesis.

Music specialists, class teachers and learning support specialists were frequently self-deprecating and modest in their descriptions of their musical intentions. This might be indicative of a musical or artistic way of working or mind set, or sense of musical and educational professional integrity where the participant acting as a facilitator, directs attention towards the musical performance or in this instance the needs of the children, rather than to themselves. Equally, it might be indicative of attitudes about the wider use of music in schools, such that even though participants recognised the wider potential of their use of music, they continued to describe their use of music in musical

terms rather than adopt learning support and educational terminology that might have better described and differentiated more explicit practice from normal music education. An inclusive approach to education was evident in participants' practice, which meant educators did not see any practice relating to children with SEND as separate or different from their normal practice. Alternatively, this might also be due to the nature of music itself. As Rabinowitch, Cross and Burnard (2012) point out, music-making provides the perfect disguise to target non-musical objectives in enjoyable and engaging ways through the outcomes that arise implicitly from music-making. Thus music in this sense is simultaneously explicit in its targeted focus and implicit in the outcomes it generates.

This obviously has considerable potential benefits for the child but presents particular challenges for researchers in identifying such practice, and for educators and policy makers in recognising the contribution music might make to learning support practice. These issues are addressed here and in following chapters. Teasing out the use of music as it relates to children with SEND has thus been a central challenge throughout this research.

This research has taken a deliberately broad and exploratory approach in investigating the use of music in this context, given the paucity of formal research in this area. In some ways this broad approach risks straying into a wider discussion of how music is used generally in mainstream primary education rather than this study's specific focus of music in relation to children with SEND. However, as Chapter One outlines, best practice in supporting children with SEND is not confined solely to the delivery of interventions, even though recent governmental and educational priorities have focussed attention on the provision of early intervention programmes and practice. It is worth remembering that best practice starts in the classroom where the majority of a child's learning occurs, and where individual needs and barriers are identified. Thus, identifying the use of music in the wider contexts of the classroom and in school life, alongside any explicit use outside the classroom is both valuable and relevant to this discussion for a number of reasons. Firstly, it draws attention to the wider potential of music to make a positive targeted and daily contribution both to learning support provision and best practice in the classroom. Secondly, it shows how, with some forethought and planning, music in all its forms might contribute to providing a positive, meaningful and creative learning environment across all mainstream learning settings; breaking down barriers and acknowledging and supporting individual learning

styles and needs in simple ways, which participants' accounts suggest may be just as effective for children with SEND as any explicit learning support intervention.

A thematic analysis of practice revealed a number of similar, overlapping subthemes across participants' practice in the way musical resources and methods of delivery were matched to, and were led by, a range of musical and non-musical learning objectives. Three key superordinate themes emerged which are helpful in understanding both the nature of participants' musical practice in relation to children with SEND, and the learning setting in which it occurs. The most dominant of these themes described practice where music was explicitly *tailored to children's needs* as an intervention. Of secondary importance was a broad use of music as a resource, where music was *tailored to school needs* across the learning support setting, general classroom, and in school life; and finally, through the use of music *in the music classroom*, which met both individual children's needs and school needs as implicit musical goals. These three themes provide the framework for a more detailed analysis of practice in which overlapping emergent themes and specific outcomes are highlighted in context. The discussion then moves on to consider a thematic view of the wider opportunities and challenges music presents to children with SEND and their educators. Before doing so, a short overview of practice is provided to identify the range of emergent themes as they relate to musical purpose, delivery and resources, which are then considered in context in the more detailed analysis of practice.

4.2 An Overview of Practice

4.2.1 Purpose

Participants reported using music in three ways, in settings that reflect the learning purpose. Firstly, music was used to explicitly target individual and collective *cognitive, physical, social, emotional and behavioural needs*: either as a packaged intervention or as a bespoke musical intervention tailored to specific needs in the learning support setting; or explicitly, as part of normal practice in the general classroom and learning support unit. More specifically, this explicit use of music was used to target a number of needs: *speech and language development and literacy* through rhythm and song; *memory function* through the memorisation of song lyrics in performance; *social integration, social skills, self-esteem and confidence* through musical interaction and leadership; *physical skills* such as handwriting through the development of hand-eye

coordination; *sensory development* through a multi-sensory exploration of sound; and *emotional literacy and behavioural support* in the general classroom.

Secondly, music was used more broadly. In this instance music was *tailored to school or class wide needs* rather than child-specific needs, where the overall aim was relevant to *all* children but which nevertheless had particular relevance and benefits for children with SEND in overcoming potential barriers to learning. Here, the musical purpose supported educational aims in the classroom or specialist unit, and across year groups or key stages, particularly during *cross-curricular work*, and across whole school populations in *school assemblies or musical performances*. For example, music was used *as a curriculum resource* through the use of songs and music chosen for their relevance to the topic that helped *to contextualise non-musical learning, stimulate creative thinking and imagination*, and which provided opportunities for *integrated, experiential learning*. Equally, music was used to provide an *inclusive, positive learning environment* in the classroom to *support classroom routine* easing transitions from one activity to another, reducing the reliance on language in the classroom or learning support unit and *regulating mood and atmosphere* that impacted positively on individual and social behaviour. Across the whole school, music was used to address wider school issues of relevance to children with SEND such as *engagement, inclusion, integration, school identity, cohesion and belonging*.

Thirdly, in contrast to practice outlined above, non-musical learning was addressed indirectly, through the implicit processes of music-making in the music classroom. Here learning objectives were explicitly *musical* rather than non-musical, where the development of non-musical skills relevant to children with SEND arose implicitly through the process of music-making and children's own musical abilities and interests. The music classroom provided more integrated opportunities for a musical and sensory exploration of the curriculum through composition and active music-making. The implicit process of music-making and performance also enabled the realisation of wider school aims of *independent and creative learning, social inclusion, cohesion, recognition and reward*.

What appears to separate or define the musical activities described here is not their outward musical appearance, but the learning intention behind them, which inevitably is hidden from the onlooker. This raises interesting questions about whether the wider benefits of music should be harnessed as a set of explicit non-musical aims or derive implicitly as a result of the inherent processes involved in making music.

4.2.2 Resources

Participants' use of resources was closely tied to the specific purpose. Those involved in explicit practice reported *tailoring* their use of *musical resources to the child's needs* or to the *music specialist's or educator's needs* in order to meet the delivery aim, using hand-held percussion instruments such as djembes, shakers and push button hand bells with singing, as well as the use of packaged musical interventions and recorded music.

Participants using music for more broad purposes saw music as a *curriculum resource*, choosing resources that reflected *school and teacher's needs* rather than any individual needs. Here participants used ready-made cross-curricular *musical programmes* with accompanying CDs or *musical ICT* in the form of 'apps', musical composition and recording software such as Garage Band and online musical resources such as the Sing Up Song Bank. Visiting community musicians were also used to meet school needs adding a live and interactive element to cross-curricular and musical learning.

Participants leading musical activities in the music lesson utilised multi-sensory resources in similar ways to those engaged in explicit practice, but here they were tailored to musical needs as well as children's needs, emphasising the tactile and vibratory qualities of hand-held percussion instruments and specially designed materials to support children with visual impairment and other children attending a specialist mainstream unit. Another participant had linked music to sign language to create, explore and enhance sensory sound worlds for deaf and hearing impaired children. Practice across all purposes was thus frequently *multi-sensory, embodied, holistic* and *informal* in nature. Singing also predominated across all practice.

The use of *specialist musical resources* supported participants' aims to ensure *equal access and opportunity* for musical participation for non-verbal children and those with the most severe physical disabilities. Adapted beaters or wrist-based instruments were used for children experiencing motor difficulties, while the use of technology provided a vital means of overcoming potential barriers presented by some musical instruments and singing for physically disabled and non-verbal children respectively. Switch-based instruments such as Quintet boxes were programmed to enable children to participate in Wider Opportunities guitar lessons and communication aids such as VOCA¹⁶ were used to encourage communication through musical turn-taking in call and response songs.

¹⁶ Voice Output Communication Aids

In one school, such technology moved with the child from one learning setting to another, vital in ensuring children were able to participate in any use of music.

This *multi-sensory* and *technology-based approach* was motivated in a number of ways: firstly, by participants' previous *experience of working with children with SEND* in musical and non-musical settings; and secondly, by some participants' *research interest* in music and/or SEND provision, which directly influenced their decision to use a multi-sensory approach as part of their normal practice to ensure equal access. More specifically, some specialists drew on their *knowledge of multi-sensory pedagogical approaches* such as Kodály, which by their training provided them with a ready *mental store* of musical activities, songs and games. Others built upon their experience of *existing musical provision* such as Wider Opportunities and Sing Up training, methods and resources, which encouraged an *inclusive* approach and experience of group teaching. More experienced participants drew on their *advanced musical knowledge* and *prior SEND experience*, while less confident participants relied on *packaged interventions* and *programmes of musical education* to support their use of music that also included programmes tailored to the needs of specific groups of children or needs.

Music specialists, both in and outside of school were happy to *share their skills* and plan with, or for, other educators in tailoring music to fit specific and broad non-musical purposes. This ranged from informal conversations with colleagues in corridors to bespoke musical interventions and the development of a bespoke musical resource, complete with accompanying teaching materials, CD and training. This was designed to encourage classroom educators working in a cluster of special schools, attached units and mainstream primary schools to develop communication skills through a focus on musical pulse. In this way the *music specialist role* both in and outside of schools was a valuable and existing musical resource in mainstream primary schools for educators to draw upon. In a similar vein, TAs were also seen as a *vital link* for music specialists in providing knowledge of the child and their interests, and in supporting children's behaviour, although at times they constituted a challenge for children and music specialists by impeding efforts to develop children's independence.

Whilst resources were largely determined by musical purpose they also *led practice*. For example, one musical intervention arose directly from a search for accessible musical instruments. Similarly, *child-led evidence* and *research evidence* provided an important resource that motivated and informed participants in their use of music.

Perhaps less obvious, but no less vital a resource, the provision of *financial support* also led practice by enabling pilot projects to be developed that in turn meant bespoke projects were provided at no cost for schools, if only for a short time. Grant funding and school fundraising enabled the purchase of specialist equipment and attendance at musical events. School music budgets provided the resource to purchase special visits from musicians and musical resources that were used to support a wider use throughout the school. Funding from the National College, now known as the National College for Teaching and Leadership, provided funding for staff at a small rural school to develop a creative curriculum, of which music was an integral part. The provision of *time, goodwill and support* from schools and head teachers to music specialists was critical in enabling the development of new practice related to children with SEND. Such was the commitment of one participant that she funded a second project in her own time in the absence of sufficient funding in order to enable her to continue developing her bespoke practice. This evident *passion* and a *long-held belief* in equal access to either music and/or to learning for children with SEND, united and sustained all participants as a significant resource.

4.2.3 Delivery

Just as resources were related to purpose so the means by which music was delivered also reflected these choices. Delivery was overwhelmingly *inclusive and child-led*, in the sense that delivery was *tailored to children's needs*. Although much practice was *teacher-led*, at times musical learning was led by the children themselves through *peer-led learning*. A *multi-sensory, embodied and holistic* approach enabled children to use their strengths and interests to support their wider learning.

Explicit practice tended to be *led by music specialists*, although an inclusion manager and a TA also led practice. They relied on an *intuitive and instinctive approach* to deliver their musical practice. Music specialists drew on a *mental store* of musical knowledge, experience and resources, while learning support specialists used their knowledge of the child's needs to inform their use of music. Equally, for some participants, their own *research* interests, musical or educational, appeared to determine their personal practice. Similarly, explicit practice was led by, or in sympathy with, the *strategic vision* of external music providers and employers. Explicit practice was characterised by delivery to *small groups* of children often defined by their need rather than age, which meant that these groups often comprised a *wide age range* of children.

Broad practice in contrast was largely *teacher-led*. As already outlined, class teachers either relied on the *support of the music specialist* to provide suitable musical resources *in support of the curriculum*, or they used purchased *musical programmes* and *online resources* and *music technology* to support their use of music. In the classroom, where music was used *to support class routine*, music was delivered in similar *informal, intuitive* ways to that seen in explicit practice, although these class teachers were also often music subject leaders (or had been in the past), which enabled them to draw on similar mental resources and methods of delivery evident in explicit practice. In contrast to the wide age range associated with explicit practice, in this instance, children were grouped by class or year group rather than by need. Similarly, the use of music as a broad resource meant music was *integrated* into the curriculum and daily classroom practice, unlike the explicit and often separate nature of intervention-based, explicit musical practice.

Whether explicit or broad in nature, practice often developed, although not exclusively, as a result of chance encounters and conversations. This *collaborative, discussion-based approach* was often inspired by a *shared vision* of education, equal access and opportunity in education and/or music. These beliefs were realised and facilitated by *shared ways of working* and *sharing of skills* and experience. However, purely musical practice was led by music specialists, who, although delivering music in similarly intuitive and instinctive ways to those involved in explicit practice, usually *worked alone*, determining their own practice to meet the aims of the music curriculum and extracurricular musical activities. Individuals, across all types of practice, were often curious, *pioneering and innovative* practitioners who by their own accounts appeared to be *self-starters*, who were keen to develop practice and provide positive learning experiences for all children.

This short overview gives a flavour of some of the practice related sub-themes that have emerged from participants' accounts of their use of music in relation to children with SEND. The discussion moves on to consider these emergent themes in context using participants' own descriptions to illustrate and enrich the discussion. As already identified, the three most dominant themes to emerge across musical purpose, resources and delivery are used as a framework for discussion. Thus practice is considered in three ways:

- 1) practice, which was *tailored to children's needs*, exemplified by an explicit use of music;

- 2) practice *tailored to school needs*, where practice was broad in aim; and
- 3) *musically led learning* in the music classroom, where non-musical learning arose implicitly from musical learning objectives.

Emergent themes mentioned above which affected practice such as *individual knowledge* and *support* are considered in following chapters. Using short case study examples of practice, the following analysis aims to highlight similarities and differences in practice in order to provide an overarching view of how music is used in relation to children with SEND in mainstream primary education as experienced and described by this sample of participants.

4.3 Tailored to the Needs and Interests of the Child

As already intimated, examples of explicit practice were principally determined by the needs of the child rather than any statutory demands of a curriculum. Music was delivered in three explicit ways. Firstly, two bespoke musical interventions were identified, referred to by participants as a “literacy support project” and a “singing project” rather than as an intervention. Their use of music is distinct from other musical practice in the way these participants tailored their use of music directly to the needs of individuals or small groups of children that was delivered by music specialists as a separate and specific activity within a specialist unit, or as a separate learning support activity over a defined period of weeks or months. Secondly, where spontaneous resource-led musical practice evolved into a specific learning support intervention following endorsement from a visiting learning support specialist. And thirdly, through the targeted use of music in the classroom, music lesson or in specialist units attached to mainstream schools. These are now considered in turn.

4.3.1 Music as a Bespoke Learning Support Intervention

As outlined in chapter three, informal communication about the research study post-survey led to the identification of two pilot projects: one a literacy support project, the other a singing project, where music was used in a fashion that might be described as a *bespoke learning support intervention*. Each project had its own name but these names are not used in order to preserve participants’ anonymity. These pilot projects provide important insights into the use of music at its most explicit and as an intervention, where practice has a specific aim from the outset, occurs over a predetermined period of time and is evaluated pre and post-intervention. However, evaluation in this context

was more broadly defined than might be the case in common practice in research or educational interventions. In this instance, evaluation relied on anecdotal evidence from teachers or was focussed on evaluating the wider strategic aims of the project rather than the evaluation of individual educational progress. Nevertheless, this desire to evaluate non-musical learning post-activity is more akin to the nature of an intervention and helps to distinguish this type of practice from purely musical practice where any evaluation would measure musical rather than non-musical progress.

Both examples were similar in that the participants had a clear vision of what they wanted to address from the outset even if the manner in which the projects were delivered developed differently and *organically* in response to the individual needs of children and wishes of the schools. Both were designed and delivered by peripatetic and community music specialists in collaboration with learning support specialists in mainstream primary schools, where the primary educational focus centred on learning support, rather than musical or general educational aims. Here, music was explicitly tailored to individual children's needs and delivered as a separate musical learning support activity.

4.3.1.1 Using Rhythm and Song to Develop Language Skills

The literacy support pilot project, based in the east of England, focussed on the development of phonological awareness, language and literacy for a small mixed age group of children in Reception to Year 4, all with Statements of Special Educational Need, attending a SLCN unit attached to a mainstream primary school. The participant, a peripatetic teacher (A001), described how the project arose from a chance conversation with a fellow peripatetic teacher at a conference. They both had similar backgrounds in literacy support and shared a desire to explore how music might be used in this context.

A pilot project rapidly developed some two months later, indicative of their determination and pioneering spirit, characteristic of self-starters. Their employers, the county music service, supported their innovatory approach by providing initial funding to enable the project to be delivered free to two participating schools, who were "happy to give it a go" based on a long standing working relationship developed over many years with the participant, a peripatetic teacher (A001, P. 8). The project was designed and led by the participant and her colleague (not interviewed), with the support of the unit's teachers who supplied details of the children's individual needs, and the unit's TAs, who actively participated in the music sessions. The project used African

drumming and singing to target child-specific language difficulties and took place initially over six 30-minute sessions during the children's normal support time in the unit. This project was later adapted for delivery in a second school with Year 2 children on the school's SEN Register during a specially allocated period of the school timetable. The project has since become a trademarked element of the music service's programme of services to schools.

The project design appeared collaborative in nature and explicitly tailored to children's needs. The unit teachers provided individual information about the children and their learning needs, while the peripatetic teachers' drew on their research knowledge, prior experience of literacy support, special education and instrumental music provision to select songs and rhythms which directly targeted specific sounds of relevance to individual children but which did not draw attention to these individual needs. The explicit nature of this practice is evident in the very precise choice of songs, tempi and rhythms as the peripatetic teacher describes:

A001: pp. 4-6. [...] We have a singing the name song. And there is one child who has difficulty with [...] "his" and "hers" [...]. So it's sounds silly but its "Tickeldy, tickeldy bumblebee, can you sing your name for me?" and the child does. And then everybody else says- He'll say (sings) "My name is didlele duh". "His name or- her name's diddle duh". And that goes round the circle. [...] We did Little Liza Jane [...], one of the children had a 'luh' thing, but also that was picking out the rhythms of 'Little Li__za Jane' [...]. And then we have done things like pure rhythm work, marching around the room to a drum beat. And at 100- approximately 120 beats per minute, as that is supposed to be an optimum speed for speech, the underlying rhythm of speech. [...] So approximately that and then doubled it and halved it so they are marching in time and then we have added the loud and soft. So with a loud beat they stamp and with a soft beat they tiptoe. And then broken that down within the four patterns, in that, so the idea is that they are mimicking the stress within words, [...] but with feet. [...] It's flexible because you would choose different songs for different groups of children.

Call and response or turn-taking songs were specifically chosen by the music specialists to reinforce, for example, the differences between consonant sounds or language such as 'his' and 'hers', whilst simultaneously moving around the room in ways coordinated to a pulse tapped out by the children and teachers on individually hand-held djembes or other hand-held percussion instruments. The collective pulse was deliberately chosen to correspond to optimal speeds for speech. Children were encouraged to explore the rhythmic and dynamic nature of language by tapping the rhythm of their names or other key words on the djembes or other deliberately chosen

hand-held percussion instruments such as shakers that enabled the children to manipulate the sounds physically:

A001: p.7. I might introduce the shakers because there are some rhythms we won't be doing on drums because the stress is all wrong and your hands will get tangled up- we're using djembes. But some of the rhythms in the songs that we might want to pick out, I'll want to use little shakers for.

Different songs targeted different children's needs but importantly, the children were unaware that specific songs or rhythms were directed towards their own needs. These child-specific learning objectives were disguised in the enjoyable context of music-making and show how the use of music in this context can be simultaneously targeted and inclusive, explicit and implicit.

The project adopted a cognitive neuro-scientific approach, and of all the examples of practice cited here, is the closest in design to intervention studies in the research literature, where music is linked with the direct development of auditory function and associated learning. This practice is similar in approach to that suggested by Wan and colleagues (2011) regarding the use of rhythm and singing to develop language skills in the language classroom and also resembles the Musical Activity Programme (Overy, 2003, 2010) where rhythm and movement were shown to positively affect the spelling of children with dyslexia. Although led principally by personal interest and practice-based reflection, the participant described how her knowledge of research in this area encouraged and confirmed her own personal ideas:

A001: pp.1-2. We have both got some background in literacy support in the past and it just came out of a conversation. We suddenly had a sort of a click and a meeting of minds. My colleague, [name] is a singer, and she [...] enjoyed it when she worked in literacy support doing special needs and she has always thought she would like to do it using the singing aspect. [...] And I'm a flautist, but I've always had this idea that you should be able to develop the underlying skills, like memory and that sort of thing of children with mild and special needs just through doing music, per se. [...] Part of the Wider Opps work that I've done- well I'd never done any drumming before and it seemed to sort of make sense that if you put the singing and the drumming together it might be something really powerful and [...] we thought well yes the singing on a very basic level engages the whole brain rather than just a part of it, so you are bypassing the bits that don't work so well in children who are having difficulties. [...] And the drumming side of it- I came across somebody's thesis- I can't remember who [...]. She had done some work with a drum circle with some children with dyslexia [...] And that sort of encouraged me. But reading more technical work with Usha Goswami, and I haven't read so much of Katie Overy's work, but I have read a little bit that with dyslexia, one of the common problems is the temporal processing thing. [...] And that you can improve that by improving the sense of rhythm so it doesn't have to be linked to language,

just developing the sense [...] of rhythm through music can be beneficial. And we thought of bringing the two together.

It had been intended to evaluate the children's learning, but this was problematic for two reasons: the peripatetic teachers were unable to find an objective evaluation measure and had hoped to rely on teacher assessment. However, they found that teachers either did not have time to carry out the assessment or did not feel that much learning would take place over such a short period of time, which despite their willingness to be involved with the project, was perhaps indicative of wider attitudes about the impact of music:

A001: p.12. [...] well I talked about evaluation, they said, "Ooh it's only six weeks you'd probably wouldn't see very much anyway. But we will get training out of it and carry on."

Countering this view, the participant described how the project did generate very positive responses from both children and staff that challenged views about the children's abilities generally and musically, and led to a number of unexpected outcomes:

A001: pp.6-7. We were a bit worried before we started because we were told some of them don't talk very much, but they have all joined in from the very beginning, [...]. They are very well motivated. [...]. No behaviour problems or anything.

Whilst the decision of combining rhythm work with singing was designed to support the underlying skills involved in language development, the use of rhythm work had a second role that might not be so evident. An inclusion manager (A017) whose role was to ensure equal access to learning highlighted the pitfalls of just using singing in the classroom, as it would preclude non-verbal children from participating equally. She highlighted the importance of providing other supporting musical activities, such as clapping, moving to the music or the use of percussion instruments for non-verbal children so that they might join in. Thus, in the case of the literacy support project, the rhythmic work may also have provided a dual cognitive and social scaffold not just for the development of language skills but also an inclusive, enabling environment in which these children were able to participate equally, allowing them to maximise the learning opportunity and outperform expectations. Staff were positive about the literacy support project and the effect it had on the children:

A001: p.8. [...] there are two specialist teachers in the unit and they're very busy on a Friday morning and they haven't been in. Apart from one, who was in for half a session, [...] and she was in again last week, [...] and this teacher had

made a point of saying how much she had enjoyed the session and how valuable she could see it was for the children.

The participant's sister, a TA working in a primary school in another county also saw the relevance to her own work and set up a drumming group with other staff, and followed her sister's programme with telephone support. Whilst developing phonological awareness was a central premise in the project's design and aim, its direct relevance to the phonics programmes used in schools was not known at the outset until staff in the TA's school identified a direct link between the musical activity and units of work in the Letters and Sounds phonics programme used in schools as part of the National Literacy Strategy:

A001: p.16. She said, "Ooh! I reckon a bit of drumming would help with listening skills with some of my pupils". So I sent her some information that I had been sending off to other schools and she showed it to the teachers she worked with and they were the ones who actually said, "Ooh! Letters and Sounds." So that is where that came from.

The literacy support project was extended to a second school who also saw this link, which motivated their involvement in the pilot project:

A001: p.9. This second school reckons they will get- they're just as enthusiastic. I had a meeting with the SENCo, the Assistant SENCo and two class teachers and they seem to think we are on the right- and of course it links in with Letters and Sounds which we didn't realise when we set it up, but if you read- is it Phase one or is it in the Introductory phase? The things you are meant to do in Phase one [of the Letters and Sounds phonics scheme] and throughout all of this is are auditory discrimination, auditory memory and auditory sequencing. And music just covers all that without really trying. [...] We didn't realise this before we started, but I think this is perhaps why they are quite so enthusiastic! Because it links into what they're supposed to be doing anyway.

These comments are highly significant. They raise a number of important strands that are central to the discussion here and in the chapters that follow. Firstly, although the project was exploratory, the peripatetic teacher and her colleagues demonstrate in very clear terms how the musical development of auditory function as an inherent and implicit element of active music-making might make a direct contribution the development of key pre-literacy skills, and the aims of the National Literacy Strategy. Nevertheless, whilst the peripatetic teacher laughs at her own comment that "music just covers all that without really trying", illustrating her self-deprecating attitude to her practice, she encapsulates the complexity ("covers all that") and simplicity of the issue ("without really trying") and makes a powerful case for the use of music in this context. Her comment adds weight to Rabinowitch, Cross and Burnard's view (2013) that music can provide a valuable disguise through which to target other learning. Although the

peripatetic teacher felt that schools were happy to lend their support to the project because of her long-standing relationships with them and their support for music, the comments above also suggest that schools were motivated to participate because they could see the project's direct relevance to their own priorities. This is important for two reasons: firstly, other participants in school and classroom roles reported how their use of music was negatively affected by the focus on core skills and the need to justify their practice; issues which are discussed further in Chapter Six. The peripatetic teacher's comment that "music just does all that without trying", provides a powerful reply. This project also highlights the value of collaboration, the sharing of knowledge, skills and understanding within education in developing practice. However, as Chapters Five and Six show, music specialists often work in isolation and opportunities such as this to collaborate, particularly in learning support provision are relatively rare. These comments raise interesting questions about the purpose, value and place of music in primary education. These issues are considered in following chapters.

4.3.1.2 Developing Cognitive and Social Skills through Singing

The second project, in the north of England, tailored the use of music to children's needs and interests in a more open-ended manner, which reflected the particular way of working of the national music provider who initiated the project. The project was led by the strategic aims of the provider's to increase access to music-making amongst groups of children historically at the periphery of mainstream education and music provision. However, it was also led by the national programme manager's (A005) curiosity to explore how music specialists and SENCOs might work more closely, discussed further in Chapter Six. The project explored how singing might be used to support a range of individual and collective needs across a range of different ages and group sizes as a separate timetabled learning support musical activity across an existing cluster of six mainstream primary schools. The project used the focus and activity of these bespoke singing interventions to explore the main strategic impetus for the project, which sought to bring together SENCOs and music subject leaders in new working relationships, addressing issues of musical confidence and delivery through the provision of musical training, mentoring and role modelling by an experienced visiting vocal leader and SEND music specialist.

The project was initiated by the national programme manager (A005) and colleagues at an open meeting with schools to showcase the work of other national SEND music organisations where the idea of the project was put forward. A project facilitator

(A011) designed the overall shape of project in consultation with schools and head teachers who signed a learning contract that detailed expectations on both sides. The project was delivered jointly by an experienced vocal leader (A019), who designed and delivered specific practice, with two educators in each school, usually the SENCo and music subject leader, on a fortnightly basis over a period of five months. The two school staff were expected to maintain the activity in the intervening week and keep a journal of their experiences for self-reflection and training purposes. A specialist SEND music leader was also employed to deliver staff training at the start of the project and provide standby support to the vocal leader and the project. Thus, this project was longer in duration and more strategically led than the literacy support project, and had wider musical aims that were supported by the established structure and working style of the national provider.

Although the project appeared more formally defined through the use of a learning contract between the national provider and head teachers, the singing project was more open-ended in approach than the literacy support project. In the literacy support project, although the unit staff provided the details of specific sound and language difficulties, the peripatetic teacher (A001) determined the project's central focus on language development. In contrast, in the singing project, teachers and schools defined the child-centred goals rather than the vocal leader (A019). This led to a range of very different child-centred aims within and across schools, around which the vocal leader tailored her use of music.

The aims of the singing project targeted cognitive skills, for example developing memory in children with dyslexia, to more broad and intangible aims around personal development, such as self-esteem, confidence, leadership and engagement. Similarly, there was much greater variety in group size, setting and range of needs, as the project facilitator (A011) explained:

A011: pp.7-8. [...] they [schools] all identified different groups of special educational needs, so one school had an autism unit, and all of the young people involved were on the autistic spectrum and part of that group of children were withdrawn from some lessons. One school had [...] a nurture group. So, children who had all kinds of issues with learning, for example one girl had Foetal Alcohol Syndrome, which meant that she didn't learn as quickly, so she was a member of this nurture group. And [...] they had some Year 6 children, some of whom had been excluded, acting as role models and young singing leaders and supporting the nurture group. So that was a big group, [...] about 30, when you put them all together, whereas the group of children on the autistic spectrum was very small, just five or six. One school wanted to work

specifically around [...] dyslexia and memory. So they were all identifying a different focus, [...] for example the school with a group of children with dyslexia, they wanted to work on improving their memories, so they did a lot of song learning. Another school, the nurture group was very much about developing confidence and self-esteem. One of the groups was a focus through development of self-confidence and self-esteem improving behaviour, and some of the groups, interestingly, were just whole classes, so they weren't withdrawn.

She highlights the range of individual and collective needs in schools, but also the capacity of music to support each need in individually relevant ways. Despite these variations, the key needs identified by teachers were broadly similar: to build confidence and encourage active engagement through fun and enjoyable singing activities. The vocal leader (A019) adopted a flexible approach. She combined her considerable musical experience as a vocal leader working with marginalised groups of children and musical groups in the community with her experience as a musical trainer of class teachers and her experience of working with adults and children with SEND (although this by her own admission was relatively limited). She tailored her musical delivery to meet the wide range of individual and collective needs and settings across the six schools:

A019: pp.6-8. [...] I was going to be working with a group of children who'd been bullied and had issues with confidence and they were incredibly shy, so the idea with them was to work towards them being able to lead some singing with their peers, which was a really nice idea, so it was kind of a bit like the [project name] with [national provider]. They brought those children out of their classes [...]. In that school I worked with three different groups, I worked with a group who were boys with serious behavioural problems, followed by this group of very shy children who were going to become young leaders, then two boys with severe learning difficulties. So that was a real variety in one school. [...] I've got a lot of experience of working with primary aged boys, [...] I set up quite a lot of boys choirs in the [area name], so I do have lots of ideas up my sleeve of how to keep them interested and focused, and with regards to working with the young leaders, I suppose it was a little bit like working with nervous teachers, kind of giving them ideas of warm ups and games and just getting them to enjoy them, and then gradually getting them to lead little songs on their own.

Each activity in each school culminated in a planned musical performance, providing a long-term goal and valuable opportunities for public recognition that also led to school-led initiatives such as a fundraising day and the production of a CD, alongside a number of other unexpected positive outcomes. As will be discussed later, these musical performances provided opportunities to evaluate learning in often dramatic ways that in turn challenged teacher and peer attitudes and stereotypes of these children, thus fulfilling wider school goals of inclusion, cohesion and integration.

Where the peripatetic teacher (A001) chose songs and rhythms for their rhythmic and language potential, in contrast, the vocal leader (A019) drew on children's interests. In one case she drew on children's' cultural heritage to encourage the primary aim of fostering musical engagement amongst a group of traveller boys who were part of a large and often separate part of the local community:

A019: p. 9. They [teachers] said these boys never engage with any music at all, and they just said if I could possibly get them being a little bit interested in music, and what I noticed with them was that they loved dancing, I think that's part of their culture is they like to have a good dance, and so I started getting them to choreograph songs and they loved it and that was a way of getting them eventually to then start singing them as well.

The vocal leader adapted her practice in response to her observations of the different groups of children. In this instance, her sensitivity towards the children's cultural identity appears to have provided the vital hook that enabled the children to see the musical learning as relevant and meaningful to them. As discussed earlier, Sloboda, in his critique of school music education, points out, for music to be meaningful and engaging, it must be relevant to the individual (2001). Hallam (2010) too notes in her review of the wider potential of music, that music must be enjoyable to be effective. Crucially, it also provided the pathway for the vocal leader to realise the school's wider aim of musical engagement. In the case of the traveller boys, the tailored use of music succeeded where obviously other musical approaches had failed to engage this group of children. Perhaps because the vocal leader centred on their interests, with what they were comfortable doing and used their culture heritage. This practice might be described in social constructivist terms, echoing the theories of Vygotsky (1978) or Cultural Historical Activity Theory (Engestrom, Miettinen & Punanaki, 1999). The vocal leader cleverly uses the children's cultural, historical and musical traditions to build trust and a relationship alongside the social dynamics of group singing as a Zone of Proximal Development to guide children towards new learning and social integration, through the children's abilities and interests that enabled them to engage with the music-making.

Another participant, a head of a SLCN unit (A007) described, in relation to her own musical practice, how this social constructivist approach is a particular characteristic of the Kodály method in scaffolding learning:

A007: pp.16-17. [...] well, it [Kodály] starts with the basic principle that you work with what children know and can do. Instead of giving them impossible intervals to sing that they couldn't possibly reach, we were giving them very

simple, sort of same-y intervals to start off with, the sort of things that they would sing in the playground, and, my goodness, the children are suddenly singing back to you, because it's something they can do and it's natural to them. [...] It's partly working with what the children can do, and secondly it's doing singing games, these interactive games that you do with the Kodály approach means that the children are motivated to join in, you don't have children sitting out anymore. [...] You're, you're singing "Doggy, doggy, where's the bone?" or something, and they're so motivated to have a go that they sing. And I never force anybody to join in. I have seen children time and time again forced to join in these things, and it's painful, it's like forcing a child to eat. They should come to you [...] when they're ready, but I find they come to you so much quicker using this approach, and it's so much more painless; they think they're having fun. [...] They learn through play, they learn through having fun, and you as a teacher, your skill is just to guide them through it.

This reflects not just best practice as defined by Kodály but also in SEND provision, where understanding the child from their perspective is seen as essential, not just in identifying and targeting specific needs but in ensuring learning and support is accessible and relevant. The head of the SLCN unit (A007) also highlights a recurring theme throughout this thesis about how the explicit learning objective, whether musical or non-musical, is hidden from the child; where the objective is disguised in fun musical games and a playful enjoyable approach that is relevant to the child, which enables children's own barriers to learning to be overcome more easily. The head of the SLCN unit (A007), inspired by her Kodály training, felt that music provided valuable opportunities to develop relationships and trust between children and teachers, even when with some children it appears impossible; opening up channels of reciprocal communication:

A007: pp. 33-34. I've just remembered a new quote from Zoltan Kodály himself. It was a lecture I was at last week, and apparently he said [...], "The teaching of music is partly based on the relationship between the teacher and the pupil", and that is fundamental too, it's having an understanding of your pupil, having that good, positive relationship, perhaps a bit of a sense of humour where it's necessary, having something going between you. It's part of this reciprocal communication, so in that way the communication thing and the music needs are very linked, in fact they're inextricable [...] I think in some ways the most interesting area is autism, because the teacher has to be able to understand to some degree how the autistic child is looking at the world, because their world perspective is so different, and without that understanding it can be quite difficult to work with that sort of child in any setting, really. [...] It comes back to the relationship, but it is there when you think perhaps the relationship is the most difficult, you can still have that relationship.

Although not SEND music specialists, it is perhaps significant that both the peripatetic teacher (A001) and the vocal leader (A019) had previous experience of working with children with SEND, which they said, coupled with their child-centred approach to

musical learning, informed their approach. Interestingly, the vocal leader (A019) found the children with the most severe needs to be the most personally challenging because, in contrast to her experience of working with boys, she felt she lacked specific experience with children with this level of need and was unsure of their capabilities:

A019: pp.8-9. The toughest was the two boys with severe learning difficulties. [...] I wasn't initially aware of what they were capable of I suppose, so that was quite difficult at first, but I had the two teachers with me that made it a lot easier, and over the weeks I realised what they were capable of, that they could just about hit an instrument, and they got a lot of enjoyment out of that. Because that's a very specialist area that I haven't got a great deal of experience in.

Having teachers or support workers who know the child was seen as a vital link for the majority of participants in helping to ensure their practice was relevant and tailored to the child's needs and interests. However, some participants disagreed, finding some TAs hindered children's musical participation; an issue discussed later in the section considering challenges.

The musical performance at the end of singing project in each school provided a valuable platform to showcase children's learning. The project facilitator (A011) described how these performances appeared to challenge stereotypes held by teachers, parents and the children's peers in a dramatic fashion. It also highlighted how the vocal leader through her tailored use of musical resources and delivery had managed to provide a wide variety of individually meaningful and relevant learning opportunities through singing, as the project facilitator (A011) explained:

A011: pp.9-10. [...] I went along to three of the performances- the repertoire was all very different. For example one of the groups that was withdrawn had a group of boys that were presenting significant behavioural difficulties, and were very difficult to manage, and she'd chosen very different repertoire for them. In actual fact, I watched them perform solos, and what shocked me, and made me feel really proud for those lads was, not only were the teachers surprised, but the kids who were sat watching them were like "I can't believe that that is that person!" [...] I don't know what their, what their reputations were, but there was surprise by the kids sat in front of me at who was performing. [...] And then in the nurture group, the music was very different. It seemed kind of softer and more reflective in the nurture group, [...] and again, I was very surprised at the socialisation of the children, so they sang a song called "Me and My Shadow". So you had these quite tough Year 6 boys who had been excluded, holding hands with these Year 3 kids, swaying side to side singing with them, and their parents, being equally shocked, sat on the benches at the side of the hall. So there's all these kind of stereotypes being thrown up and shattered, and, so yes, the repertoire was chosen, I think, to support each particular group.

Teachers kept journals throughout the project for evaluation and self- reflection purposes. The journal and the performances provided important evidence of children

and teacher learning. However, more generally across all example of practice such evidence did not appear to be integrated into school assessment processes or linked to IEPs. Only one example, in a rural school, was found where the head teacher (A014) described how evidence of musical learning was connected to standard school evaluation measures, by capturing children's musical work in portfolios or in electronic formats. Nevertheless, the project facilitator (A011) described that anecdotal evidence from teachers suggested that the singing project had had wider benefits for children not directly associated with the project. Such evidence, highlights how practice centred on children with SEND can also benefit all children:

A011: p. 8. Some of the schools just picked a class that had young people in it with special educational needs, and [A019] worked with the entire class, and what they found was that behaviour improved for the entire class, concentration improved for the entire class, not just the young people with special educational needs. Although in their evaluation they were only focusing on the young people with special educational needs, but they had noticed the general raising of confidence, and improved concentration and behaviour for everyone involved.

Teachers' evidence also highlighted other individually relevant impacts that simultaneously met wider school goals as a secondary outcome, but raised important questions about how such practice could be sustained in schools. It also highlighted how anecdotal evidence alone, whilst powerful, could not establish a causal link between this learning and the musical input, reflecting the on-going debate in the research community discussed in Chapter Two, as the national programme leader explains:

A005: p. 31. We did kind of a round up session towards the end of the project and anecdotal feedback included things such as the group I was working with who have dyslexia seemed to improve in literacy levels, separate to the sessions, but is that linked? We didn't have enough evidence for example, but the teacher said 'They've really improved literacy in the last six months, more so than they have done.' Is the singing activity linked? In terms of the children engaged and how their involvement in singing and music actually gave them the opportunity for the first time to be regarded as equals by their peers was very, very evident. [...] In [place name] there's quite a big population of gypsy traveller communities, and therefore lots of children in schools are part of those communities and there can often be divides between children in schools and it really was again, bringing together- for all children to see groups from communities in a completely different light. [...] There were also challenges such as how do we continue this?

These two projects provide extremely valuable insights as to how music can be used as an explicit and bespoke intervention based on a child's needs and interest. As the head of the SLCN unit (A007) points out, it is important to start with what a child can do,

recognising their abilities and strengths, an approach which both these tailored projects clearly supported. However, such tailored practice was not confined to music specialists. An inclusion manager, recruited post-survey (A017), also reported developing musical practice, led by her desire to find accessible resources tailored to children's needs and abilities, from which an explicit musical learning support intervention subsequently developed.

4.3.2 Resource-Led Interventions

The inclusion manager (A017) described how she was always searching for accessible musical resources to increase access to class music lessons for quadriplegic children attending her mainstream primary school. She found a set of coloured push-button hand bells. Although they were originally intended for use in the music classroom, a comment from a visiting occupational therapist (OT) led to the development of a nurture group intervention that had wider implications for inclusion, social integration and individual recognition:

A017: p. 20. I was just talking to our OT one day [...] and she started saying "Oh that's good for hand-eye coordination, that's good for handwriting", [...] and it's that sort of way that you pick up lots of things.

This endorsement led to the use of the hand bells as part of an intervention to support hand-eye coordination, handwriting, colour recognition and social skills. The intervention was delivered twice weekly over a half term in a nurture group setting and as an extracurricular lunch and after-school club led by TAs:

A017: p. 20. At the moment we've got a group going on that are just more- SEN children, more just low level SEN rather than complex, and they're using it [the hand bell] for listening skills, turn-taking skills, as well as the handwriting because they're learning how to do colours, and the whole song will be " When have you got to come in with your colour [coloured hand bell] When have you got to come in with your note? Are you watching? Are you listening? Are you paying attention? Erm are you getting self-esteem from it?" And they love it and some of our children [...] can't sit still in class and they're wriggling and they're all about the floor and everything, you put them on this and they're so busy concentrating, trying to decide where they've got to come in that they're brilliant!

Again the use of the term musical intervention is my interpretation. The inclusion manager does not identify this practice as a musical intervention, even though from her description it appears that the activity is explicitly targeting specific non-musical skills through musical learning. Instead, the inclusion manager sees the hand bell as a musical resource that is used to support other learning. Significantly, this simple

resource also had a wider impact, enabling non-verbal children to participate in whole school musical events that supported social integration and inclusion:

A017: p. 4. At the minute we're doing Christmas carols, and then at the end of this they're going to perform in a concert with the other children for the Nativity, but they're also going carol singing, well they can't sing, 'cos a lot of my kids can't talk, but they can use the hand bells.

Additionally, one example was identified, again post-survey, where two SEND music specialists working for the music service and in a special school respectively, had collaborated with a curriculum leader to design and produce their own programme of songs and music recorded onto a CD, with the specific aim of developing communication skills through a focus on pulse. The resource was designed for non-specialists to use on a daily basis for five or ten minutes as part of their normal practice in a mainstream primary school, an attached specialist unit and a special school, organised as a partnership.

Although similar to the literacy project in focus, the programme was designed in response to a perceived lack of music in schools. It sought to support non-specialists, by developing a ready-made resource and programme that was tailored to a specific but common need that was an identified school learning priority across the partnership of schools. The CD was introduced to teachers through a six-week training programme led by the SEND music specialists. The training was designed to address issues of low confidence amongst non-specialists by showing them how to use the resource through demonstration and shared experience. The SEND music specialist (A013) also prepared a set of accompanying learning objectives for teachers to refer to. However, although the songs, music, instruments, speeds and genres had been deliberately chosen to support the overarching aim of developing communication through pulse, interestingly, unlike the literacy support project, the list of learning objectives, where musical outcomes were linked to other learning were compiled *after* the CD recording had been completed.

In these latter two cases, similar to the literacy support project, practice developed organically from informal conversations and personal ambitions in contrast to the more strategically driven singing project, although all participants were driven by a desire to support children with SEND. Across all these examples of bespoke interventions, music was tailored to meet a wide range of individual and collective needs, even if they were motivated by different aims, such as participants' own desire to explore practice (A001, A005), address musical issues of confidence and delivery (A005, A011, A013,

A019) or ensure equal access to learning via accessible resources (A017). All these examples had wider educational and musical impacts, which satisfied wider school issues of inclusion, integration and equal opportunity as well as music training and creative practice.

This part of the discussion has considered how music can be used as a bespoke intervention, indicating how music might contribute to the range of intervention-based provision in mainstream primary education. The CD resource highlighted how a packaged ready-made intervention might support practice. Other participants reported using commercial interventions, which whilst musically led, as exemplified by the bespoke musical practice described here, nonetheless involved music. They were of particular value to those with less musical experience that on occasion inspired spontaneous music-making between child and educator. They provide a useful comparison to the bespoke interventions described above, particularly when considering how musical intervention-based practice might be sustained and developed in the future through ready-made programmes or interventions.

4.3.3 Commercial Packaged Musical Interventions

Several participants reported buying in *packaged* learning support interventions, marketed to support or directly target specific needs in the learning support setting or general classroom over a defined period of time. These commercially available, ready-made interventions included training and materials to enable delivery and evaluation by learning support specialists and class teachers. The following example involving a speech and language intervention called Jabadao¹⁷, led to spontaneous song-making between the TA and the child as the deputy head (A002) describes:

A002: p. 7. That's a speech and language group as well, but that often uses songs and music because they [TA and children] often make songs up and sing to each other because that's been found to be quite useful to children with speech and language [...] problems and stutters, stammers and things like that. Often the children can sing it and not necessarily say it because they are thinking about what they're next going to say, whereas when they're singing it, it is more that kind of flow of the words and things.

Just like the CD resource described above, the programme is primarily centred on developing communication, albeit through movement but where music plays an important but supporting role. Although reference is made to spontaneous and informal

¹⁷ Available at <http://www.jabadao.org/>

music-making between the children and the TA, it is notable that the programme is “followed”, suggesting a fixed method of delivery directed at a group of children rather than the individually tailored and responsive approach seen in the bespoke interventions. Nevertheless, the use of rhythmic movements to music reflects an embodied and multi-sensory approach that is also evident in other examples of explicit musical practice described here. Although the deputy head (A002) appeared familiar with the wider potential of music and its value in this setting, this was the only example in her school’s comprehensive early intervention programme that involved music. No participant reported choosing an intervention based on cost or its effectiveness. This is important as these were both cited as critical factors that would affect any future use of music in learning support settings, which is discussed further in Chapter Six. Instead, participants reported that the decision to purchase these programmes was often based on the recommendation of an external learning support specialist. However, an external learning support specialist (A006) was only able to cite two musical packaged interventions: “THRASS”¹⁸ (Teaching Handwriting Reading and Spelling Skills) which targets phonological awareness and spelling via an intervention of daily 30 minute sessions over a 13 week period; and “The Listening Program”¹⁹ that aims to develop auditory processing skills through daily passive listening via headphones to specially chosen recorded music.

Both the external learning support specialist (A006) and head teacher (A014) felt that a personalised approach that addressed individual needs was preferable to a packaged intervention, highlighting the value of the tailored approach adopted in the bespoke interventions described above:

A006: p. 11. [...] although I don't go along the child deficit model, I think in a way you have got to look and see what the child's difficulties are, so you have got to do some assessment to say “yes, it is memory or it's visual tracking” or whatever it is. You can't just say “Oh, because they are dyslexic, we'll put this programme in”, it's got to be a personalised programme that plays to the strengths and the weaknesses.

The head teacher (A014) described how she too was prepared to adapt packaged interventions to meet individual needs, basing her choice of intervention on her observation of the children:

¹⁸ Available at <http://www.thrass.com.au/>

¹⁹ Available at http://a.advancedbrain.com/tlp/the_listening_program.jsp

A014: p. 20. Well partly on my experience, partly on what I see working with the children, [...] plus I want it to be concentrated in this instance around our very special time together. There's too many variables really. I just have to make things fit into us and our vision and if there's aspects of it that I don't like or that my instinct tells me I don't want to do it that way, then I'll tweak things. [...] I don't think any intervention ever comes off the shelf and one size fits all, even with the interventions that are established you've got to pick and choose very carefully.

The head teacher used background music to provide an atmospheric, alternative learning environment in which to encourage creative thinking and writing as part of a packaged intervention called “Big Writing”²⁰. She felt that a positive creative learning environment, discussed in more detail below, coupled with high expectations and quality teaching had particular benefits for children experiencing literacy difficulties. The example below supports points raised by the controversial Ofsted report (2010a), discussed in Chapter One, which argued for good teaching instead of increased labelling as best practice for children with SEND:

A014: pp. 18-19. It's [Big Writing intervention] been phenomenal in convincing boys that they can be authors. In fact when I did the statutory SENCo training, I used one of the children as a case study because he is a special needs child who'd done a very good job of teaching everybody in the school that he was helpless and, and to have stuff done for him, and when we did our first Big Write [also known as Big Writing] he wrote I think a line and a half, and he was below level two. Two terms later he was writing two and three A4 sides of lined paper and he was a solid level 3 and that's the sort of difference that high expectations and the right environment and the right sort of teaching can make.

Participants described how other choices of non-musical interventions, such as Reading Recovery and Numacom were used in support of government literacy and numeracy campaigns such as Every Child a Reader or Every Child Counts respectively. These interventions were delivered outside the classroom in one to one or nurture group/intervention group settings with highly prescribed methods of delivery. The inclusion manager (A017) explained the detailed and prescriptive nature of nurture group provision where Higher Level TAs were expected to undergo training and follow strict practice guidelines, which were reflected in the school's learning support management of practice:

A017: pp. 17-18. [...] It's supervised by me and it's actually run by HLTAs, so they actually have nurture provision training before they do it. So it's quite an

²⁰ Available at: <https://global.oup.com/education/content/primary/series/big-writing/?region=international>

intense session for nurture training first, so that you know the theory. If you can see a child that can't do something, [...] the growing-up process that might be missing that you need to go back and capture so that you can then get them to move on, so they all have that training first- [...] The teachers actually put forward the children they want to go in for nurture. The inclusion group will meet and discuss whether they think it's beneficial for the child or whether there's something else that could help instead, or as well as. They'll then go into nurture. And that'll be planned for the time they're in, and then it'll be delivered.

Of note is the collaborative approach between educators and learning support specialists as part of the inclusion group in this example. The inclusion manager described how she reviewed in-school and visiting musical specialists' planning to ensure equal access, prompting her search for accessible musical resources, however, the music specialist did not appear to be part of any overt collaborative planning. McCord and Watts (2006) suggest music specialists have a valuable contribution to make and should be encouraged to join any formal meetings where the needs of children are discussed in order to encourage the use of music as a resource, either in the music classroom or as a separate activity. Equally, this apparent lack of involvement supports the national programme leader's (A005) view that the relationship between the SENCo and the music specialist was an unexplored area, which prompted the development of the bespoke singing project.

The examples of music as a bespoke intervention demonstrate how music can provide a "personalised" learning environment in which to "play(s) to the strengths and weaknesses" as identified by the external learning support specialist (A006) above. However, for reasons outlined in the introduction to this chapter, the use of music as an explicit learning support resource or intervention appears relatively novel. These comments give some indication of the basis on which decisions about interventions are made, with educators and learning support specialists relying on government initiatives, personal recommendation, the availability of musical interventions and their fit with the teacher's particular teaching approach and children's needs.

4.3.4 The Role of the TA (Including HLTA and LSA)

The TA also appears to be another untapped role. Just as the music specialists involved in the bespoke interventions drew on their prior musical training and expertise, so in the above example, the HLTA uses the dedicated training offered by the intervention programme to guide their practice and evaluation of the child's learning and progress. The TA is often responsible for delivering such interventions and in the case of the musical interventions played a valuable role in support of the music specialist. As the earlier example of the TA who started the drumming group indicates, supporting survey

evidence, TAs sometimes initiate learning support practice, drawing on their knowledge of the child and their preferred way of learning. Whilst it is tempting to focus exclusively on teachers' use of music in the belief that they are the main drivers in determining practice, it is often TAs who have the primary contact with children with SEND. As a SEND music specialist points out, "teachers seem to be managers now and the people doing the work are the TAs, sometimes not even HLTAs" (MS001c: p. 20). Such evidence suggests the TA role and their musical needs should not be overlooked when considering any future use of music in relation to children with SEND, particularly where support occurs in separate learning support settings; an issue that is given further consideration in the following chapters.

4.3.5 In the General Classroom or Mainstream Specialist Unit

Participants also described tailoring the use of music to individual children's needs in general daily practice either in the classroom or mainstream specialist unit where participants worked alone or with the support of visiting SEND music specialists from the local music service. In these instances however, the use of music occurred as an integral part of participants' daily teaching practice rather than as any separate activity or intervention; which provides some explanation of the difficulty in finding examples of practice where music was used as an intervention discussed at the start of the chapter.

4.3.5.1 To Develop Emotional Literacy

Participants' accounts of their musical practice revealed how music was used to actively develop emotional literacy and regulate social behaviour. A class teacher/music subject leader (A009) described how she played selected recorded music as children arrived in the classroom each morning. This was principally designed to provide a calming, transitory environment from the outside world into the learning environment of the classroom in response to the needs of two children with autism who would often arrive in an agitated state. The use of music for transition is discussed later, but in this example the teacher appeared to go a step further, developing this use of music to simultaneously stimulate all children's imagination, emotional literacy and understanding. It also provided a unique glimpse into children's emotional understanding and feelings as expressed through their journals, which is of particular relevance in understanding children with specific emotional and behavioural needs:

A009: p. 14. I have music coming in every morning when they come in into class. [...] Firstly I've got two quite severely autistic children in my class who, depending on what morning they've had, can come in very agitated, very either upset or sometimes even very aggressive and angry. [...] I do find if I've got

some sort of relaxing music on [...] so the music of the month is jazz so I'm trying to put some nice jazz music on [...] when they come in. It just sort of settles them all down and settles them in. [...] I give them sort of a journal and they can just write down sort of what their thoughts and feelings are of the music as they come in and any instruments they can hear, so even though it's not a music lesson I'm just getting them to pay more attention I suppose to music and get their listening skills a bit more honed in I suppose, [...] sometimes they draw little pictures of what they imagine, what they can see and they can hear.

This case provides another good example of the mantra that participants mentioned frequently: 'best practice for SEND children is best practice for all'. In this example, tailoring the use of music to two individuals' needs led to learning opportunities for all children, not just in developing creative opportunities to explore emotional literacy and understanding but in generating a positive calm learning environment for all concerned at the start of the day.

4.3.5.2 To Stimulate the Auditory Nerve

The head of a deaf and hearing impaired unit (A012) attached to a mainstream primary school, reported how a SEND music specialist would visit the unit to deliver rhythmic work primarily to stimulate the auditory nerve:

A012: p. 1. [...] so she [SEND music specialist] started off with a lot of rhythm work for those children and that really helped and also auditory experiences. Because the idea is for deaf children, if you keep the auditory nerve in some fashion going it keeps the whole thing alive and active [...] Most of them have quite a bit of hearing in the very low frequencies which wouldn't help you to understand speech particularly, but is still an auditory experience and often in the high frequencies as well, your classic thing goes down at 1000 Hertz where there's most of the speech sound happening, so they might even get speech but it might sound like 'ahhraahh' which means it's meaningless. [...] Music does the whole range doesn't it? Which makes it very, very good and actually its also very important for them to use, because as I said it keeps the auditory nerve stimulated and hearing aids have got better and better and better, [...] which will make a big difference in terms of musical experience.

Echoing earlier comments about the potentially valuable contribution music specialists might make to learning support provision, the external SEND music specialist worked with the head of the deaf and hearing impaired unit in similar ways to a speech or occupational therapist works with learning support specialists. This supported the participant's own learning support practice and use of music in this setting, evident in later accounts, as well as her personal desire to ensure that opportunities for auditory development, facilitated by new technology, were maximised.

4.3.6 Summary of Explicit Practice

The examples in this first section of the discussion show how participants have tailored their use of music directly to meet individual children's needs. Such practice appeared to generate individually relevant and wider impacts for learning and self-development, consistent with the aims of good learning support practice as outlined in Chapter One. This evidence also shows how music might make a bespoke contribution to existing learning support practice in contrast to more fixed packaged commercial interventions. This is important for a number of reasons. Firstly, participants' accounts of their explicit child-led musical practice appear to reference best practice in education, where educators adapt their own practice in response to children's different learning styles and needs with the aim of removing barriers to learning. Secondly, survey respondents who did not use music as a learning support intervention or as a resource said they would be encouraged to do so by child-led evidence, clearly evident in these examples. Thirdly, the discussion has highlighted too the valuable role the music specialist, inside or outside school, can play in supporting children with SEND, particularly when they are given the opportunity to work in collaboration with the school SENCo and other learning support specialists, again evident in many of these examples. The next section explores this issue, examining the way in which music education and the music specialist can contribute to a broader use of music where music is tailored to school or teacher needs. Such practice arguably has just as important an impact on the learning experience of children with SEND as any explicit intervention, through the provision of a positive, creative, experiential accessible and enjoyable learning environment.

4.4 Tailoring Music to School or Teacher Needs

The explicit use of music as an intervention appears to be distinct from a second category of practice where music was used more broadly as a *resource* in class, across year groups and key stages as part of daily school life. Arguably the use of music was still explicit in nature as it was used consciously to enhance and support non-musical learning. However, although the use of music was still child-centred, importantly, practice was tailored primarily to and by the needs of the *school* or the *teacher* rather than the child. Here music was used for a variety of non-musical purposes that were clearly supportive of, if not contributory to, best practice in relation to learning support. For example, to create a positive and stimulating learning environment; enhancing and contextualising non-musical learning in support of the curriculum; supporting class

routine, behaviour, independence, understanding and self-esteem; and the provision of inclusive learning opportunities. However, perhaps unsurprisingly, because this practice related to teacher and school needs and was once again integrated into participants' daily practice, this use of music was not referred to by participants as an *intervention*, even though the use of music was often clearly motivated by, and designed to address, the needs of individual or groups of children. The most dominant emergent theme in this context was the use of music as a curriculum resource.

4.4.1 Music as a Curriculum Resource

Class teachers reported using music in support of the curriculum, drawing on either a number of different commercially available music resources, their own musical resources and activities to achieve non-musical aims, or by working in collaboration with the school's music specialist or community musicians. As alluded to in the discussion concerning the Big Writing and other packaged music interventions, the integrated use of music as a curriculum resource has particular relevance to children with SEND in providing a positive, creative, experiential and alternative learning environment in which to stimulate their senses and imagination. In so doing, music appears to provide different starting points for learning, which if carefully chosen, as already identified, can help to make learning meaningful, accessible and enjoyable. Participants described how potential learning barriers such as writing, reading, sitting still or language dominant delivery were reduced or removed through the active experience of musical interaction and performance.

Challenging the widely held belief that schools must follow the National Curriculum, several participants worked in schools that had chosen to follow the International Primary Curriculum²¹ (IPC) or in the case of a small rural primary school, the Forest Schools Curriculum²². Indeed, this rural school (A014) and the deputy head's school (A002) had designed their own creative curricula, partly in response to a curriculum vacuum²³, but in the latter case as a consequence of previous work with Creative Partnerships; a government-funded programme supporting schools wishing to move

²¹ Further information available at: <http://www.greatlearning.com/ipc/the-ipc/what-is-ipc>

²² Further information available at: <http://www.forestschooolsuk.co.uk/>

²³ The fieldwork occurred soon after the election of a new government in 2010 when a major review of education and new curriculum and funding for key initiatives such as Creative Partnerships were halted.

towards a more creative approach to learning. In both cases, participants felt an integrated approach to learning was best for children, reflected in their schools' decisions to design or adopt new curricular approaches.

In the IPC, each unit of curricular work has accompanying songs. The adoption of thematic, topic-based and creative curriculums enabled schools to integrate their use of music, as the deputy head describes: "[...] without forcing links where the links don't necessarily exist, but where there should be links they are made really explicit." (A002, p. 10). The deputy head felt this move away from a prescriptive curriculum to a more integrated creative approach, where specialist musical skills were incorporated into normal practice provided quality learning experiences that allowed children to immerse themselves in their learning:

A002: p. 4. People are being encouraged to build all the subjects in thematically now as opposed to saying "Well this is what you do in Year 6" and you do that, or "This is what you do in Year 2" and you do that. [...] So the music objectives would be worked into each term in different ways for Year 1 and Year 2, and then I know 3 and 4 have done the same and 5 and 6. [...] So it's about, we're trying to sort of link things a bit more. And an Africa Day. I did African food and talked about food miles for the fruit and vegetables we get here from the continent. We did another room that was an Egypt room, we had another room that was African animals and then [name], my colleague who is the music specialist did African drumming in her room. We've found that's been a more effective way of building it in really than a standalone music lesson.

Participants described how this use of music helps to bring learning to life, gives insights into other peoples' heritages and again, like the example of the traveller boys in the singing project, provides a different starting point or way into other learning. The class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) described using songs from different countries in order to help migrant children integrate into school and have a sense of belonging.

In the schools that had adopted a thematic curricular approach, in-school music specialists, either working alone or as part of a team, acted as a resource to encourage and support teachers in finding suitable songs to use in the classroom to enhance each unit or topic of work:

A003: pp. 23-24. I do all my planning on my own but I link music skills to their International Primary Curriculum, so it kind of feeds into the rest of the school. So for example, they're doing a unit on rivers. I've written a piece that we've called "River" for the children to learn ensemble skills and then we've done a kind of composition, and then I've played it to them, and the compositions have some of the features in that's in the actual piece of music and then it links directly to their river learning. I'm doing it with all IPC units. Tonnes of

planning. A lot of thinking outside the box as well. How am I going to make learning about habitats, how am I going to link that to music?

However, in the rural primary school the head teacher (A014) led the cross-curricular use of music, building on her colleague's strengths through a team-teaching approach as part of the Big Writing intervention mentioned earlier. She adopted an "EYFS approach" to learning that occurs in nursery and reception classes where learning is organised as thematic areas of knowledge rather than subject-based areas of learning:

A014: pp. 11-14. [...] we've created our own creative curriculum, so we're doing whole school topics, which is easy for us because there's only two classes and everything is part of everything else, so at the moment we're studying Vikings so the music they're looking at is the sort of Viking music, Viking instruments, how did it fit into the society? How was it used? What was its importance you know and, and so they'll write a Saga and then we're using music to augment the effectiveness of the written piece as it's performed. [...] What it's been so far is very much a case of "Well lets listen to Peter and the Wolf" 'cos that's a good starting place and "Let's listen to the instruments and how does each instrument contribute to the character that it's representing", [...] so you're looking at the elements of music there, and then they're writing their own Viking Sagas in Big Write [Big Writing] which is the writing programme that I do with them, and then as they develop an understanding of instruments and how it can augment a character then they're doing the experimenting, they're pulling it together. They've already done a little performance of the sound collector poem for the other class and the staff, just to show how they'd put it together with graphic scoring and recorded it. [...] That was just an afternoon's work.

Just as in the singing project, musical performances provided the basis on which to evaluate children's learning, which were uploaded onto the school's interactive website for parents and other children to see. In this way the children were mimicking real life creative and artistic ways of working through the production of a final product and a personal creative portfolio. This provided alternative ways of assessing learning and understanding, showing strengths that are difficult to assess in paper and pencil tests. This thematic approach appeared to provide an effective use of resources and time, which enabled the head teacher and her staff to use an approach that matched their shared educational philosophy.

Two class teachers adopted a more informal approach in using music to support curricular learning in the classroom. Interestingly, both participants held dual roles and were also music specialists, one as a part time peripatetic teacher/ classroom teacher (A004) and one as a class teacher/ music subject leader (A009):

A004: p. 14. I do lots of singing, even if it is like a ten minute music thing at the end of the day [...] I've done times-tables songs and stuff like that, you know

musical, I've done songs about bloody number bonds [...] which work because the kids have remembered multiplication sets because it has been in song. When I have done it before I have just put it in the Number Crunch Song [...]. But I know some of my colleagues aren't confident singing and using a musical instrument. [...] It is just something that I do.

In this example, the informal and spontaneous use of music relied on the participant's (A004) own musical skills, in contrast the class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) used musical apps that allowed musical learning to be shared with colleagues and to be taken home, extending opportunities for frequent repetition with parents or friends beyond the classroom:

A009: pp. 26-27. [...] I recently discovered Percy Parker Times Tables²⁴, the best way to teach children times tables ever! It's basically a cartoon, it's an app you can get on your iPhone or i[Pod]Touch [...] and he sort of raps and sings the times table, but loads of other people have done it and there are loads about, but this one is just so, so good and the songs are really catchy and they're all in different genres. I teach sort of bottom set year 5. Some of them can barely read, but you put one of the songs on and they sing their little hearts out to the whole song, not even realizing that they're singing the six times table, cos they just get so into the song. So I'm wheeling that out to everybody saying "Go on sing in your math's class, have a go with Percy Parker!" It's been really positive actually and you can say to the children it's an app "Use it at home!" And loads of them now have got it at home and use it at home as well.

This is particularly relevant for schools working in areas of social deprivation where engaging children and their parents in their learning is a particular priority. The use of songs to teach numeracy allowed children to become immersed in their learning, where underlying learning was disguised by the repeated fun and enjoyment associated with singing and its presentation in an aural and multi-sensory format rather than as a paper-based format. Interestingly, the participant, who was both a class and peripatetic teacher (A004), spoke rather disparagingly about his use of songs for numeracy. This was in contrast to his descriptions of his music teaching as a peripatetic teacher and the enthusiasm demonstrated above by the class teacher/ music subject leader (A009). This difference in language appears in part due to his later account of the considerable pressures on him as a class teacher to meet national targets and working within a rigid curriculum with limited resources that affected his ability to use music in his class teaching role, in contrast to his freedom to use music as a peripatetic teacher. This was a pressure others experienced, discussed further in Chapter Six. However, although the

²⁴ Available at: <http://percyparker.com/singyourtimestables/index.html>

way in which he used impromptu songs is indicative of his musical confidence and skills, his use of music for non-musical purposes seems to go against his own musical integrity as a musician even though he acknowledged the wider benefits of music in the classroom, especially for children with SEND. In contrast the other class teacher/music subject leader (A009) later described how she tried to squeeze music into every possible opportunity in her classroom practice. This suggests a range of personal and institutional factors affecting the use of music in this context, explored in the following chapters. It also raises the question once again as to whether the wider potential of music should be realised as an explicit intention or implicitly through musical learning.

4.4.2 Using Music to Contextualise Learning

Participants felt that using music as a curriculum resource in these ways supports all children's learning, but such use has particular benefits for children with SEND by providing alternative starting points for learning, through a multi-sensory, fun and enjoyable atmosphere and learning environment. Most importantly, participants felt music provided important opportunities to contextualise learning; something that many children with SEND find difficult, particularly when dealing with abstract concepts, as the deputy head explains (A002):

A002: pp. 17-18. I do think music is really good for creating that kind of atmosphere. [...] Anything that helps children with special educational needs focus on a particular aspect is probably helpful. So I think a thematic approach using music and art and lots of other things, and contextualising for children with special needs, I think that does play a massive part. So even if I wasn't using music in a maths session but I was talking about a real life context that would help a child with special needs because it's the abstract that children with special needs tend to really struggle with. So being told to write a story about something they've got to imagine is just far too many things all at once whereas if you can give them some of the imaginary ideas or you can create the imaginary world through music or through pictures or through film or whatever it is that you are using. [...] I think it is supportive of all children, it's just that children with special educational needs require that to be able to do what they are doing, whereas a lot of other children can handle the abstract better.

The use of music to contextualise learning was not confined to the mainstream classroom but was also evident in the specialist unit, where music was used to enhance literacy work through sensory explorations of language. The head of the deaf & hearing impaired unit (A012) reported linking music to literacy work and sign language working in collaboration with specialists and the music service's SEND specialist. Here music was used to expand children's understanding and explore the story as

meaningful, musical and auditory experiences, although she described how this approach met with opposition from members of the deaf community:

A012: p. 2. [...] I incorporated the deaf instructor and we put music to stories so he or she would tell the story in BSL [British Sign Language] and the children would discuss how to do music to go with a story. They sort of encouraged how to do notations, how to write it down, what kids have to do and because they could fully understand it because it was done in BSL they could really go for it. They had the story in BSL and they enjoyed the story and they sort of expanded, making it an auditory experience as well, in a way that was meaningful to them cos they were in control. It wasn't the hearing people who said, "Oh it would be nice to do this" [...]. They would play it. Obviously we helped a little bit, guided a little bit, but it got so good actually we did performances to the mainstream primary school that we were attached to at the time, and they absolutely loved it 'cos it was somebody signing. We also did performances at the centre and got heavily, heavily criticised, "How dare we do that with deaf children. That's no use! Music is for hearing people! How dare we do that!" [...] Deaf adults yeah criticised, whereas the kids loved it because it was meaningful, otherwise they wouldn't have done it.

This negative response is somewhat surprising, but is indicative of some of the wider institutional attitudes that surround the use of music, discussed in the following chapters. In this case, in contrast to the example of the traveller boys where music drew upon and supported the children's cultural traditions and their performance was a cause for celebration. Here the use of music challenged the established cultural practice of this community, where the positive outcomes for the child were seen as a threat to the wider community's cultural identity. Thus, this practitioner, motivated by her desire to provide the best opportunities for the children in her unit, has to negotiate a sensitive path in her use of music and in challenging existing practice and attitudes.

4.4.3 Using Music as a Classroom Tool

Participants also described how they used music as a classroom tool to regulate class routine, behaviour and activity levels, or as a reward for good behaviour, for example where children were allowed to use the ICT suite for golden time:

A002: p. 20. [...] when it was any sort of golden time [...], we'd often book the ICT room and the children would choose to use eJay Dance²⁵ as well. A lot of children wanted to buy eJay Dance for themselves so it was a really, really good one. It was always one of the things Year 6 always used to talk about at the end of the year that they had really enjoyed doing.

²⁵ Available at: <http://www.ejay.com/us/>

Similarly, the use of motivational songs were used by the enthusiastic class teacher/music subject leader (A009) mentioned above to promote positive learning attitudes and provided an alternative way to convey instructions and expectations:

A009: p.10. I try to get singing in as much as humanly possible cos I just love it! We normally have a class song that we do which I do at least once a day. At the moment we're doing "Ain't No Mountain" for the beginning of the term, and then just things like I'll sing them to the carpet sometimes- I'll give them a little song to get down to the carpet, and they know that at the end of the song they need to be sat down ready.

Reducing the amount of language used in the classroom has particular relevance for children with language and comprehension difficulties as the head of the SLCN unit explained:

A007: p. 11. The problem very often with inclusion in the mainstream is that it's very language-dominated, and particularly the "carpet time", when the children are being introduced to a topic, when things are being explained, and they're told what it is that they've got to go away and do, it would just go right over their heads, and they'd be left behind.

Similarly, music was also used by other participants to signal the transition from one activity to another, or to regulate the mood and activity levels of children after PE or following periods of sustained sitting and listening through the use of musical energy breaks. The head teacher (A014) drew on her experience of working in schools in areas of social deprivation, which had sparked her research interest in addressing disaffection and engagement. She describes her multi-sensory, embodied musical approach to sustaining children's engagement through 'wake up and shake up' times, in which children "retuned" their bodies for the next learning activity:

A014: p. 5. Well it's getting up on your feet and it's moving all the different parts of your body so it might be stamping, it might be shaking, it might be tapping. Just, large and small gross motor movements so that they're retuning themselves if you will. It's like having a stretch and then kind of retuning yourself, and the routine is such that they know when they've finished it then they sit down and they're kind of reenergised. It's woken their heads up again. Things like that, we use it in lots of different ways. We often use it on transition or for signal if you will for this is the end of this bit or this is the start of this bit. So it's used in a huge number of ways. [...] If you want them to be energised then you need something they can jump up and down to but if you want them to be focused then you need something that's not got bounces, it's not got sudden outbursts of noise, you need something that's lyrical and rhythmical and smooth. In terms of movement it's more about energising them, but without the movement I use music as a wind down.

In this way, the head teacher is making an effective use of music's capacity to alter levels of arousal and mood, discussed in Chapter Two, and echoing Osborne's

rhythmic musical practice with refugee children experiencing Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).

In a similar vein, the music specialist (A003) provided a list of call and response songs for teachers for the specific purpose of “brain breaks” as part of a drive to develop outstanding practice:

A003: pp. 13-14. Some of the class teachers have had a company in to help them to become outstanding teachers, and part of that is having little moments of the lesson where they're starting to switch off, get them going again. Some teachers have said to me, "Well I think singing is the best way really, because it's so accessible and it makes them happy so we want more!" Some of them have said, "We want more of, like, short songs, like call and response songs that the teacher can sing to the class and then the children can respond back", and then you've got them again.

The use of music in these ways helped participants to overcome potential barriers to learning which were of benefit to all children, but particularly so for children who find sitting still for long periods of time difficult or who have poor attention or language skills. These participants' use of songs enabled them to convey instructions and expectations, reducing the need for verbal language. Their use of different musical genres and tempi helped to regulate children's behaviour and mood as appropriate for the next learning activity and provided an inclusive and fun way of ensuring a conducive learning environment, without the need to draw attention to individual children. This integrated use of music appeared to be an integral part of these participants' toolkits reflecting Hitchcock, Meyer, Rose & Jackson's (2002) universal approach, discussed in Chapter One, which encourages teachers to have a range of accessible resources at hand to use spontaneously as the need arises.

4.4.4 Using Music to Provide a Positive Learning Environment

The importance of providing a positive learning environment cannot be underestimated for children with SEND as the head of the SLCN unit (A007) explains:

A007: pp. 21-22. People often say "Oh, why do you keep talking about positive language, why are you always using this positive language? It's so wishy-washy, and you're being soft on the children", but I would say that no, it's about creating that calm, constructive atmosphere in the classroom. So not only are you helping to calm the child and build up a positive relationship [...] rather than always being in a negative, confrontational situation and saying, "Don't do this, don't do that" [...]. You also, as a result, want to have this lovely, positive atmosphere in the classroom, and that is best achieved by doing it that way.

Earlier in the discussion mention was made of the head teacher of the rural school's (A014) use of music to create a positive learning environment for literacy work. The

head teacher was under pressure to raise literacy standards following two years of trying to remove a poorly performing teacher. Her use of the intervention, Big Writing, was delivered to the whole class, which in this small setting constituted a mixed age group of children across Key Stage 2. The head teacher describes how the intervention uses music as a backdrop to provide an alternative, creative learning and working environment that appeared to have particular hidden benefits for children with literacy difficulties:

A014: pp. 17-18. You do the planning interactively [with the children] in the first hour then they go out to play. They come back in and there's a candle burning, there's music playing, there's special pens, special paper, we have special books. It's a very special time. The lights are dimmed a bit. [...] and they come in in silence, sit down and start writing, so that's how it works, [...] after doing the planning, they sit there and they write quietly and they have the music playing. And the children have said that they found it enormously helpful just to have the music there in the background. It's better than silence and it means they can't hear other children's pens being busy on the paper and it puts them into their own little world. We did have a secondary school student, a sister of one of the children at the school who came in and did a project on the impact of the music. We did a writing exercise with no music and a writing exercise with music and she found that there was significant improvement in the sort of language used and sentence structures when we had the music playing. [...] If you're a child that's got low confidence then hearing other people busily writing away is very negative for you, whereas if you're listening to something and you kind of get lost in your own little world and it's not something that's popular that they sing along with, but Mozart is one that I know has had some research done about the effect it has on brain waves and things so that's why I went for Mozart particularly [...].

Her comments support the findings of Schellenberg, Nakata, Hunter & Tamoto (2007), in which the use of background music versus silent conditions led to increased creative content and processing in children's drawings. Interestingly, she makes reference to her use of Mozart, highlighting the earlier discussion in chapter Two about the widespread awareness and belief in the Mozart Effect. Schellenberg and colleagues showed however that versus silent conditions, any music or audio recording can lead to improved spatial skills as a function of the mode and tempo of the music, but also level of arousal and individual listening preferences. In this instance the head teacher chose the music. Using music that children preferred might have generated different results or further improvements.

The head teacher (A014) also points out the engaging and distracting role music can play, referred to by MacDonald, Kreutz and Mitchell (2012), which in this example hides the potentially demoralising sound of children writing and encourages children to

enter into a creative learning environment that aims to stimulate their imagination. This head teacher had worked in schools in areas of considerable deprivation and felt music was an important way of engaging children who were disaffected. She placed an emphasis on fun and creative learning as part of her daily practice:

A014: p. 8. I've used it right down to ending the day with silly songs whatever age. Right up to the top of primary we do silly songs and we've got engagement through that because the children are enjoying it and that's often the first step to getting them engaged is, is getting them to realise that they can have fun at school, you know it doesn't all have to be hard grind.

Making learning fun, meaningful and enjoyable is a recurring theme throughout this discussion either as an intention or as an outcome of participants' musical teaching practice that concurs with their notion of best educational practice and which appears to help children overcome potential barriers to learning. Participants' drew on their musical skills, passion and experience to use music as a tool or resource to achieve these ends. For others, as the following chapters will show, using music in these ways was not always possible for individual and institutional reasons. Although music was universally recognised by all participants for its ability to generate fun and enjoyment in children, class teachers who lacked confidence in using music felt using music generated more classroom management issues than it solved.

4.4.5 School Music Education: An Inclusive School Resource

At school level, participants described using music as an inclusive resource. For children with physical disabilities, wet or cold playtimes were a particular problem as children were unable to spend long outside in their wheelchairs. The inclusion manager (A017) described how a learning support assistant (LSA) in her school decided on the spur of the moment during a wet playtime to use Garage Band²⁶ to record a backing track and a vocalised message created using the children's vocal aids, known as 'talkers':

A017: pp. 31-32. This was a LSA thing. We did it as a wet lunchtime activity [CD recording plays]. That's one of the children on a voice box just keeps pressing a button. [...] They've put a message on the talkers and they play it when they want it to play it in the music. [...] Most of them are either speaking at one word level... can you hear that one? [...] He's deaf, you've got him at one point, and it was just things like that. They just decide to come in. That was just something we did on a wet play 'cos it was too cold and too wet for them to go out.

²⁶ Available at: <https://www.apple.com/uk/mac/garageband/>

Despite the spontaneous nature of the activity, the recording was used to showcase the children's abilities at school events and at specialist conferences, and to build self-esteem:

A017: p. 32. We did it at the start of the school production. We've got a big screen and as the children, as the adults and everyone came in it was playing in the foyer on the big screen. And we've done conferences where lots of different children have gone out to talk but try and get at least one of mine in then we'll play that at the start [...]. Just trying to give-, really trying to give self-esteem.

As suggested earlier, school musical performance was again seen as a valuable tool to include children and evaluate learning, showcasing often hidden talents and strengths, which provided important opportunities for self-expression, development of self-esteem and experience a sense of achievement. In this way participants' accounts demonstrate how musical performance can provide a window into the experiences of children with SEND, fostering a spirit of shared understanding and inclusion between children and between children and educators. Other participants described how children were encouraged to sing and sign in assemblies with their hearing impaired peers (A012), while the use of the push button hand bells mentioned earlier, enabled physically disabled children to engage in musical outreach work in the community with their able bodied peers (A017).

Similarly, the opportunity to sing with other schools as part of local school cluster events, or at county or national level provided once-in-a lifetime experiences for all children, of particular significance for children from socially deprived areas. The class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) worked in conjunction with the charity Clic Sargent. This led to opportunities for the school choir to perform at the Royal Albert Hall, the O2 Arena and on BBC TV's children's programme Blue Peter. One child with cerebral palsy was a long-time member of the choir, in contrast to other children with SEND, who whilst welcome, did not often stay very long in the choir. The participants described the challenge of coordinating transport provision as choir practices were held after school, highlighting a key organisational challenge for children with SEND in accessing extra-curricular musical activities. Nevertheless this participant was keen to create positive school and childhood memories for as many children as possible, replicating opportunities that she had been privileged to experience as a child:

A009: pp. 17-18. I don't audition. I never ever believe in auditioning [...] I just don't think it's very fair. I think that any child should be able to sing. It does mean that the choir is a ridiculous size. It's all year groups. As soon as we

started the choir there was sort of 80 already. But now I have to do it into two sessions, so I do a lower school and an upper school choir which upsets me slightly, 'cos I do like mixing them but there's just no way I can, and in there's about 80 children in the lower school one, 80 children in the upper school. It's just a great opportunity. When we went up to the O2 especially, most of them had never been up there before; some of them had never even been up to London before [...]. It's what I remember from school, is going on to a trip with choir and being part of lots of different things like that.

More specifically, class music lessons, if delivered appropriately, provided the opportunity for wider learning, which fulfilled objectives relevant to both individual children and school-wide goals.

4.5 In the Class Music Lesson

Participants' accounts of normal class music lessons appeared to also provide important opportunities for children with SEND to integrate with their peers and develop independence through peer-led learning, which helped to engender a spirit of inclusion and equality in the music room that was not always experienced outside. Here, the intentions of the teacher were entirely musical, but wider non-musical benefits were derived *implicitly* from accessible music-making, which enabled children with SEND to participate on equal terms with their peers. Thus, just as in the case of the use of music in the general classroom, formal music education as part of the curriculum might equally be considered a valuable *resource* in support of children with SEND.

The head of the SLCN unit (A007) described music lessons as providing valuable “cross-over time” for children in an attached specialist unit to integrate with children attending the mainstream school (p. 10). She described how she actively encouraged peer-led learning in her music lessons, using children from her mainstream class to mentor and act as role models to children in the unit, either as an intended or implicit consequence of musical learning:

A007: p. 10 [...] on Friday afternoon some of my Year 1 children [from the unit] would come along and sing and do games with the wider cohort, and that was quite nice because it gave the other children a chance to be accepting, and to make their own allowances for the other children, and it gave my children a chance to develop a bit more confidence. So socially there's a big need for inclusion, it gives them good role models and it can build their confidence, as long as it's tackled in the right way.

The music lesson was also seen as an opportunity to target non-musical learning specific to individual learning needs. Although, in contrast to the explicit non-musical focus of the examples given above, this tended to be as explicit *musical* goals, such as

independent playing, attentive listening and watching, turn-taking, waiting and so forth, all implicit in musical performance. For example, the in-school music specialist (A003) working in a school with an attached visually impaired unit, deliberately used multi-sensory strategies and specially made resources to emphasise tactile and aural experiences of rhythm and pulse. However, this appeared to be part of a wider musical strategy to ensure the best musical experience for all children:

A003: pp. 5-6. When they're younger, early years and Year 1 and we're talking about beats and pulse I've got some little hearts, like little stuffed hearts that they can feel, and I'm kind of developing that really. So anything they can touch and feel and is brightly coloured for those that have got a little bit of sight, we can work with them to actually feel the beat. Whereas some children, I can just put it on the board and they can see it, and it just really gives them [visually impaired children] a bit more understanding of the idea. In terms of reading rhythms and things, I kind of don't tend to go that way with it, it's all, kind of, learning by ear and I think sometimes the VI children cope much better because they can't see, they're just relying on their ears and they pick things up really, really quickly. [...] I'm trying to use a mixture of Orff and Kodály principals with them, and with the Kodály stuff, it can get quite heavy, but just the basics of it I find really useful to explain well every song has a heartbeat and a feel, and so when they're little and they've done big movements with their body and moving to the pulse and things like that, and then we kind of, explain it to them. I mean we all have the hearts out, so all the children use them but it's especially good, and they can just pulse on the soft hearts. And you know it is a beat and it's like your heart beat, life context really [...]. And then we sing a song and they try and match the beat to the song and as they're singing the songs and show me the beat, and without me explaining it to them.

This multi-sensory, embodied and informal approach to music-making allowed visually impaired children to use and develop their sensory strengths, a view echoed by the head of a SLCN unit (A007) who also used a multi-sensory approach in her music lesson and normal classroom practice in the unit:

A007: pp.10-11. I do follow a very particular approach to teaching music. [...] I felt it was very inclusive anyway [...]. I was aware of their needs, the language was kept to a minimum. You don't explain everything too much, you just get on and do it. [...] You can use visual props, puppets, pictures, and just do it.

A multi-sensory approach also developed a spirit of inclusion and peer-led learning, as the music specialist working with visually impaired children again explains:

A003: p.7. I think, when they're older and they're working in groups, so for Years 5 and 6, and they're putting a piece together- and I say "Well we want to work together, we don't always want to count in", and because the other children in the class are so used to having the eye [sic], they almost adapt it for them, so they will tap them on the shoulder or something to say when to come in. Oh it's lovely, it gets me every time. Yes they get used to it themselves and then

“Oh yes they can't see so we need to think about that” and it just becomes part of their learning, like problem solving really.

Whilst children were happy to support each other, as exemplified here and in the head of the SLCN unit's use of music as a cross-over time referred to above, this approach also encouraged independence. The participant described how visually impaired children were allowed to attend music lessons without their support workers, as music was seen as a place where independence could be successfully fostered, in contrast to other lessons:

A003: p. 8. I used to have the VI assistant come into my lesson to adapt the learning, but then they realised that actually it's probably good for them to just experience it not being adapted for them, and just experience it with the other children and maybe because of the way I teach it, they don't need so much heavy adaptation like they do in other lessons. It's really nice for them to be without an adult by their side all the time, doing things for them to help them find things round the classroom and that kind of thing. [...] I think that's another thing is independence, and our VI children are quite independent, they really are, getting them to do things for themselves.

In this way, what started as musical best practice became an opportunity to target independence. In this instance, the wider non-musical benefit was realised as an implicit consequence of music-making rather than as a desired pre-planned objective. The lack of adaption for this group of children once again exemplifies the view discussed in Chapter One, of Ofsted (2010) that all that children need is good teaching. The use of a multi-sensory approach and resources played a significant role in achieving these wider non-musical outcomes.

The class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) also used a multi-sensory approach within the school's attached unit to target physical movement and coordination and the sensory exploration of the tactile, physical and embodied elements of making music and the creation of different sound worlds:

A009: pp. 20-21. As part of our professional development at school, every teacher each term has to teach a lesson in the [centre name] to give us the opportunity to learn how to teach in that sort of environment. I've always done music lessons with them and, as always, it's just so rewarding, [...] especially when you get the instruments out for them. The physical feeling of hitting the glockenspiel or banging the drums with them is so rewarding. It's that physical, that sort of kinaesthetic, they can feel it, they can touch it, they can play with it. For children like that I think it's really nice that they can have the opportunity to do that and I try not to make it too structured. I try to have instruments all around the room. “Let's find a banging sound”, and they can go around and find as many banging sounds as they possibly can. Just something like that they can just explore a bit more and use that feeling sensation. Instruments can be so

exciting to just feel and touch and explore. [...] They certainly relish the opportunity to make as much noise as possible.

Music lessons were also identified by the head of the SLCN unit (A007) as valuable opportunities to develop less obvious social skills such as eye contact by rolling a ball to encourage looking in response to music. In contrast to the music specialist's tactile approach outlined above, the head of the SLCN unit adopted a more noise-sensitive approach to the exploration of sound by acclimatising children to loud sounds and social behavioural norms such as clapping, through simple, progressive, sensitive music-making where gentle clapping is gradually increased in volume over a period of lessons. This is particularly important for children on the autistic spectrum who often react negatively to loud or extraneous sounds that preclude them from attending whole school events such as school assemblies and productions and sadly, even music lessons:

A007: pp. 35-36. You've got so many children can't bear loud noise, and any children with glue ear might have a problem with that, it's not just autistic children. They might be putting their hands over their ears, they might be screaming. People often don't understand why autistic children scream to block out noise. Some people get cross, or might not have any idea how to handle a tantrum or a screaming fit like that, so you do need this specialist knowledge, really, to some degree. You need to know how to go about desensitizing them. It can be achieved, sometimes it's avoidance. Sometimes you really don't want to make them confront a situation, but at other times you know they're going to have to cope with this if they're going to lead any sort of life, going to the theatre or even in a class assembly, they're going to have to learn to cope with clapping, so you have to find a way to introduce it, and, again, a music lesson could be ideal for that. You could show them quiet ways of clapping. You could have just one person clapping at a time and you gradually build it up [...]. That happened at this specialist school that I was at, where children would go from not being able to cope at all with any loud noise or clapping, to actually managing a whole assembly.

Thus, this approach was musically led, but also *child-centred* where practice was determined by individual needs. It was also *child-led* where practice was directed by children's responses to music and the opportunities it provided for children to actively drive their own learning, as the head of the SLCN unit (A007) explains:

A007: p.45. It's a two-pronged thing, isn't it? How can music be used to help children with SEN to develop their skills, but also what can they get from music? What does it do for them?

This comment summarises very well the dual nature of music in relation to children with SEND as both an explicit, tailored intervention and as an implicit resource from which wider benefits are derived. These accounts highlight how, to the child, individual or wider aims are disguised through the distraction, enjoyment and creative

novelty of making music that enables them to explore and develop other skills and learning in individually meaningful ways. To the educator, it is the intention rather than the resources or delivery that defines their use of music in relation to children with SEND. The peripatetic teacher who led the literacy support project provides a succinct explanation: “It’s a different focus, it’s not desperately different technique, but it is a different focus” (A001, p. 15)

4.6 Outcomes

4.6.1 Explicit Versus Implicit Outcomes

A recurring theme throughout this discussion has centred on how wider benefits of music might be derived through explicit intervention-style practice or more implicitly, as a resource through a broad, integrated and cross-curricular approach or a purely musical approach. Participants frequently referred to musical learning as a ‘natural’ way of developing and addressing other learning that made discerning hidden intentions difficult to identify. Whether explicit or not, outwardly all the practice described here was inherently musical and as such any wider outcomes appeared to arise implicitly as a consequence of musical interaction or performance. This was considered a strength in that music can disguise learning that might be considered by the child as too difficult in another setting. In addition, music is an existing resource in schools enabling such aims to be realised as part of normal educational and musical practice. The main challenge therefore appears to lie in identifying and distinguishing such practice. This is important if the wider potential of music to support children with SEND in mainstream primary education is to be recognised and used more frequently as part of integrated educational and learning support practice.

4.6.2 Unexpected Outcomes

Not all outcomes were expected. Music specialists, educators, parents and children’s peers alike were often surprised by the positive responses and achievements of children with SEND. Similarly music specialists were encouraged by the unexpectedly positive feedback and enthusiasm they received from their colleagues, head teachers and other organisations such as school partnership teams and other supporting educational specialists. This appeared to be partly because music specialists were meeting educational needs, or building on and supporting existing educational practice in schools, even when the initial focus was centred on the child rather than school needs,

or the initial aim was musical rather than non-musical. This was also evident in the way schools were keen to sustain practice post-project, developing and extending practice beyond the aims of the original project, evident in the singing project. Just as participants appeared innovative in their practice, so they were innovative in finding new streams of income to support their work. However, in the case of the literacy support project, this work now generates a new source of income to the music service, now a regional hub, at a time of fiscal restraint, tapping into other school and county budgets for non-musical learning and support.

The increasing demand for tailored packages from schools and for collaborative work particularly with health and child services agencies is growing to such an extent that one SEND music specialist (MS001c) felt keeping pace with this demand was one of her most pressing challenges. One of the key findings to arise from the evaluation of the singing project was the identification of a lack of specialist SEND music knowledge and experience in schools. Indeed, a key outcome of the singing project was the need to develop a network of specialist trainers capable of cascading specialist SEND music practice and skills to other music specialists in schools as a first priority, if collaborative practice between SENCOs and music subject leaders in relation to children with SEND is to develop further. In a different approach, but addressing similar concerns, the promotion of the concept behind, and the methods used, in the literacy support project to TAs through workshops at a TA conference rather than exclusively to head teachers, highlighted earlier in the discussion, challenges notions of existing practice and working relationships at a time of fiscal restraint and organisational change within education and music provision.

4.7 Opportunities and Challenges

4.7.1 Opportunities for the Child

This review of practice has highlighted a number of opportunities for children to develop relevant cognitive and social skills through specific interventions and targeted practice. In separate learning support settings, music was tailored to specific and collective needs through bespoke musical intervention-based activities and more broadly through packaged interventions. Music was integrated into some participants' normal teaching practice on a daily basis through songs, movement and recorded music that helped to create an inclusive and positive learning environment and atmosphere in

the classroom, regulating individual and collective mood and behaviour which helped to reduce or remove potential barriers to learning in the classroom or specialist unit. The use of music as a curriculum resource also helped children to contextualise learning, providing alternative and creative starting points for learning that helped to engage children through meaningful and enjoyable activities.

Similarly, in the music classroom, children were able to explore and make sense of the world around them through active multi-sensory music-making and specialist resources. This approach enabled them to use their sensory strengths to develop independence, cognitive and social skills through the implicit development of their own musical abilities, alongside their peers in a spirit of equal opportunity and participation. The music lesson and associated school-wide activities such as singing or musical assemblies and school concerts were also seen as places to support the integration of children, who despite often being in the same building attended separate specialist attached units. Participants described music as a useful “leveller”, closing gaps between children, “stripping off labels and divisions” (A009: p. 24) through shared, enjoyable experiences.

4.7.2 Challenges for the Child

Participants’ accounts suggest that the way music is delivered is critical to its success. Understanding the child’s needs, a sense of patience and a sensitivity towards their actual or potential musical responses is essential. Two SEND music specialists (A018, MS001c) felt this was an instinctive quality or inclination that not all music specialists possessed, discussed further in the next chapter. It is notable that most participants used a multi-sensory approach instinctively to ensure equal access to musical learning opportunities. The head of the SLCN unit (A007) highlighted the challenges autistic children face in regard to loud sounds while the inclusion manager (A017) highlighted the need for adapted instruments or the use of technology to support those with physical disabilities. Both these participants also highlighted how music teachers need to provide more than one way of participating. So for the non-verbal child, who might find singing difficult, having other ways to join in through clapping or movement enables them to participate and may support their singing, evident in the literacy support project. Similarly, giving fidgety children something to hold during a Christmas concert was found to be effective in enabling the child to stand still for a short while during the performance.

Whilst most of the practice described here occurred during the school day, some tailored practice and extra-curricular music activities, such as choirs occurred as after-school clubs. This was particularly problematic for children who rely on taxis or specialist transport that arrive at fixed times to collect children who may live at a distance from the school, particularly where that school offers specialist provision. The inclusion manager (A017) described how it was easier to run nurture clubs at lunchtime than after school.

Formally evaluating and recognising the outcomes of this learning for children did not appear to be a priority for participants for a number of reasons. Identifying a causal link between music and wider learning in the case of both bespoke projects was considered challenging due to a lack of quantitative evidence and lack of testing pre and post-intervention. Only the head teacher of the rural school (A014) reported keeping a portfolio of children's musical work. Whilst the use of music appears to generate important anecdotal and child-led evidence of the wider impact of music on their learning, no other participants reported integrating this into existing school assessment. Similarly, no participants mentioned linking musical learning and its outcomes to any Individual Education Plan, echoing the findings of the survey. Nevertheless, musical performance, whether in class or on a public platform provided significant opportunities to showcase and celebrate children's abilities. Musical performance was an important tool in evaluating learning and most importantly and somewhat unexpectedly, in powerfully challenging stereotypes and attitudes held by teachers, music specialists, family and children's peers. Whilst this research study did not canvass the views of pupils, the children's obvious enjoyment, as reported by participants and the reactions of educators and peers to children's performances, suggests their musical participation may have had positive impacts on children's immediate and long-term personal and educational development.

Capturing such impacts is vital for the child if any evaluation is to fully recognise not just their difficulties but their strengths and subsequent progress. However this is problematic for the teacher due to inherent difficulties in evaluating musical learning quantitatively to meet current evaluation measures and methods used in school. Attitudes to music and a lack of musical knowledge generally in some participants' schools meant educators were unsure how to assess musical learning and show progress, the latter being the current gold standard of educational assessment and school attainment. These issues are considered more fully in Chapters Five and Six.

4.7.3 Opportunities for the Educator

This was a dominant theme for participants, who derived considerable personal and job satisfaction from their use of music. They were able to see their personal desires and strategic aims become a reality either through the fulfilment of long-held beliefs and ambitions in delivering and developing best musical and/or learning support practice, or in satisfying their desire to use music proactively and creatively to support children directly by addressing their needs and providing an inclusive learning environment. Participants appeared highly motivated by children's positive responses to music, evident in their reported levels of engagement, positive behaviour and participants' descriptions of the satisfaction they derived from seeing children achieve or outperform expectations.

Participants also expressed their satisfaction in pioneering and sustaining best practice that reflected their personal professional integrity, particularly when their use of music challenged expectations about the potential and ability of children with SEND, including at times, even their own expectations. Being able to target individual children's needs inclusively without drawing attention to these needs also appeared satisfying for participants. Similarly, musical performance offered educators the chance to provide new, sometimes once-in-a lifetime experiences and positive school memories, inspired by their desire to pass on their love of music to children by providing high quality musical experiences similar to that experienced in their own childhood.

4.7.4 Benefits of Collaborative Working

Much of the musical practice described here was collaborative in nature, which generated a number of benefits for children and educators. Experienced music specialists and educators appeared keen to share their musical skills with colleagues in schools. This was particularly evident in the examples of bespoke and cross-curricular practice but also amongst staff working in attached units and across clusters of schools. Collaborative practice also extended to the informal training of non-specialists, where music specialists worked alongside their colleagues using a team-teaching approach, giving non-specialists valuable observational and experiential opportunities to try out and adopt new practice. Such an approach is similar to the methods described by the external learning support specialist (A006) in her role helping class teachers develop learning support practice and the identification and removal of barriers to learning in

the classroom. The class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) used the Sing Up “Singing and SEN” resource as training material with colleagues in the attached specialist unit, while the deputy head (A002) reported working with her school’s music specialist using music technology, which she was able to sustain in the music specialist’s absence for “golden time” with her class. Similarly, the teachers involved in the singing project sustained the project in intervening weeks, which enabled them to sustain their practice after the project had ended. The in-school music specialist (A003) described how she supported teachers’ use of songs in support of the school’s curriculum and used assemblies to address areas of musical learning that were an issue for both teachers and children. Here, just as for the children, individual needs (this time educators’ needs) were disguised in a collective musical training opportunity for children and educators together.

For music specialists in particular, working as part of a team was a new experience for some in contrast to their often isolated self-sufficient role that provided valuable emotional and administrative support. They described how this collaborative approach had helped to build a sense of teamwork, developed new working relationships, a shared vision and workload, which contributed to their sense of job satisfaction. Collaborative working was perceived as a more efficient method of planning and use of existing skills and resources that led to higher quality learning opportunities and experiences for children.

A collaborative approach also had direct benefits for children through the development of a thematic, topic-based, creative curriculum which children found enjoyable, helping children to contextualise learning and providing them with quality teaching from skilled educators. Equally, music specialists described how seeing class teachers working alongside music specialists, not only reinforced the status of music in the eyes of the child, but also provided important role models for children’s own musical learning in seeing adults overcome difficulties, that in turn helped children to develop and appreciate such skills as persistence, resilience and delayed gratification in the pursuit of long-term performance goals.

Musical performances in school, across clusters or through associations with charities gave children the chance to make music with other children and for the benefit of others through outreach performances that reinforced their musical identity and awareness of other’s needs. Collaborating with charitable associations led to funding for musical resources and specialist equipment and to performance opportunities. The

CD resource designed for use by educators across a cluster of mainstream and specialist schools, focussing on communication through the development of musical pulse, is a good example of collaboration at a local level that had direct benefits for children and educators simultaneously. It focussed on a primary educational need and provided a targeted resource for non-specialists through the collaborative use of educational funding and musical skills across the cluster in association with the music service's SEND specialist.

The collaborative relationship between the SENCo and music specialist, evident in the bespoke projects, had particular significance for children with SEND as individual needs were addressed through the sharing of skills and knowledge to meet a shared aim. The national programme manager (A005) highlighted the potential of this relationship, which the in-school music specialist (A003) had started to explore with her SENCo colleague informally on their own initiative, based on their joint awareness of the wider potential of music in relation to children with SEND. This integrated approach mirrors existing collaborative ways of working in learning support practice where schools work with nurseries and external specialists in the early identification, intervention and support of children experiencing difficulty with learning and the development of good classroom practice. The evidence presented here provides examples of how the in-school and external music specialist might make a similarly positive contribution to supporting children with SEND. The national programme manager (A005) felt the role of the music specialist is a valuable existing resource in schools that merits further exploration and recognition.

4.7.5 Challenges for the Educator

The analysis also identified a number of challenges, which appeared to affect the opportunity to use music and develop collaborative practice in particular.

4.7.5.1 The TA

For music specialists, the TA was considered a valuable resource, acting as a vital link between the music specialist and the child, as exemplified in the literacy support and singing projects. However, the TA role also presented particular challenges, as the SEND music specialist (MS001c) and the head of the music service (MS001b) explained:

MS001c: p. 21. [...] There's one school in the city that's got a lot of low level autistic children, and we invited their children for a day here [at the arts centre], and every time we spoke every single child had a TA with them. They

didn't really need one but they obviously were all in different lessons in school so they go with a TA. When we announced something, "Now we're going to drum", each TA repeated it to the child next to them, so we had this, sort of, echo effect and the noise of those TAs in the room made us ill, and in the end I had to say "Please could all TAs stop speaking", because we just couldn't speak to the children, they were behind these people, it was an extraordinary day, we were exhausted by the end of it! It was so noisy! The children never spoke! [...] They weren't realising we were doing the communicating, and they're always interpreting in their lessons for the teacher, and we don't need, you know, we almost wanted to tell them to go away. It's difficult, very difficult.

MS001b: That's an issue generally with TAs; sometimes they inhibit the child from learning to be an independent learner.

Consequently, peripatetic teachers working with TAs in this music service were given specific training in how to manage TAs effectively.

4.7.5.2 A Lack of Teacher Participation

In contrast, participants described their frustration at the lack of teacher participation in Wider Opportunities classes or musical work with children with SEND, choosing to do marking or other work. This contrast was evident in the case of the literacy support project where the unit's TAs and not the teachers attended the music sessions. The lack of participation from teachers was a source of considerable annoyance to the class teacher/peripatetic teacher (A004) as he felt this sent the wrong messages to children about the value of music and showed a lack of respect for his position and a lack of commitment to Wider Opportunities teaching and music in general. For these reasons, the singing project asked schools to sign a contract, which set out expectations and confirmed the school's commitment to release teachers for training and participation in the project. Such accounts indicate the need for clear and in some cases formal agreements between schools and music providers from the outset.

4.7.5.3 A Lack of Time

Some music specialists reported working in isolation from the rest of the school or were pressed for time, either because they were travelling from one school to another as a peripatetic teacher, or because they were running lunch and after-school clubs plus a full teaching timetable in delivering music to the whole school. This limited time for collaboration or a proper exchange of information about children with SEND.

Sometimes, snatched conversations in the corridor were the only opportunity some music specialists had to pass on or find out information about children. The music specialist (A003), who was keen to collaborate with the SENCo, had requested time from her head teacher to meet so they could develop their ideas for future collaboration.

The vocal leader (A019) of the singing project described the opportunity to plan with staff and have the administrative back up and support of the wider project team as an “absolute luxury” (p.4). Having time to build rapport with children was an issue for the head of the SLCN unit (A007) who because of the nature of the timetable, only had groups of children for music for a few weeks and then had to restart with another group of children. She felt this led to a loss of continuity and the opportunity to develop relationships with children, which she felt was particularly vital for children with SEND. Similarly, short project lengths meant little or no chance to follow up on practice, as in the case of the singing project, where the vocal leader’s (A019) six month involvement with schools ceased at the end of the project

4.7.5.4 A Lack of Specialist SEND Music Training

Music specialists cited a lack of training, particularly in SEND music provision, already identified in the earlier discussion. The lack of SEND experience amongst peripatetic teachers appears to be compounded by the fact that SEND music provision is often contracted out to specialist organisations. The few SEND music specialists employed by county music services are directed to special schools leaving individual music specialists working in mainstream schools to develop their practice on an ad hoc basis.

These examples give a foretaste of some of the challenges participants experience generally in relation to music, but also in respect to its use in relation to children with SEND. These issues are considered in more detail in the following chapters, which identifies a number of individual and environmental factors that appear to affect the use of music in mainstream primary education as it relates to children with SEND.

4.8 Summary

This chapter has identified how music is used to support children with SEND across a variety of learning support settings in mainstream primary education to meet individual and collective needs, and contextualise and enhance learning through a positive learning environment, which addressed potential barriers to learning within the classroom. Music appeared inherently inclusive, multi-sensory and informal in nature, using percussion instruments, the voice and the body as well as specialist musical resources and technology to ensure equal access to musical learning opportunities. Practice was child-led, using children’s interests and strengths as starting points for

learning, but which also met teachers' needs in delivering best practice. Music specialists, class teachers, learning support specialists and assistants shared their skills in a spirit of collaboration, focussed on the shared goal of meeting the needs of the child and shared vision of equal access and opportunity for all. Funding, goodwill and support from participants' employers, parents and colleagues supported such practice.

Music was delivered in explicit and implicit ways; either as a bespoke or packaged intervention in separate learning support settings; or as a resource as an integrated part of normal practice in the general classroom, specialist unit and class music lesson. However, it is important to point out again that the distinction made here between music as an intervention and resource is tentative. As outlined at the start, survey and interview evidence indicates this distinction is not always clear in practice, nor is it clear in the minds of educators using music in these ways. Those participants delivering music as a bespoke *intervention* were clearly explicit in their intention, however, the use of music as a *resource*, whilst highlighting a more informal, implicit use of music, was nevertheless just as focussed on individual needs as any explicit use as an intervention. Similarly, although non-musical intentions may have been explicit, the outcomes were achieved through the implicit processes of music-making. Thus, whilst this analytical distinction between music as an intervention and a resource, or as explicit or implicit musical learning, might be helpful in considering this use of music in broad terms, this distinction hides a certain degree of fluidity and similarity in practice.

It also indicates the difficulties of describing the use of music in the learning support setting, particularly when the use of music in support of children with SEND is disguised as musical education, curriculum support or as inclusive practice in the classroom. Whilst these issues confirm evidence from the literature discussed in Chapter Two about the different purpose and nature of music education, training and therapy, these difficulties of description may also be indicative of the holistic nature of music, which defies clear demarcation. Music's particular ability to transcend different learning contexts may make it a valuable, inclusive, holistic alternative to existing notions of learning support provision. It may also be the case that using terminology borrowed from other disciplines may not accurately reflect the use and value of music in these extra-musical contexts.

How music is thought of, identified, analysed, used, delivered and promoted in learning support settings within mainstream primary education is important as it raises key

questions about how the wider potential of music might be best harnessed in the mainstream education to support children with SEND. This discussion has identified a number of factors that have supported the use of music in this context. The following two chapters consider these factors in more detail, alongside other individual and institutional factors that emerged from the analysis, which appear to affect the use of music in relation to children with SEND attending mainstream primary education.

Chapter Five

Individual Differences

5.0 Introduction

The previous chapter sought to answer the first two research questions about the use of music as an intervention and the opportunities and challenges it presents to educators and children. This chapter, and the next, explore the third research question concerning the factors that inhibit or promote this practice.

This chapter explores differences between individuals, which emerged from the analysis, concerning participants' motivations and perceptions about the use of music in this context. These perceptions appeared to be influenced by participants' past musical experiences and present personal and professional priorities, which influenced and shaped their attitudes towards and use of music in this context. The discussion makes comparisons between those engaged in such practice and those who were not.

However, once again this is a fluid definition as some participants' accounts of practice reflected past practice or where such practice had been delegated to others as part of collaborative practice. Again a profile of a particular type of practitioner emerges from the analysis; however other participants demonstrated similar motivations, but for reasons explored here and in the next chapter, were constrained in their musical practice by a number of individual and environmental factors. The discussion starts by providing an overview of the key emergent themes.

5.1 Overview

Confirming existing research evidence by Hennessy (2000) and Holden & Button (2006), interview data revealed basic differences in individual levels of *musical training, knowledge and confidence* that positively and negatively affected the use of music generally, and its use as an intervention and resource. The analysis also revealed the long-lasting impact of childhood musical experiences in shaping both personal and professional *musical identities* and *individual attitudes towards music*, which positively and negatively affected perceptions of individual *musical ability*. These perceptions appeared to have consequent effects on participants' use of music in their classroom practice, and for those in leadership positions, in the priority they afforded to music in their schools. These different experiences and musical trajectories also led to fixed

notions of professional musical identities as *specialist* and *non-specialist* that appeared to define and affect the use of music in participants' professional practice, and its use as a resource within the classroom. Moreover, the thematic analysis also revealed important differences amongst music specialists in their knowledge and understanding about the *needs of children with SEND*. Collectively, these different experiences and levels of understanding shaped individual perceptions about the *purpose, nature and delivery of musical learning*, which have specific implications for the definition and use of music as an intervention and resource.

Common *personality traits* and *ways of working* were identified across participants using music as an intervention and resource that concurred with the view expressed by participants working as SEND music specialists, discussed in the previous chapter that the use of music with children with SEND requires an *instinctive* knowledge and understanding of children's needs and musical responses and a *flexible, informal, creative and sensitive approach* to music-making; an approach that was more akin to music therapy than music education. These findings suggest a distinct group of music specialists using music in this research context, however as the previous discussion demonstrates, the use of music in this context also included learning support specialists and teaching assistants. These participants appeared united by their passion for music and/or the needs of children with SEND, innovative and creative working practices and ownership of their practice. This may explain why these individuals, working in different musical and non-musical roles were motivated to use music in this context, as it reflected their individual *professional and personal priorities*, their *passion* for music and/or children with SEND and their different understanding and use of music. This was in contrast to the attitudes and practice of other participants who held a more formal notion of music education.

Nevertheless, these individual differences appeared to be also inextricably linked to a number of other themes clustered under the title 'Environmental Differences', considered in the following chapter, which describe *institutional attitudes and priorities* that appeared to positively and negatively affect participants' *opportunity* to use music as an intervention or resource. They also account for some of the individual differences described here. It was notable that those participants who were able to use music as an intervention or resource expressed considerable *job satisfaction*, while others expressed their *frustration* at their inability or lack of opportunity to use music in their practice. They explained how this conflicted with their willingness to use music in their

professional practice, their desire to provide a balanced curriculum and their understanding of music's wider potential contribution within the curriculum and learning support best practice. These two different experiences were described thematically as *desire becoming reality* and *desire versus reality* respectively, reflecting models of human behaviour and motivation, commonly known as needs theory, described in models put forward by Maslow (1943) and developed by Alderfer (1972) among others, which are discussed later in this chapter. These two themes are considered more fully in the next chapter, given the influence of environmental factors upon them. They are raised here however, as they also describe the conflict or harmony between participants' musical learning experiences, associated musical identities and their individual ability to use music as a resource in the classroom and as an intervention. These findings also reflect musical development and identity theory, which identifies the effect of various individual and environmental factors on musical identities and subsequent levels of musical engagement over the life span and at key transitional moments in personal and professional lives, (Burland, 2005; Burland & Davidson, 2002; Burland & Pitts, 2007; Howe, Davidson & Sloboda, 1998; Howe & Sloboda, 1991; Lamont, 2011; Pitts, 2009; Sloboda & Howe, 1992). These theories provide a valuable framework in which to situate the following discussion and examine individual differences between participants using music as an intervention and resource and those who do not; links which are referred to at relevant points in the discussion. The discussion starts by considering key individual characteristics that united the group of participants who used music as an intervention and resource. It then moves on to consider how differences in individual identity, knowledge and confidence affected musical practice in the classroom and learning support setting. The chapter concludes by considering individual differences in knowledge and confidence of using music with children with SEND.

5.2 Common Characteristics

The use of music as an intervention or resource described in Chapter Four was not exclusively confined to those with music specialist roles, or the most musically experienced, as might have been expected but was evident across the full range of leadership, teaching and support roles in school, learning support and musical mainstream settings.

This group appeared distinct from other participants and survey respondents in a number of ways: firstly, their *passion* for or interest in music and/or meeting the needs of children with SEND; secondly, their *informal* approach to music-making; thirdly, their *innovative and creative working styles*; fourthly, their *ownership* of practice; and significantly, the *opportunity* they had to use music in this context. Whilst these separate characteristics were not exclusive to these individuals, these themes appeared to define this group collectively from their colleagues in similar roles and settings.

5.2.1 Passion

A striking characteristic amongst participants using music as an intervention or resource was their passion and desire to support children with SEND and deliver best practice, based on their individual musical and/or educational knowledge, training and experience. Their *passion* and *long-held beliefs* about education and/or music shaped their personal and professional priorities and personal identity, which if given the opportunity, drove their practice.

Some participants' musical practice was certainly inspired by their passion for music, their advanced level of musical knowledge and/ or experience in music-making with children with SEND. This provided them with practical abilities, confidence and wider knowledge that they used to good effect in providing bespoke and inclusive learning opportunities for these children. Indeed, the peripatetic teacher was so passionate about the bespoke literacy support project, she funded a second project herself in her own time stating, "It's important and I want to do it" (A001, p 10). However, the musical knowledge of these participants was also distinct from others in that it appeared to reflect the *nature* of participants' personal and professional musical learning experiences that shaped their informal, multi-sensory, creative and inclusive approach to, and vision of, musical learning. For these individuals, the process of musical learning was valued as much as the musical performance or outcome. These views and experiences were in contrast to the views of participants who were engaged in, or had more formal notions of music education that are discussed further below.

This different view of musical learning aligned music specialists with other participants in non-musical roles who shared this view of music-making as a gateway to other learning, based on their understanding of the wider potential of music and an informal creative approach to music-making. This different understanding meant they did not feel constrained by negative notions of musical ability described by other participants.

This was evident in examples of practice led by the inclusion manager (A017), the sister of the peripatetic teacher (A001) who introduced the literacy project to her school, the HLTA who initiated the wet playtime recording, and the head teacher (A014) and deputy head (A002) in facilitating their schools' creative curricula. In these instances participants appeared to be motivated by their passion for providing best practice and equal access to learning for children with SEND rather than any specific passion for music. Instead they saw music as a means of achieving their personal and professional goals rather than as an instrumental or musical skill to be learnt or performed.

5.2.2 Research, Knowledge and Child-Led Practice

The previous chapter indicates how participants' use of music was built on their existing musical and educational practice, in learning support settings, specialist units and the classroom, as well as music education in schools and community music groups. They drew on their professional knowledge and prior experience of working with children with SEND in developing their use of music as an intervention or resource. Both the bespoke projects were led to some extent by a combination of personal interest and research knowledge, which informed and supported participants' practice and the design and delivery of the projects. The singing project was part of a wider strategic programme that was informed by research commissioned by the national provider, which had investigated the extent of current musical provision in relation to children with SEND generally. Nevertheless, the national programme manager (A005) described how the project was also inspired by her personal curiosity to explore how music specialists and SENCOs might work together.

The literacy support project was similarly informed by research evidence, but in contrast to the strategic, commissioned research that informed the singing project, this arose from the peripatetic teacher's (A001) own knowledge and Internet searches. This knowledge concurred with the peripatetic teacher's own practice-based insights and ambitions outlined in Chapter Four that encouraged her to develop her ideas and gave her practical examples of how this research might be applied in practice. This research influence was reflected in the design, choice of materials and delivery of the literacy support project, described in the previous chapter. The class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) and the head teacher (A014) had conducted their own educational research, examining the factors affecting teachers' confidence to use singing in

classroom practice (A009) and the disengagement of children (A0014), which they reported informed their use of music and desire to develop new creative practice.

The in-school music specialist (A003) and the head of a SCLN unit (A007) described supplementing lifelong personal musical experiences with their knowledge of specific musical pedagogical approaches such as Kodály and Orff, through professional training undertaken in their own time, indicating their considerable musical interest and passion. Their accounts in the previous chapter and here indicate how this training shaped their practice, through their understanding of the limitations of different musical teaching approaches and knowledge of accessible resources. This knowledge gave them confidence to adapt their practice to the needs of different children in specialist units attached to their schools, and in their own classroom practice.

In contrast, the inclusion manager's (A017) use of the hand bell as an intervention or the HLTA's use of Garage Band software to create a CD as a wet lunchtime activity were driven primarily by a desire to ensure children with physical difficulties were kept occupied, rather than any musical goal. Here, the quality of the musical delivery or materials was of secondary importance, thus, the inclusion manager or TA's own level of musical confidence did not appear to be a factor in determining their use of music, driven instead by a desire to find accessible resources. As already discussed, the wider potential of the hand bell only became clear through the endorsement of the visiting therapist, which gave new significance to this simple musical instrument. The HLTA's musical background was not made clear in the interview but their use of music in spontaneously recording the children was arguably as instinctive, creative and ambitious in intent as any of the practice described by participants who described themselves as music specialists. The HLTA's practice appeared to be facilitated by her knowledge of music and specialist technology rather than any particular musical skills. Although the CD later became a showcase for the children, the HLTA's aim was centred once again on meeting the needs of the child rather than with any musical performance in mind. This highlights different attitudes to and purpose of musical learning than that normally associated with music education.

In contrast, the deputy head (A002) described her concerns about her own ability to use music in her teaching practice. However, the use of music as an integral part of the school's thematic curriculum was not affected by her lack of musical confidence, because as she described, she had delegated the delivery to the music specialist or visiting community musicians. Here, her confidence in creative learning as an

educator, which she said she had gained from her school's involvement with the Creative Partnerships programme, coupled with her leadership role drove musical practice in her school. Her strategic use of music specialists overcame the potential barrier of her own perceived lack of musical confidence. These are important examples that highlight the need for endorsement and leadership in developing new practice. It also demonstrates the wide range of individuals who may be interested and capable of leading musical practice and interested in its development as a resource and intervention in this context, discussed further at the end of this chapter.

5.2.3 A Pioneering and Creative Working Style

The examples of practice in the previous chapter and in the discussion that follows demonstrate how participants, regardless of musical knowledge or ability, appeared to be pioneers, innovators, problem-solvers and self-starters. By their own accounts, they were not afraid to challenge existing practice or act as powerful advocates for children with SEND, either because it was an expected part of their role, and/or because their particular passion in music or desire to develop best practice fuelled their professional confidence and interest, which meant they felt compelled to act.

Working alone or in collaboration with like-minded individuals, participants described working creatively, making connections between their theoretical, professional and sometimes research-based musical and non-musical knowledge and practice, developed through formal and on-the-job training opportunities. In so doing, they were able to apply and adapt this knowledge to meet the individual needs of children with SEND or to meet wider goals of inclusion and equal opportunity that had indirect but important benefits. The peripatetic teacher (A001) and the vocal leader (A019) described how they adapted their experience of informal music-making from their Wider Opportunities and community-based music practice to develop their bespoke practice. Participants reported working in an informal musical style either through personal choice, because it reflected their work in the community with individuals of varied musical ability and experience; or as a consequence of their prior experience of working with children with SEND, which they felt demanded an accessible and flexible, yet structured approach.

This type of musical practice was seen as a contrast to normal classroom experiences and indeed standard music lessons. Equally, the inclusion manager's (A017) constant search for accessible musical resources was driven by her personal and professional

priority to find solutions to the challenges children faced and her desire to see how far she could “push the boundaries” (A017, p. 33). Although the inclusion manager was aware of the wider potential of music, it was her creative problem solving approach and desire to meet the needs of children with SEND, which principally motivated her use of music.

Participants’ underlying musical and non-musical knowledge and experience appeared to shape their personal expectations, professional integrity, identity and reputation, which gave some the confidence to take what they perceived to be a risk in developing new practice, even if they were unsure of the eventual outcomes. Such risk-taking was sustained by long-held beliefs about music and/or education, their personal and professional experience, children’s responses and a deep sense of job satisfaction that gave them the impetus to turn personal and professional ambitions into a reality. In these ways participants appeared intrinsically motivated in their practice and its outcomes.

This suggests that any confidence to use music as an intervention or resource is not just associated with a question of musical knowledge, training, skills or experience, but requires a knowledge of the child, general professional confidence and a certain degree of institutional freedom to innovate, experiment and collaborate, free from the usual expectations surrounding music and education. As the following discussion here and in the next chapter will show, when participants have the time and opportunity to combine their personal and professional identities, skills, knowledge and confidence, identified gaps in individual knowledge and confidence can be filled through the shared knowledge of music and learning support specialists/TAs and educators working together, as the examples in Chapter Four attest. If these examples are typical, such collaboration can lead to significant impact on children’s learning experiences and outcomes in this research context.

5.2.4 Ownership

Participants’ passion was also evident in their individual and collective ownership of their practice. Their use of the words such as ‘my’ and ‘our’ to describe their practice reflected their personal commitment and working styles as self-starters, innovators, pioneers or collaborators. This was evident in the way participants took ownership of their individual practice in planning and delivering creative learning opportunities inside and outside the curriculum, finding solutions to problems as an essential or

additional part of their role or working style. Some participants took responsibility for their own musical training and in some cases educational and musical research, demonstrating their passion for their work. A collective sense of ownership and individual passion helped to manage perceived risks through a shared feeling of confidence and shared vision, as the head teacher (A014) explains, expressing her concerns about how her school's creative approach to learning would be perceived by Ofsted, the school inspectorate:

A014: pp. 23-24. You've got to believe in what you're doing. You've got to be passionate enough to stand up and defend it because there's a lot of critics out there. We're overdue for an Ofsted. I don't know what Ofsted are going to think of our curriculum when they come in. They might say, "Well yeah it's great to have all this fun, but what about-?" I don't know, so we are taking a risk.

Those in leadership roles (A002, A006, A014, MS001a) were keen to encourage ownership in their staff as individuals and collectively through a shared vision, whether that was in the development of creative curricula or in learning support or musical practice. The head teacher (A014) and deputy head (A002) perceived ownership to be a key driver of personal and organisational change that could transform attitudes to practice and learning and help embed and sustain new skills and understanding. Collective ownership between colleagues, and also between educators and children, was particularly notable in the examples cited in the previous chapter as participants and children shared a joint sense of pride in the recognition generated by the outcomes of their work, that was supported by a shared willingness to engage in new practice. This resulted in significant individual pride and enjoyment that appeared to sustain participants' passion for this type of practice.

5.2.5 A Question of Motivation

These descriptions suggest that participants using music as an intervention and resource may be operating at the upper levels of Maslow's theory of human motivation (1943), which is expressed thematically here as *desire becoming reality*. Maslow proposes a hierarchical model of six goals or needs that he labels as physiological, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualization, to which he later added, self-transcendence. He argues that as basic needs are met so other needs emerge and that people seek to maintain the conditions that support such needs, citing the need for freedom as a primary pre-condition. He points out that people are not always conscious of such needs but they may become more aware depending on the need. In a similar vein he argues that

people consciously or unconsciously seek commonness with others, which help to protect different needs. This gives support to the idea that these participants may have been drawn to certain roles or working environments in an unconscious or conscious effort to maintain or seek opportunities to develop and use their passion for music or working with particular groups of children. This was evident in other themes that emerged from participants' accounts of their practice describing *shared goals, understanding, challenges and journeys*. Freedom is a particularly important theme discussed here and in the next chapter as it describes participants' informal and creative musical approach, their professional freedom to innovate and be curious, and their individual freedom to use music based on their musical self-concept, skills and opportunity.

Maslow goes on to describe self-actualization not just as a human desire to develop and grow but also as a basic tenet of some individuals' personality: for example a painter must paint or a musician must make music in order to find self-fulfillment; a desire so great it can overpower all other needs. This is evident in these participants' musical, creative and professional passion, expressed in their innovative or creative practice or use of music, which some participants like the head teacher, acknowledged might endanger their job security, or the peripatetic teacher's decision to fund a second project, at her own personal expense. This has even more resonance in this context, because such passion is motivated and magnified further by the desire to provide equal opportunities for children with SEND to fulfill *their* potential and to give them the freedom to explore their own self-concept and learning in different ways. Participants' job satisfaction and ownership is a clear expression of their sense of self-fulfillment, which was also evident in the reported reactions of children to the musical interventions and activities.

Maslow argues that not everyone responds to such needs and notes that they do not occur in isolation. He suggests human behaviour is determined by different motivations. He notes that some behaviours are highly motivated, while others are weakly motivated or not at all, or are a conditioned reflex or response to prevailing cultural attitudes and ideas in the surrounding environment. He argues that behaviour comprises both expressive and coping behaviour, where expressive behaviour is a reflection of individual personality, while coping behaviour is about striving and goal seeking. These participants were motivated by and striving towards similar goals in

relation to children with SEND, evident in their problem-solving approach to their practice, which might be seen as a particular personality type.

It was notable how both learning support and musical practice was routinely delegated to in-school and external specialists, which could mean class teachers were only weakly motivated towards learning support or music, or not at all. The following discussion, and that in the next chapter, identifies how the use of music in both the classroom and the learning support setting was often a question of personal choice. As the following discussion will show, negative musical identities and a lack of musical confidence and practical difficulties in planning, delivering and assessing music meant using music in the classroom was seen as a risk. The reported absence of any prioritisation from school or government policy reinforced this perception and meant some educators had little or no motivation to use music in their professional practice or in the learning support context.

Maslow suggests that individuals can become so demotivated that their drive to aspire is focused simply on fulfilling basic needs. In this musical context, some participants reported the long-lasting effect of negative childhood musical learning experiences on musical identities, described further below, that appeared to affect an individual's assessment of their ability to use music. This appeared to be exacerbated when the desire to use music in an individual's professional practice was thwarted by on-going external pressures. Some participants reported how such pressure, discussed in Chapter Six, led to them protect their professional reputation and job security by avoiding using music in their practice. Nevertheless, survey respondents and participants expressed their interest in finding out how to use music as an intervention, indicating how external and personal priorities to support children with SEND in education might motivate the use music in the learning support context and reduce the perceived threat to professional identities and careers.

Alderfer's ERG model (1972) builds on Maslow's model but focuses on the outcomes of such needs, which concurs with the emergent theme *of managing competing priorities*, expressed by participants and described thematically as *desire versus reality*. His model has three levels: Existence, Relatedness and Growth (ERG). "Existence" is concerned with basic needs for survival, which in the working context would be defined as pay, job security and so forth. "Relatedness" reflects a desire to relate to others, which here might reflect relationships between teacher and child or between colleagues, as reflected in some of the examples described in Chapter Four, or

participants' professional reputations discussed further below. "Growth" relates to an intrinsic need for personal development, evident in participants' curiosity and need to work creatively, or the advancement of teaching careers. In Alderfer's model, individuals may occupy these different levels simultaneously and move between them, which Maslow recognised but in his model described as hierarchical levels. Alderfer argues that when higher level needs are not met, an individual may revert back to a lower level, something he terms "frustration-regression", where the individual is forced to focus on more basic subsistence needs, with a consequent effect on levels of satisfaction. This reflects the frustration expressed by participants about their inability and/or lack of opportunity to use music in their practice that conflicted with their understanding of the wider potential of music and their desire to provide best practice in relation to children with SEND.

5.3 The Impact of Professional and Musical Identities, Training, Knowledge and Confidence

With these thoughts in mind the discussion moves on to consider underlying factors, which appear to account for the common characteristics highlighted above, comparing the experiences of those who reported using music in their individual teaching or support practice and those who did not. The thematic analysis highlighted a number of themes relating to differences in individual's professional and musical identity, training, knowledge and confidence both in general practice and in relation to children with SEND that appeared to impact upon the use of music in this context. While some participants were inspired and supported by their musical or creative knowledge and experience to use music as an intervention or resource (A001, A002, A003, A005, A007, A009, A010, A011, A013, A014, A017, A019), others, such as the deputy head (A002), external learning support specialist (A006), the head of the deaf & hearing impaired unit (A012) and class teacher/ peripatetic teacher (A004) felt unable to use music in their personal class teaching or support practice either due to negative self-perceptions of their musical ability (A002, A006) or environmental factors beyond their control (A004, A012), despite their willingness to do so. The deputy head (A002), the head of the SLCN unit (A007) and head of the deaf and impaired hearing unit (A012) are unusual in belonging to both groups for different reasons. While the deputy head was able to exercise her musical interest through her leadership role and facilitate an integrated use of music through the development of a thematic curriculum, she did not

feel confident to use music in her own teaching role. This is in contrast to the head teacher (A014) who led musical practice in both her teaching and leadership roles. Due to the pressure of their roles as head of specialist units, the head of the SLCN unit (A007) felt she did not use music as much as she wanted, while the head of the deaf and hearing impaired unit (A012) felt unable to use music in her current role despite using music as an intervention in the past. Although the following discussion suggests that the use of music is a matter of simple personal choice, it is important to remember that such decisions may also have been influenced by institutional factors, considered in the next chapter.

As already discussed, using music for some participants was a key priority. However, for other participants in leadership and support positions, such as the deputy head (A002) and the inclusion manager (A017) and her HLTA, their decision to develop creative curricula or resource-led interventions was guided primarily by their professional knowledge and expertise as educators and/or SEND specialists but also by the accessibility of musical resources and their understanding of the wider potential of music. In these instances, participants' use of music did not require practical musical skills or had been delegated to music specialists. Given this distinction, the first part of this discussion focuses solely on the use of music as an intervention or resource where *practical* musical skills were required. It examines differences in musical confidence between participants and the subsequent effect on their musical practice. Different perceptions of the purpose and nature of musical learning emerged between these two groups, which appeared to affect their notions of music as an intervention and resource and their perceptions about their ability to use music generally and thus in this specific context. The second part of the discussion examines levels of knowledge and understanding about children's special educational needs, where differences in knowledge, understanding and working style between the group using music as an intervention and resource are compared as a whole to non-music specialists *and* music specialists.

These views are highly relevant to this discussion not just for their role in determining the use of music as an intervention, but also as a resource in the classroom or music lessons, which in some cases was the responsibility of the class teacher. The examples in Chapter Four highlighted how the use of music in this context was not confined to music specialists or music lessons, but extended into learning support and general classroom settings. Thus, understanding the perceptions of educators in a variety of

roles is of particular value in shaping any future use of music in this research context. Moreover, these perceptions appeared to have a wider impact, collectively influencing the musical culture of schools and institutional attitudes at regional and national levels, which are evident in the discussion of environmental differences considered in the next chapter.

5.3.1 Differences in Musical Identity, Training, Knowledge and Confidence

Interview data revealed significant differences in individual levels of musical identity, training, qualifications, knowledge and confidence between participants, that appeared to affect their ability and attitude towards using music. These findings confirm research by Hallam, Creech and Varvarigou (2011), Hallam et al., (2007), Hennessy (2000) and Holden and Button (2006) concerning trainee and classroom educators' levels of music confidence/knowledge and training. With the exception of those excluded from this first part of the discussion above, the majority of interview participants using music as an intervention and resource were either highly trained music specialists with postgraduate music qualifications, or class teachers who had supplemented their childhood musical learning experiences with specialist training in multi-sensory musical pedagogy or their own professional experience of using music in the classroom.

Whilst all participants were clearly aware and supportive of the wider educational potential of music, particularly for children with SEND, some participants such as the deputy head (A002) and external learning support specialist (A006) described how they and their colleagues felt anxious about their ability to *deliver* music in their classroom or learning support practice because of fixed and negative perceptions about their own musical abilities and their understanding of the nature and purpose of musical learning. In the absence of, or as a result of limited professional musical development, these attitudes appeared to derive predominantly from childhood musical experiences of formal music education and their observations of music specialists working in their schools, delivering formal performance-based music education. These observations reinforced their perceived inadequacies and childhood based notions of musical learning as a formal music educational experience. This affected individual educators' beliefs in their ability to plan, deliver and assess music generally in the classroom to such a degree that some educators such as the deputy head (A002), sought to avoid using music in practice altogether, seeing music as a *risk to professional reputation* and

competency as an educator. This behaviour reflects Maslow's theory that the desire to protect basic needs takes precedence over the fulfilment of higher needs.

Consequently, this led to a reported reliance on music specialists to deliver music. This in turn appeared to further reinforce such insecurities as participants and their colleagues, such as the deputy head (A002), referred to music specialists' practice as a benchmark against which they measured their own musical abilities and their perception of music education as a formal, performance-based subject that requires specialist skills to teach or deliver. This was in contrast to the understanding and experience of those participants using music as an intervention or as part of the classroom routine, who adopted an informal approach to music-making, that relied on singing, use of the body and simple percussion instruments, which they felt were within reach of all educators. Even where music was delivered by music specialists in support of the curriculum or in music lessons, such as the music lessons with visually impaired children (A003), the musical approach was exploratory or multi-sensory; where it was designed to support musical understanding rather than the didactic teaching of musical skills through a notation-based approach. Participants using music as an intervention and resource felt an open mind and willingness to participate musically was more important than any particular level of musical skill, highlighting differences in perception between these two groups about the purpose of musical learning and the level and type of skills required to deliver music as an intervention or resource. Nevertheless, whilst the use of music as an intervention and resource appeared outwardly simple, examples in Chapter Four revealed that it was either carefully planned or intuitive, with participants drawing on a mental resource of life-long personal, and sometimes professional, musical experiences in their roles as classroom educators or music specialists, which other participants did not have recourse to. Thus, understanding how participants perceived their own musical abilities, knowledge, training and skills within the context of their professional educational practice in musical and non-musical settings is important, for reasons outlined earlier, in identifying the factors that potentially inhibit or encourage any future use of music as an intervention or resource. These issues are considered now in more depth.

5.3.1.1 Differences in Musical Identity

All participants frequently referred back to vivid childhood musical learning experiences, which shaped individual perceptions of their level of musical knowledge, ability, confidence and passion. These memories were highly influential in determining

past, present and future musical identities that affected their use of and attitudes towards music both in their personal lives and as professional educators. Whilst all participants held positive attitudes towards music generally, for some, their apparent and self-reported low musical self-esteem, led to a conflict between their personal and professional identity and notions of musical and professional competency (*desire versus reality*). While for others, their professional practice and professional identity was led by their strong individual musical identity (*desire becoming reality*), but which notably for some, did not always conform to standard notions of professional musical identity commonly attributed to music teachers within mainstream music education.

5.3.1.1.1 Negative Musical Identities

Childhood musical experiences appeared to be highly influential in determining participants' individual musical identities. Those participants with the least musical confidence were self-critical of their own musical abilities as the deputy head (A002) recounts:

A002: p. 26. I did learn the recorder, which nearly killed the member of staff I was learning it from because I was absolutely terrible. But I remember very clearly learning the recorder at school and do remember having music lessons and quite enjoying it even as somebody who is not blessed in any sense with any musical ability and I do like music in my own life as well and so on.

Memories of musical enjoyment coexist with negative memories of this participant's perceived failure to learn to play the recorder, caused by what she believes to be her lack of musical talent. As a consequence she has come to the conclusion that she was not "blessed" with "musical ability". The external learning support specialist (A006) drew similar conclusions about her musical ability and knowledge that impacted on her professional use of music:

A006 p. 23. I'm a rubbish singer. I'm thinking if I had a beautiful voice, maybe I would do that [use music in her practice]. I mean I can play the piano [...] it's something that I'm not skilled in really. Whereas if somebody came and showed me what to do, I would be quite happy to take it on.

Several interesting strands arise from these comments. Firstly, both participants blame their lack of musical skill on their perceived inherent musical ability, rather than on a poor teacher or particular pedagogical approach. Secondly, their use of the present tense suggests there is a sense of fixed state about notions of their musical ability, knowledge and level of skills that led them to believe that musical ability is innate and thus not remediable. Thirdly, they both aspire to and measure themselves against a notion of musical perfection, which they perceive to be unachievable. Hennessy (2000)

argues this is an entrenched view amongst educators. Lamont in a keynote speech about music identity and musical learning over the life-span highlights how “the discourse around talent is still a prohibiting factor for many adults, particularly in relation to singing. Judgments made about children and young people’s music-making can be very damaging.” (2011, pp. 384-385). Holden & Button’s review of music teaching by non-specialists in primary education (2006) found that singing was an area of considerable concern to non-specialists, some of who described themselves as tone deaf or having difficulties with pitching.

The class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) was keen to support class teachers in their use of music as a curriculum resource or as part of their daily routine, but she found it difficult to overcome similar negative music identities amongst her colleagues, which she felt stemmed from childhood musical experiences:

A009: p. 22. [...] I just think that a lot of people don’t think they can [use music] because they’ve probably been taught that they couldn’t from a young age, probably from when they were at school unfortunately.

Howe & Sloboda (1991) identified how a positive self-concept of musical “talent” supported children’s musical development and confidence, irrespective of whether such notions of talent were valid. However, Howe, Davidson & Sloboda (1998) in a later review of other research in this area, found no empirical evidence to support claims of musical talent as a predictor of later musical success. Instead rather a combination of practice, training and support was found to be more influential. However, Lamont (2011) points out that the notion of musical talent is still prevalent in education, citing the Henley Review of Music Education (DfE, DCMS, 2011b), school Gifted and Talented programmes and educators’ self-concepts based on their own musical experiences; all of which reinforce these notions at an institutional level.

For the deputy head (A002) and the external learning support specialist (A006), childhood past musical identities appear to have become internalised as present musical identities, affecting their musical self-belief both personally and as professional educators. Neither used music in the teaching element of their roles, despite their positive attitude to music. Nonetheless, they said they would use music, if shown how. Thus, despite their negativity and lack of musical practice these participants are still open to the development of a new professional musical identity and skills, highlighting the fluid and on-going nature of musical development throughout an individual’s lifetime. As Pitts’ (2009) and Lamont’s (2011) separate investigations of musical

identity over the lifespan indicate, people re-engage with music at different points throughout their lives, in different or similar ways to earlier experiences; for different purposes and with different motivations that might be seen as a way of redressing negative prior musical experiences; a desire to reengage with positive musical experiences later in life; a chance to engage in music-making for the first time; or make up for lost opportunities.

Lamont highlights how “false starts”, “risk points” and “critical moments” (pp. 378-379) may be necessary elements of individual musical transitions at different points in development, for example in moving from adolescence to adulthood or when moving into different professional roles. She argues this sometimes requires complete breaks from musical learning or participation to overcome negative musical learning experiences of the past. Lamont indicates the variety of different pathways that prompt people to engage or reengage with music with some simply deciding to “learn music as a consequence of other people’s efforts or suggestions” (2011, p. 374). This highlights the importance of external motivators and musical leadership and support which, as examples in Chapter Four and the following discussion show, have particular relevance in this research context in encouraging staff to use music, prioritising music within school life, or by providing the framework for a more integrated and/or creative use of music.

This is important given Howe, Davidson & Sloboda’s earlier assertion that musical development depends not on talent, but on practice, training and support. Burland & Davidson (2002) and Burland’s doctoral studies (2005) of young expert musicians and university music students respectively, extended this idea to include personal qualities, identifying how individual levels of motivation, self-belief, coping strategies and musical identity determined later musical career decisions. Burland found those who went onto pursue professional performance careers were problem-focussed, strove to meet their goals and develop their skills, while those who did not pursue performance careers were more sensitive to criticism and had fixed notions of their abilities that led them to avoid similar negative experiences, exhibiting helpless behaviour. These differences while pertinent to university music students, echo differences between musically confident and less confident participants in this research. Lamont cites a range of other social and environmental factors as influential, but emphasises the importance of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, resilience and passion in maintaining a robust musical identity that sustains musical development over the life span and at

critical times of transition. These factors echo Corrigan, Schellenberg and Misura's finding (2013) that how an individual's openness to learning was predictive of the duration of individual musical training. They also mirror the descriptions of the common characteristics of participants using music as an intervention and resource, discussed above which appeared to distinguish these individuals from less musically confident participants.

5.3.1.1.2 Positive Musical Identities

In contrast to the experiences of the deputy head (A002) and the external learning support specialist (A006), other participants engaged in using music as an intervention or resource appeared to have positive musical identities that were confidently defined by their instrumental or vocal skills: "I am a flautist...my colleague is a singer" (A001, p. 1); "I'm a clarinettist" (A003, p. 17); "I trained as an opera singer" (A019, p. 18). Some saw their musical studies and career as inherently personal and a defining characteristic or matter of personal destiny and passion: "I had to do music, [...] that's kind of my thing really" (A009, p. 8 & p. 37). These identities appeared to lead to their professional role and identity as "head of music" (A009, p. 4), an "in-school music specialist" (A003, p. 3), "vocal animator, or a singing leader, or a choir director" (A019, p. 19). These comments reflect Burland's description of performers' musical identities, Lamont's identification of motivation and passion as key elements of a strong musical identity discussed above, and Maslow's and Alderfer's models of motivation and behaviour outlined earlier.

Even for those participants who did not pursue traditional musical career pathways, their childhood musical experiences and passion for music continued to shape their use of music in their personal life and educational career, and defined the nature of their professional responsibilities and professional musical identity in different ways, as the class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) using music as a resource in the classroom remembers:

A009: pp. 37-38. [...] my mum didn't want me to do a music degree because she didn't think that it would be much scope for anything else afterwards so I paid attention to her. No I didn't do music really in the end. It would have probably pigeonholed me too much actually, so I'm quite glad 'cos I've been able to keep on with the music but at a different level I suppose, [...] my own enthusiasm and passion really and I suppose the training in it [her research project investigating class teachers' attitudes to singing] as well. Now I'm confident in it and comfortable and I've had training on how to train teachers in music, and

obviously with the Masters created my own training sessions so that's where my CPD's come from.

This participant uses her positive childhood, adult and professional musical experiences and knowledge to merge several different musical identities as a performer, leader, organiser and trainer with her role as a classroom educator. Her passion for music pervades her professional life despite her reported lack of any initial teacher music training. Instead she highlights how her Masters research in education, in which she chose to research classroom educators attitudes to singing, had supported her professional development as a music specialist and given her the opportunity to develop not only her own skills, but a clear understanding of the difficulties class teachers face in using music. She described how she used this knowledge in her musical leadership role to support her non-specialist colleagues' use of music. Interestingly, she notes how her decision not to study music at undergraduate level had prevented her from being "pigeon-holed" and allowed her to continue music at "a different level." These comments suggest that despite her role as music subject leader she saw her role differently from other music specialists engaged in formal music education. She seems to feel this position and identity affords her more freedom and different expectations. She explains later in the interview how her own school music teacher, who equally did not conform to her idea of a music specialist, was a key influence in her decision to become a teacher and inspired her inclusive, informal musical approach:

A009: p. 39. The teacher that was in charge of music at the school was just such a passionate, bubbly personality. She created so many opportunities for me and my classmates to do various things. We sung Joseph and the Amazing Technicolor Dream Coat. Just as a school choir up in London, and we did all of these amazing things just purely from her, and she [...] didn't have all the certificates and this, that and the other. She was just a lady that was very passionate about it and I think that, that background, that personality is what actually pushed me into being a teacher in the first place and has given me the ethos that I have now. That is what my role is, through music to encourage children to have all these fantastic opportunities. I think of all the subjects, music is the one that does offer so many unusual and different doors that you wouldn't ever necessarily imagine yourself going through and trying and experiencing.

Howe and Sloboda, in their study of the early lives and musical transitions of exceptionally musically talented children (1991), note the influential role a child's first music teacher plays in early musical development. Their study pinpointed the personal qualities of the music teacher as more influential on sustaining a child's early musical development than the teacher's performance abilities, which is evident in this

participant's focus on her teacher's personality and passion for music; something which she appears to have passed on to her pupil. Although Howe and Sloboda examined the effects of instrumental teaching on learning, this participant's account above supports and extends Howe and Sloboda's theory into a professional educational context. It also highlights the influence of *school* music teachers on future educators and music specialists' practice that in turn may affect their own pupils' musical learning experience and outcomes.

Like her own music teacher, the class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) sees her role as providing opportunities for children *through* music, highlighting her wider view of musical learning, evident in her use of music as an intervention to support autistic children in her class, and her desire to provide children from disadvantaged backgrounds with major life experiences through music. This was a musical vision shared by other participants engaged in using music as an intervention and resource that was distinct from other participants' views of music education. Her description of her teacher's practice mirrors the provision she described providing, indicating the significant impact of her childhood musical experiences on her professional musical identity, practice and self-motivation:

A009: pp. 16-17. [...] whatever job at whatever school I was going to, I was always going to have a very big choir, very good choir. I was always going to have lots of singing. I started the role of music in my NQT year 'cos there was nobody and I was fed up and it had to be done. So straight away I got set up with having these singing assemblies every week. We do whole school Christmas concerts, which has actually been fantastic to raise money for the music room. But that's where the whole school literally comes and the parents come and we sing. I take various Years to Sainsbury's around the corner from the school and to the residential home to sing carols. The choir do so much. We sang at the O2 a couple of years ago, the Royal Albert Hall last year, and we're doing the Royal Albert Hall again this year for Christmas. [...] We were on the Blue Peter Christmas special, which was awesome!

In these different ways she was able to move from childhood notions of musicality and experience to value her musical knowledge and confidence as part of her professional skill set and identity as a classroom educator and subject leader. Whilst the deputy head (A002) might describe this participant as a music specialist, importantly, the class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) distinguishes herself from this professional musical identity to suggest a different identity perhaps as a musical leader and facilitator rather than just a music "teacher"; an identity inspired by her own teacher's practice. Thus, there appears to be a passing down of musical ethos, expectation and working style, which informed her use of music as an intervention and resource. Pitts'

study (2009) observed that primary school teachers were rarely mentioned as influences on individual musical development. Whilst Pitts sees this as positive, nevertheless, as the following discussion demonstrates, this may be due to the fact that some primary school teachers actively chose to avoid teaching music, perhaps accounting for this negligible effect. The examples above illustrate how primary school teachers can exert a powerful influence, not just on personal musical identities, but on educators' later professional musical identities, which continue to shape the musical identities of future generations and access to musical learning opportunities in schools. This is important in this context because a daily and integrated use of music in the classroom and the music lesson, were seen to provide important opportunities for wider learning for children with SEND, evident in this participant's use of music as a classroom tool and targeted resource in her use of listening diaries and background music to support autistic children in her class.

Interestingly, the head teacher (A014), also distanced herself from conventional identities of in-school and external music specialists, influenced by both negative childhood experiences of formal music education and her negative previous experience as a music subject coordinator. She highlights distinctions between different notions of music "specialists" and other reasons why class teachers become demotivated or disengaged from using music in their practice:

A014: pp. 31-32. [...] I suppose I did piano when I was little and I have a piano and I suppose I got to about level 6 but I never took exams 'cos I hate them and I'm just a sort of a self-taught singer really, so I don't do anything beyond that I just enjoy myself. [...] I was music coordinator at my first school. By the times I'd spent sort of six or seven years plonking out hymns on the piano four days a week, I'd kind of lost my love for it, and I said after that I don't want to I don't want to sit and play the piano in school, I don't want to take choirs, I want to be able to just enjoy it with the children. We're sharing it together and enjoying it together [...] it's very different to sitting at a piano four mornings a week going "Give me joy in my heart", yet again! You can't put anything of yourself into that and I need to be able to express myself creatively. I do it through words. I do it through music. I do it through painting. I need to be me in it.

Her account suggests she saw her previous musical practice as constrained, which perhaps helps to explain her decision to introduce a creative curriculum to her school that facilitated her integrated, creative use of music as an intervention and resource to support other learning and classroom routine, mood and behaviour. This practice also reflected her personal and professional musical and creative identity and her flexible informal approach to music that was also evident in other participants' use of music as an intervention and resource. Even though she was demonstrating considerable

musical leadership in her role as head teacher, she saw her classroom practice as an intrinsic part of her desire to work with children as a *co-creator* rather than as a teacher or musical leader that suggests a further definition of a music educator's professional musical identity. It also suggests a different understanding of the purpose and nature of music "education" that was also evident in other participants' use of music as an intervention and resource, where the process of musical learning was as important, if not more important, than any performance or the acquisition of instrumental skills. Significantly, the head teacher describes her need to express herself creatively, using her musical skills to address learning difficulties and find musical solutions to issues in the classroom. In these ways, she highlights her high levels of motivation and passion for her work and a creative identity, which overrode other needs such as job security, reflecting Maslow's concept of self-actualisation. Her leadership role coupled with external support from the National College gave her the freedom and opportunity to develop a working environment in which she was able to express this aspect of her musical identity in a professional context, which other participants were not able to do; an issue examined further in the next chapter.

Burland (2005) highlights how university music students who did not pursue performing careers did so in order to protect their love of music, put off by the pressure of external critique and a predefined career path, but also in deriving one's sole income from musical performance. Both these accounts suggest these participants' approach was determined to a certain degree by their desire to protect their love of music. The head teacher's (A014) dislike of music exams and the pressure to play the piano in school, reflects the profile of the non-performing student proposed by Burland, that led this participant to develop and share her musical skills within the classroom where she felt she had greater control, creative freedom and opportunity to fulfil her love of music. The class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) clearly enjoys her freedom to determine her use of music in dual roles as music subject leader and class teacher and to use her singing and conducting ability to develop singing within the school, free of pressure to teach music formally. Both these participants felt the need to express their passion for music and desire to share their love of music with children, which they felt a conventional music teaching or performance role might restrict, although both held music subject leader roles. Nevertheless, the in-school music specialist (A003), peripatetic teacher (A001) and vocal leader (A019) who adopted a similarly creative and flexible approach did not appear to be impeded by their specialist role. However,

perhaps notably, these latter participants also sought to engage in music-making as musical leaders or facilitators rather than as music *teachers*, in similar ways to the class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) and the head teacher (A014). These collective similarities suggest a particular musical identity and working style peculiar to this group, considered further at the end of this chapter.

This section has revealed a variety of childhood musical memories that shaped personal and professional musical identities, going beyond the simple but common division of music specialist and non-specialist. As outlined in the overview, those using music as an intervention and resource were able to draw on a lifetime of personal and/or professional musical experience and training which they brought to their different roles, sustained by largely positive musical identities, in contrast to others such as the deputy head (A002) and the external learning support specialist (A006), who were less confident in their music ability and identity.

5.3.1.2 Different Professional Transitions

Supporting the findings of the survey, it was striking how nearly all the participants complained of the very limited and inadequate musical teacher training they received as part of their initial teacher training programmes, despite music's place as a statutory foundation subject in the National Curriculum. Teacher training for primary educators has to cover many subject areas and according to participants' reports, is focused on core rather than foundation subjects as the deputy head (A002) explains:

A002: p. 26. There were limits on how much training you got. But I probably had five music sessions over the entire time [a year's PGCE course]. [...] It's low compared to how much input you get with the core subjects but it was very similar to things like DT and art really.

Thus, the amount of initial teacher training assigned to music appears to be no different to the time allocated to other foundation subjects. However, the quantity of initial teacher musical training was considerably varied. Echoing survey findings, the class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) received no musical training as part of her teacher training. The class teacher/peripatetic teacher (A004) received a couple of hours of training, the deputy head (A002) a few sessions, while others in contrast held undergraduate music degrees (A001) or postgraduate music and performance qualifications (A019, A003), and a music PGCE designed for secondary music specialists (A003). Whilst this lack of initial teacher training was not exclusive to music, the effect of this appeared to be more keenly felt in music than in other foundation subjects because individuals did not pursue music to a higher level at

school, which appeared to reinforce the long-lasting impact of childhood musical experiences, as the deputy head explains:

A002: pp. 28-29. [...] I think when you start primary teaching all teachers have certain subject areas that they are more concerned about, because you're aware that you're not going in as a specialist [...] music will be one of those areas, because the chances are you are less likely to have done it to a higher level. So a lot of people wouldn't be doing maths or literacy or some sort of core subject because the chances are you've done something like that to at least to GCSE and then to A Level and then possibly in a degree. [...] Whereas I think it's possibly quite rare, just because of the uptake generally, is that somebody's gone into primary education and has done music to such a level. You've either done it to degree level or you've potentially haven't done it at all. [...] it's that feeling of you're either musical or you're not.

The deputy head highlights how initial teacher training effectively confirms childhood musical identities, splitting educators into two groups with clear professional and individual musical identities as specialists and non-specialists or as musical and unmusical. The lack of musical content in initial teacher training also seemed to convey a message to novice teachers that music is not an essential part of the educator's tool kit or craft; a view that is confirmed by environmental factors discussed in the next chapter. Interestingly, music specialists involved in this research did not share this dichotomous view, believing strongly in the notion of 'music for all'; a belief and passion that motivated their use of music with their colleagues and especially with children with SEND.

Lack of music training during initial teacher training meant the least musically confident educators were denied the opportunity to develop and practise their musical skill base and knowledge, address negative musical experiences and equip themselves with the professional skills to lead music in the classroom. Arguably, this is a different musical skillset that even some well-qualified musicians would find daunting. This inequity annoyed the class teacher/ music subject leader (A009), recognising the impact this had on newly qualified teachers (NQTs) and on school music specialists who had to manage the legacy of a lack of initial music training:

A009: pp. 37-38. They [trainee colleagues] didn't do any music at all which really annoyed me. It was fine for me 'cos I already knew it, but I just think it was completely terrible for those teachers that then had to go into a class having never had any lessons into how to teach music. [...] It then puts a lot of onus on the music specialist then I suppose to train up these NQTs that have got enough to think about.

She makes the important distinction that newly qualified teachers (NQTs) would have to "teach" music having never taught it before. In the absence of any professional

training in this regard, non-specialists looked to the music specialist as a role model and source of knowledge and support, on which they based their expectations and understanding about the purpose of musical learning and how music should be delivered. This potentially further reinforced perceived notions of musical learning and expertise as a specialist subject requiring performance skills.

These findings mirror Hennessy's review of trainee teacher's attitudes and experiences of musical teacher training (2000). Hennessy highlighted how trainee teachers' childhood musical experiences had "left many of them with feelings of inadequacy and a strong belief that in order to teach music one had to be an accomplished performer" (2000, p. 188). This meant that students did not come with a "clean slate" as they did for other subjects, including other arts subjects. Hennessy describes how these beliefs were difficult to unpick during the university course and depended on the opportunity to teach music and most importantly on the support of more experienced teachers and music specialists as role models and informal assessors in order to change attitudes. Interestingly, Hennessy's study identified an informal approach to music-making as an effective means of challenging trainee teachers' attitudes and building confidence. In giving children responsibility for their music-making, trainee teachers were able to become involved alongside children, rather than spend time managing the class and consequently benefitted from their responses and feedback, which echo the experiences of those involved in using music as an intervention or resource. Hennessy suggests that schools have as much a role to play in teachers' professional development as teacher training courses. She describes how some schools assume a generalist trainee teacher will not want to teach music, so automatically do not make opportunities available during their placement. The low profile of music within the curriculum affected class teachers' attitudes towards music and opportunities for trainees to teach in the classroom.

Inevitably, as explained above, any lack of initial musical training had less impact on music specialists or those who felt musically confident. As the SEND music specialist (A013) who was involved in designing the CD resource for teachers commented: "I guess I've always done music in my life anyway so I've got that" (p. 28). This meant these participants already possessed a considerable reserve of musical resources, ideas and practical experience, evident in the examples of practice outlined in Chapter Four, as the class teacher/ peripatetic teacher (A004) explains:

A004: p. 20. I can flick through songbooks, choose stuff I can hear in my head. I am confident to use my voice, and play various instruments without fear. And I've got a huge range of stuff that I can play kids.

However, in this case, aside from his earlier reference to singing songs about times tables, this participant appeared to only use music in his peripatetic role. He expressed his regret that he did not use music in his class teaching role due to environmental pressures on him, discussed in the next chapter.

These life-long musical experiences formed the basis of a mental store of musical resources referred to in the previous chapter, which were highly significant in shaping participants' use of music as an intervention and resource, although this also appeared to depend on having participants' opportunity to use such skills and knowledge.

Positive musical experiences led participants to pursue further musical training in their own time and expense, notably in multi-sensory pedagogical approaches that matched their inclusive attitude towards musical learning. These experiences allowed these individuals to gather and absorb practical musical knowledge, skills and confidence through observation and hands-on experience which helped them to successfully merge their childhood musical identities, knowledge and confidence with their professional roles and identities as educators, enabling them to use music with confidence.

Where music specialists described feeling "comfortable" in their use of music, notably, those with the least confidence used words such as "terrifying" and "daunting" to describe their professional insecurity and fear of using music. Those with the least musical experience inevitably had less knowledge and skills to bring to their professional practice, affecting the potential use of music generally, and thus potentially as a resource in the classroom or learning support setting.

It was notable that only one participant (A003), an in-school music specialist, who used music to support visually impaired children, reported that her music teacher training was designed to equip trainees with the skills to lead and teach music and question existing practice. Her training course was designed for secondary music specialists although she eventually moved into primary education. It provides an interesting basis for comparison with participants' reports of negative experiences of initial primary teacher music training programmes and differences alluded to earlier between formal and informal musical learning and pedagogy, and a creative and didactic teaching styles:

A003: pp. 20-22. I did my training at [place name], [...] it's all about being musical and not just sitting in forms. It's getting you to think outside the practices that are already being done in schools and come up with your own. Think about the children you're teaching. I think it prepared me really well, I thought it was excellent really.

I: [...] was it a specific music PGCE?

A003: Yes.

I: So you would have done a lot of music training within that?

A003: We had to go from the classical training background, then we were thrown into leading African drumming workshops and samba workshops, gamelan, world music, and getting hands on and just doing it. And singing, I hadn't really done much singing before really, but that was obviously a really important thing for us to be able to do, or lead vocal workshops so we just had to, we were just thrown into it really. [...] It's having the right mind-set I think. It gears you up for not having the same mind-set as everybody else on the course, but for you to discover what you think and believe that music teaching should be about, and give you space and time to go away and think about it, as opposed to, "Oh you must make sure all your paperwork is done." Although that is important, that wasn't the be all and end all. It was the wider thinking and "All go away, what do you think about this?" and he'd [course leader] just throw something out at you and you'd have to discuss it and you had that time to question things really, and as well as the practicals. I think the two together, [...] I know that was like six years ago for me, but I'm still thinking "How can I teach that better?" and "How can I improve that?" and "That child isn't accessing music, what can I do to make that possible?"

I: And do you think if you had done a primary PGCE you would have had the same sort of support? Even if you were interested in doing music as your specialism?

A003: I'm not sure I would have done, only because when I've spoken to people on PGCEs, they've done music for like an hour, and then went onto numeracy and literacy.

This type of musical training adopted a creative approach, providing numerous opportunities to try out and learn new musical skills in the safe context of the training and live classrooms. This participant talks about being "thrown into" new experiences, outside her comfort zone as a professional performer, which gives her the confidence to take on new practice. Time was prioritised for self-reflection in order to develop a critical awareness of individual practice and develop a responsive and flexible approach to musical delivery appropriate to the learning task or needs of the children. This reflection helps to develop ownership and an individual teaching philosophy and style, which she described as "the right mind set", that in turn contributed to her professional confidence as a music educator. In many ways the course is modelling the type of practice that it aims to instil in trainees and gives permission to trainees to become critical professionals, confident in their approach and knowledge, but ready to

challenge existing practice. She notes how she was encouraged to move from her classical performance background and be open to new styles of music-making, which by her own reports helped her make the transition between the professional identity of a classical music performer to that of a music teacher, capable of leading and teaching rather than just performing music. Thus, it is perhaps not just a question of having a strong musical identity, or musical knowledge, training and confidence but also having the skills as an educator to adapt such knowledge for use in the classroom. This training programme appeared to put considerable emphasis on providing opportunities to develop not just musical skills but also personal qualities that would enable trainees to be open-minded, pioneering, innovative, flexible, responsive and reflective practitioners. As noted earlier, these were common characteristics amongst participants using music as an intervention or resource. This helped her develop not just a musical but a professional confidence and identity as an educator and music specialist, giving her the skills, expectations and authority to develop new practice.

5.3.2 Continuing Professional Musical Development for Non-Specialists

Attempts have been made by music providers to address issues of musical confidence and training by devising ready-made musical programmes with multi-media resources to support their delivery, or by providing in-school musical training for non-specialists as separate services or as an integral part of musical provision. For example, by encouraging educators to overcome their musical fears by learning an instrument alongside their pupils, as exemplified by the Wider Opportunities scheme, but which has met with varying degrees of success (Lamont, Leighton, Underhill & Hale, 2009; Ofsted, 2012a; Ofsted, 2012b). The Sing Up²⁷ programme supports enthusiastic members of staff, who may not be music specialists, identified as “Singing Champions” who encourage the development of singing in their classroom practice and throughout school life. However, whilst the idea has had much success in increasing singing in schools and cascading musical training and skills in order to widen the pool of musical expertise in schools (CUREE, 2011), the model still relies on the passion and commitment of one or two individuals endeavouring to challenge attitudes and practice in schools where colleagues may or may not be so predisposed towards music.

²⁷ Available at: <http://www.singup.org/>

5.3.2.1 The Music Specialist as a Musical Trainer

The previous chapter showed how the music specialist could be a valuable resource for educators in support of their use of music within the curriculum and in collaborative work tailored to the needs of children with SEND. Music specialists were keen to share their skills and knowledge with their colleagues, with one participant (A003) actively engaged in the training of colleagues in developing singing generally and its use in relation to children in the attached specialist unit. Certainly, the music specialist can act as an important role model, mentor and resource (Holden & Button, 2006). The bespoke singing project showed how this might be achieved and sustained in practice through an experiential and team-teaching approach to the use of music in this context.

Holden & Button's research (2006) identified that class teachers who reported the highest level of musical independence in their sample, had received advice and assistance from a music specialist, yet only 9% of their sample had had the opportunity to experience this form of support. Moreover, the majority of class teachers in Holden & Button's study relied on published musical schemes of work, which they appeared to follow religiously. They found only a third of teachers were prepared to use their own musical ideas and knowledge in their teaching which corresponded to the group with the highest musical confidence levels. This is important in this research context as it helps to explain calls by survey respondents for ready-made interventions and programmes, a need, which the CD resource, referred to in Chapter Four, aimed to address. However, these findings also give credence to the approaches adopted by the bespoke projects where the music specialist worked alongside school staff not just in delivering music as an intervention but also in providing training that help to change attitudes and embed new practice. This is a view supported by Hennessy's findings discussed above, in relation to the support music specialists can give trainee teachers and exemplified in the deputy head's use of the music specialist in her development of a creative curriculum that was also supported by her prior work with music and creative specialists as part of her school's involvement with the Creative Partnerships programme.

Nevertheless, it was notable how many of the examples of practice in the previous chapter were delivered, planned, or designed by music specialists, which whilst well intentioned might actually result in sustaining the status quo between music specialist and non-specialist and lead to the further "deskilling" of class teachers. The *dominance* and expertise of the *music specialist* in delivering music for the whole school was a particular theme to emerge from the analysis. Despite the positive benefits identified

above, the music specialist role in some cases had adverse effects. The presence of a music specialist was seen to limit opportunities for classroom-based music training, reinforcing existing musical identities, feelings of inadequacy and notions about the purpose and ways in which music should be delivered in school as the deputy head (A002) explains:

A002: p. 13. [...] I was very lucky in that there was a [...] music teacher and took all the music lessons, put on the music performances and taught an awful lot of the music, taught a lot of instrument sessions as well. She was very talented and she is the AST [Advanced Skills Teacher] for music in [city name] as well. [...] So I have been quite a bit spoilt for the last few years because it was quite amazing to watch her work because obviously to have somebody who was a music primary specialist. You know she had that understanding, that really deep sense of understanding about the age range of the children and how primary children learn. [...] And she had the musical skills to actually be able to plan really exciting, really progressive schemes of work so in terms of the progression you saw within children. [...] She used to do performances at the end of the year. She did the Wizard of Oz with dual cast so there was a Year 5 cast and a Year 6 cast. We had the orchestra playing all the songs. You know it's that kind of stuff that as a non-music specialist you look at that and just think 'I've no idea!' [...] And I think that's a fairly big issue.

The large scale performance-based nature of this music specialist's practice became the benchmark against which the deputy head measured her own ability to teach music and shaped her ideas about how music should be delivered. Such views are in contrast with the tailored use of music as an intervention or resource, described in Chapter Four. The class teacher/ peripatetic teacher (A004) and others challenged the deputy head's view about the need to be an accomplished performer; a distinction that was not always clear to non-specialists:

A004: pp. 19-20. The skills are different. As a practical musician I am reasonably fairly competent but I am a better teacher than I am a practitioner, performer. You think that is the same in most- because I think if you can sense that you are not brilliant yourself then that can make you a better teacher because you are conscious of what it is you are trying to aim for, if that makes sense?

These comments once again highlight Burland's distinctions about the musical identity of the performer and non-performer, referred to earlier that might be extended here to fit an educational context.

The deputy head's aspirations to teach music were curtailed by her awe of the music specialist's skills, but also by her more basic need to pass her NQT year; reflecting Maslow's theory that basic needs of job security are more pressing than higher level needs:

A002: p. 28. And there is only so much, when you're an NQT again that you're going to push to do- "Oh let me do music lessons with the kids", instead of, "You do them! [...] You're really much better at this than me". You're not necessarily going to do that so, so that's what I mean about, it's brilliant having a music specialist but then you are probably quite deskilled- [...] And you can go to another school and you are expected to teach your music. That's quite a big thing I think for some people.

Hennessy (2000) notes how the dominance of the music specialist can limit opportunities for trainees to develop their music practice, however, not because of the music specialist's personal attitude towards supporting trainee teachers but because of the way in which schools allocated school music teaching to music specialists. In her study, some schools had bought music specialists in on a freelance or peripatetic basis specifically to provide music education and were thus unwilling to divert the music specialist to teacher training. This is important as Hennessy found that the most confident students had received the support of a music specialist during their training. She noted the frustration of one trainee teacher, keen to teach music but who had only had a few opportunities to use music. He, like the deputy head in this study, felt powerless to change the system. This highlights how a desire to use music can be supported or thwarted by the musical culture of the school and individual and institutional attitudes towards music in school practice and training, with a consequent effect on individual practice in the short and long term. These findings highlight the overlap between individual and environmental factors, which are discussed in the next chapter.

Collectively, this evidence indicates how the apparent lack of opportunities for musical training during initial teacher training can reinforce childhood musical experiences, attitudes of individual musical ability and notions of musical learning, such that the stage is set early on for educators to become dependent on the music specialist, leading to the potential deskilling of educators. This has a bearing on the use of music as a resource in the classroom or learning support setting where music was delivered by non-specialists. Nevertheless, as the inclusion manager's (A017) practice demonstrates, the use of music technology or simple instruments such as the hand bell can be highly effective in this context. The inclusion manager did not report any advanced musical background but felt that music was one of the easiest things to be included in, and adopted a functional approach to ensuring children had access to musical learning. Thus, she had different non-musical motivations and the

independence of her role meant she was not subject to the same pressures and concerns surrounding the teaching of music as experienced by classroom colleagues.

5.3.3 Continuing Professional Development for Music Specialists

The analysis also revealed that such difficulties were not confined to non-specialists. The head of a SLCN unit (A007) points out through her observations of colleagues during her Kodály music training, how even well qualified musicians often lack critical musicianship skills, a vital element of informal music-making. Through her personal interest in the Kodály method, this participant had been able to continue to develop her understanding of musicianship, which she reported using in her own practice within the SLCN unit. The head of the music service (MS003) explained how they had invested considerably in training to help peripatetic teachers develop the skills required to deliver an informal and group-based pedagogical approach to musical learning demanded by Wider Opportunities teaching. However, the peripatetic teacher (A001) explained that not all her peripatetic colleagues were keen to adapt their teaching methods to reflect such changes. This highlights further important individual and pedagogical distinctions between the group of participants using music as an intervention and resource and music specialists engaged in more formal instrumental learning.

5.3.4 Summary

These different accounts provide valuable insights into the long-lasting impact of childhood musical experiences in shaping musical identities that extended into adulthood and into these participants' professional lives that confirm the findings of other research studies in this field. Initial teacher training, the NQT year and on-going professional musical development within the classroom provide vital opportunities to address gaps in musical knowledge and musical insecurities, and encourage educators to adopt music into their professional practice from the start of their careers. However, participants' accounts highlight how the absence of quality professional musical development opportunities at a critical period of transition between individual and professional identities for both music specialists and non-specialists, appears to reinforce the importance of childhood musical learning experiences and notions about the purpose, place and delivery of music in the mind of educators. As a consequence, this appears to divide educators into specialists and non-specialists, the musical and the unmusical that leads to distinctions between musical and professional identities and

ways of working, which may halt musical development and practice; as characterised earlier by the experiences of the external learning support specialist (A006) and deputy head (A002).

The lack of opportunity to sustain the musical development of educators or develop new styles of working and relationship in schools may not matter on a personal level.

However, it does have implications for children, particularly those with SEND, who may be denied access to the wider benefits of music, due to a lack of music-making within the classroom, and more specifically in learning support practice, that arises from negative perceptions of educators about their confidence and practical ability to use music in their own practice, considered now in more detail.

5.4 Educators' Musical Confidence and Practical Skills

5.4.1 Planning Musical Learning

The examples in Chapter Four and the discussion below suggest participants drew on a mental store of musical knowledge and resources in their use of music as an intervention and resource in the classroom. This presented a number of difficulties for the least musically confident. They felt they not only lacked practical skills but also appropriate knowledge in order to effectively plan, deliver and assess musical learning to meet their perceived standards in musical and wider educational practice. This was again a particular concern for the deputy head (A002), highlighting the impact her lack of music training on her professional musical confidence and practice compared to other subjects:

A002: p. 12. [...] If someone had said to me to do a series of music lessons it would have been a lot harder for me to plan that [...] than if someone had said to plan a sequence of history lessons or a sequence of geography, which isn't to say that that's the right attitude to have but I can understand why teachers have that.

The ability of participants using music as an intervention and resource to draw at will on a mental store of resources meant they were able to adopt a flexible but often hidden planning style that developed organically over time, allowing them to respond in real time to the needs of the group. This approach appeared to be in contrast to the more formal planning process used by class teachers in their own schemes of work and across key stages and overt verbalisation of learning objectives, discussed below. The vocal leader (A019) who led the bespoke singing project highlights the disadvantages

of rigid planning in her work as a community music leader; methods she brought to the bespoke singing project:

A019: p. 12. A lot of my work is just flying by the seat of my pants, and also because you can never tell what a group is like until you start working with them. I could plan for ages, turn up and realise I've completely misjudged the abilities of the group. But yes, after the initial kind of working with the groups then I was able to think, "Alright, let's think about a set of songs we can work on and what kind of different outcomes we'll get from each song", and then, we could perform that in a final concert and stuff".

The vocal leader attributed this particular skill to confidence built up over years of experience and a certain personality type:

A019: p. 12. I mean it's about confidence it really is, and I've had a lot of experience of working with different music groups, to the point now that I just turn up and just, without having to plan much, do a lesson straight away. I think you have to have quite a lot of years of experience with doing that. It's a certain type of personality as well I think, because I think what's really important with music, no matter who you are working with is to match a fun atmosphere with the kind of formality and structure, and getting that balance right.

In contrast, the class teacher/ peripatetic teacher (A004), who did not use music as an intervention or resource, described how he transferred his planning approach as a class teacher to his music teaching as a peripatetic teacher to meet professional expectations and counter negative attitudes about music amongst staff and children:

A004: p. 9. I haven't been Ofsteded for a couple of years, but as long as you- in any subject, you state your learning objectives, as long as you seem to be addressing those, you try and be as flexible and creative as you can and always trying to make sure if anyone came in and said, "What are you learning about?" they would be able to say, "We are doing this, we are counting. We're finding multiples of 10,100" or, "We are learning how to use complex sentences". Even when I do a whole school singing session I will say, "What we are going to try and do in the next 20 minutes is try and improve our diction by singing this song. I'm going to work on some pitch. I'm going to do a warm up" [...] and I will tell them why. I won't just say, "We're going to sing this". I will tell them why and make that clear. [...] It might be so they don't think of music as being like a dossy thing. It's actually something to be taken seriously as any other subject which [...] just trying to make sure that you plan something which is reasonably interesting and engaging which you think children are going to want to do, with clear learning objectives. [...] And I'll try and apply the same rigour to a music session that I would to a numeracy session. [...] When I am in a school for a morning doing an hour and a half of National Curriculum music then [...] I will behave like a class teacher not some bloke who turns up with a ukulele.

It is interesting that he feels he must behave like a class teacher when teaching music in school, hinting at a resistance within schools to the informal way in which he felt some music specialists worked. This is important as it highlights a potential barrier to the use

of music as an intervention and resource given the informal approach adopted by participants. Whilst this participant combines both his knowledge and experience as a class teacher and music specialist to deliver what he perceives to be best practice, his use of learning objectives is in contrast to the head of SLCN centre (A007), who expressed her dislike of talking about learning objectives in her musical practice; principally due to the language and comprehension barriers she felt they generated for some children with SEND, discussed in the previous chapter. Importantly, her views also reflect current thinking by Her Majesty's Inspector of Music, exemplified in the recent Ofsted review of music education (2012b). The review found that the practice of explaining learning objectives verbally at the start of a music lesson did not necessarily guarantee good musical practice. Instead, the review recommended that music should be the target language and that learning objectives should be introduced musically rather than verbally. Thus, there appear to be differences in working styles and expectations between music specialists and classroom educators and amongst music specialists, but also within Ofsted, which may account for participants' concerns about planning musical learning and fears of professional incompetency.

The verbalisation of learning objectives enables a teacher's planning to be evident to children and visitors to the classroom. However, just because it is not made explicit in the music lesson or activity does not mean it does not happen, as the bespoke projects attest in their planning and design. Here, participants did not have any existing schemes of work to rely on. Instead they tailored their practice to meet the needs of individual children through an *observational*, *intuitive* and *flexible* approach.

Taken together, these differences in practice reflect not just individual, but institutional attitudes, working styles and notions of best practice. These differences appeared to lead to conflicts in terms of individual professional identity, integrity and competency with consequent effects on individual attitudes about music generally, its use in the classroom, and as an intervention or resource, which are discussed further in the next chapter.

5.4.2 Finding Suitable Resources

All of the examples of practice described in the last chapter required participants to adapt existing resources to meet the specific needs of children and/or associated learning goals as an integral part of the planning process. Finding "a particular piece of music that fits with something" (A002, p. 19) was another practical challenge for the

deputy head (A002) who also worried about practical issues of copyright in using published resources. She emphasised the importance of directing trainee teachers to sources of web-based ready-made musical resources, which they could draw on when planning lessons, coupled with the opportunity to try them out as a targeted part of their training that echoes the need for experiential training discussed earlier:

A002: p. 26. I used to be involved in a lot of teacher training myself, that I really think to be effective, especially when you know you have only got so many sessions if it's a PGCE, is to just bombard new teachers with resources really and places they can go to find things. [...] A lot of people just need something to start them off and if you can start your PGCE or your NQT year teaching a really good music lesson, the chances are you will use it in your teaching. [...] I know it was one of my targets to use music as an NQT because I hadn't done that much of it in my PGCE. [...] And I did do it a little bit but always felt I was scratching the surface really and wasn't really sure, and that lack of confidence is there potentially for the rest of your career. I don't know whether something can be changed there to really make people quite enthusiastic about giving it a go which then you know if you feel good about teaching it and you have those good lessons or suggested activities and they work. Then potentially, you'll try something else and you'll feel confident about it.

Searching for appropriate musical resources was seen as a time-consuming challenge:

A002: p. 18 [...] I think everyone you'll speak to will say that they can see that music has a place in lots of different things but the reality of whether we always incorporate it- because on a Sunday when you're doing your planning, do you find that perfect piece of music that would work well for that? [...] And that's the reality of it unfortunately.

This issue inspired the development of the CD resource for use in the classroom to develop communication through a musical focus on pulse, as the SEND music specialists (A013) explains:

A013: p. 24. It takes hours and hours to try and plan music as opposed to any other lesson [...] and a lot of that is because you have to find music and being able to teach things through using different styles of music. You've got to have the resources there and you've got to sit there and listen to [...] some CDs to find the right one that meets your specific needs. [...] Some of them [teachers] just don't understand what they're meant to be teaching. [...] We don't even have schemes of work for them to work from for music. We used to use a QCA [...], but they would have had to have had them downloaded by now, 'cos they're not there anymore! [...] I think that's another reason as to why we decided to do it [produce the CD resource], because we don't have a scheme of work and people don't have the resources at hand. They don't know where to find them, or don't know what they're looking for.

She highlights the need for resources when teaching “through” music and the absence of dedicated resources in the learning support context; something that survey respondents identified would encourage their use of music as an intervention and

resource. The lack of established schemes of work in relation to music generally, was an issue raised by other participants, in part due to the curriculum vacuum that occurred at the time of the research when online access to key documents was removed as part of the present government's educational reforms.

Again, this provides support for the notion that musical practice was an individual choice, depending on an individual's motivation and interest to overcome such obstacles. From participants' accounts, for some, music was neither a personal or institutional priority. Therefore, it is not surprising that less confident educators put other pressing professional needs first. Thus, there appears to be a gap between an aspiration to use music and an individual's ability or motivation to do so, as the class teacher/ peripatetic teacher (A004) describes:

A004: p. 19. [...] You'd never find a teacher who says, "Music is a waste of time, load of nonsense". You never hear anybody say that, as much as you never hear anybody say, "I'm so glad I stopped learning the piano, what a waste of time that was". [...] But it is the gap between what people aspire to, and actually provide.

5.4.3 Managing Musical Learning

The deputy head (A002) also revealed wider insecurities about the nature of the music lesson itself, which she and the external learning support specialist (A006) felt necessitated a different style of classroom management and behaviour strategies, particularly in respect of its use of music with children with SEND:

A002: pp. 11-12. [...] Then you've got the added complication that it is one of those lessons like a DT or a PE where it is very different to your English or your maths, where a lot of it is sit down, teacher explanation, response from pupils, where you can have some independent work and group work and you feel you can do both quite successfully. So you've got that strand as well, from the behaviour aspect.

The external learning support specialist (A006) and the deputy head (A002) both pointed out how some children found the "free" nature of the music lesson difficult to cope with, which they felt discouraged some educators from using music, despite acknowledging the benefits for children:

A002: p. 11. I think it does depend on the child. We've got a lot of children that do really enjoy the music. We've got a lot of children who enjoy the different organisation of music say to other subjects and things like that as well. Different aspects of creativity. I think what our biggest issue is, regardless of special needs, is behavioural needs, in terms of something like a music session where it might be a little more free flow. Where children might have a bit more independence to choose, for example if they were doing a composition [...], is just encouraging them to work sensibly, either independently or within a group

or within a pair, that can be quite a challenge for quite a lot of our children who find that difficult in any lesson. But obviously within music you're very unlikely to be sat in a room where you've each got your own musical instrument and you're working quietly and independently. The idea is you make noise and you work collaboratively and everything else. So [...] we do find that quite a few of our children would find that a challenge, would also find a DT session a challenge, would also find a games session a challenge. Of the aspects of collaboration and group work as opposed to the actual subject.

Anecdotal evidence during the course of this research found that such attitudes and concerns were not atypical and instances were recounted of children being excluded from school musical opportunities because they made too much noise, were disruptive or because their teachers thought they would not be able to cope. However, the head of a music service (MS001b) and a SEND music specialist (MS001c) highlighted the importance of an informal and accessible musical learning approach to keep *all* children motivated by removing potential learning barriers:

MS001b: p. 15. When we do the Wider Opps, we tend not to do reading [note reading], so if they can't read it's not an issue. Behavioural difficulties sometimes they show up, but sometimes they don't because they want to do the music.

MS001c: And you've made it easier as well because you've taken out the need to read, so often behaviour is to do with the difficulty of the lesson isn't it? And if something is accessible then...

Nevertheless in contrast to concerns about behaviour, participants using music as an intervention and resource saw music as a leveller, ironing out differences and labels between children. The music specialists amongst the participants noted how they were often unable to distinguish children with SEND from their peers in terms of response to music. As noted above, they felt this was due to their multi-sensory, practical approach and personal sensitivity to the musical responses of all children, which they saw as a basic element of their musical approach and way of working. For example, the peripatetic teacher (A001) noted how they had not encountered any behavioural problems with the children in the literacy support group because they were “very well motivated” (A001, p. 12). The music specialist working with visually impaired children (A003) was aware of the potential challenges these children might encounter and tailored her music lessons accordingly. Equally, although some of the boys in the bespoke singing project were difficult to manage initially, the project facilitator (A011) noted how they appeared to have been won around by the vocal leader's sensitive tailoring of songs and dance to match their collective interests and heritage; evident in their performances, which challenged expectations about their usual behaviour and

abilities. Perhaps because musical activities were tailored to children's needs and interests, these participants were able to meet children where they were, making the musical activity engaging and attractive, with consequent effects on behaviour, participation and learning.

This informal, creative, multi-sensory, flexible and tailored approach to musical learning appeared to be a particular individual working style and priority of this group of participants that was distinct from other educators and other music educators' approaches. For example, the head teacher (A014) described how she used her standard classroom approach to manage her use of music:

A014: pp. 20-22. [...] So you put them in mixed groups and you say, "Go away and explore this, see what you can develop, what do you think about that? Talk to us, present it to the rest of the children" [...] that's how I teach music and I don't follow a scheme, and I just try and make sure that they know how to, somehow write down what they've come up with, they know what the different instruments do and sound like, they understand how it creates effect and they understand a bit about musical elements. But not sort of, "Well this week we're going to do pitch and this week we're going to do tempo". We talk. Because they're all year three to year 6, we talk about the whole thing all the time, it's kind of a drip feed.

A014, pp. 30-31: I say "This is your job" and in a very controlled way we get the instruments out and they're off and they work in their groups, and they get enthusiastic so every now and then you have to say "Come on we're practicing this really, really quietly, remember? You don't want to give your ideas away!" And then at the end we celebrate it together. Even if it's not something they perform to someone else, as a class we celebrate and that's not just for music, but that's for literacy and everything.

Notably, in contrast to earlier comments, the head teacher does not use a scheme of work; instead she gives children ownership and responsibility for their creative work and allows them to come up with the answers. Importantly, there are no right or wrong answers, which may be of particular benefit to some children. As her use of music was an integrated part of the school day, this was her normal way of working, highlighting the benefits of an integrated curricular musical approach. These different comments reflect differences between a didactic formal approach and the child-led informal approach, which appeared to be typical of the use of music as an intervention and resource.

As discussed earlier, Hennessy (2010) observed how adopting an informal musical approach and giving children creative control helped trainee teachers overcome similar anxieties to those expressed by the deputy head (A002) and external learning support specialist (A006) above. This is a subtle but important understanding that provides

insights into how participants' concerns about the free nature of music-making might be managed effectively, particularly in this specific context. The SEND music specialist (A010) described the benefits of a child-led approach for children with SEND, with whom she was working in a specialist mainstream unit:

A010: pp. 3-4. This morning we were doing a sort of talking drums thing, and I got a drum and, 'cos I've only been in a couple of weeks and a few of them are new, just trying to, get a bit of interaction with them, and while one of them, next to them was playing, they did this [demonstrating movement], and then when it was their turn, oh, "BANG", loudly. And what's really interesting, [...] because they could see the cause and effect, and they could see that I was picking up on what they were doing, they were waiting for the loud sound, so they'd do the loud sound and then cover their ears when I was about to hit it, and of course I went like that [quietly demonstrating], you know. 'Cos they're controlling it, they're alright [...]. That's my interpretation anyway, they know, they can anticipate what sound's going to come out, because they're doing it. [...] So they can tolerate loud sounds, as long as it's under their control and it's not just other people around them doing it.

Here the SEND music specialist appears to adopt an approach commonly used in music therapy. In picking up on children's musical responses, she then responds and imitates, setting up a conversation and handing control to the child, and simultaneously fulfilling her aim of developing interaction and building relationships and trust with the children, just as the vocal leader (A019) did in the bespoke singing project. Here, again, it is the *process* of music-making that appears to be more important than the outcome. This is a distinct approach that is different to teaching instrumental skills or the staging of a musical performance. Nevertheless, whilst banging a drum may look simple enough even for the least musically confident educator, this discussion has shown how an outwardly simple intuitive use of music hides considerable knowledge, experience, personal understanding and flexibility, which raises the question of whether music in this context is best delivered by a specialist or a non-specialist, discussed further below and at the end of this chapter.

5.4.4 Desire Versus Reality

Participants' concerns about planning, managing and delivering music are also indicative of the class teacher's professional need to feel in control of their classes. Handing over control to the child to explore and create sounds in the context of the classroom is perceived as risky because it may highlight an individual's personal lack of musical confidence to manage and lead the class musically, which threatens their competency as an educator. Thus, any insecurities about individual musical abilities is overridden by the lower order need to maintain self-esteem and reputation, even if this

means compromising an individual's desire to provide best practice for all children, which participants acknowledged includes music. The deputy head (A002) described how her fear of using music led her to avoid using music in her practice:

A002: pp. 14-15. [...] it is one of those areas a lot of people are quite scared of doing. You kind of go through some of your career just hoping that you just don't have to do it! [...] Maybe it won't happen on those days! [...] Which is awful because you know how much the children like it.

This avoidance reinforced professional distinctions between specialists and non-specialists. The class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) felt these were intransigent obstacles to the wider use of music beyond the music lesson. She found it hard to overcome fixed musical identities and notions of musical learning. Her research of class teachers' attitudes towards singing highlighted how educators' avoidance of singing or music hampered children's musical development and access to musical learning opportunities:

A009: p. 23 [...] a lot of them [class teachers] said at the beginning [of her research study] they refused, wouldn't sing or if they felt they had to if they were doing a school play or a class assembly or something, and they had to learn a song with their class, they'd make it as difficult as possible for the children to hear them doing anything and you just put the CD on and hope for the best. So I suppose in that sense they are taking a step back and letting the children explore but I think that's a shame. I think especially with singing, especially with the older years you know the children need to see actually it's ok that everyone's singing and that it doesn't really matter if you're not particularly good at it or [...] if you're not confident with it but you're having a go. And I do think although it's annoying sometimes that you don't have a music specialist in teaching music sessions I don't actually think it's necessary. I think the children need to know that it's not always specialist people that are teaching it, that anyone can do it, not just a specialist role [...]. It's not what we should be instilling in the children really. It's for everyone.

Burland (2005) found the fear of critique led to university music students similarly avoiding performance opportunities, a fear which determined their career paths, whilst those with better coping strategies and greater resilience went on to become professional performers. Lamont identified these psychological traits as critical elements of a robust musical identity (2011). Corrigall, Schellenberg & Misura's recent study (2013) discussed in Chapter Two and earlier here, endorses the role of personality traits in sustaining musical learning over the long term.

Nevertheless, these personal factors also appeared to be affected by an individual's role and the external pressures upon them, discussed in the next chapter. Participants described how individual and school accountability was a key driver of their practice.

As Maslow suggests, the perceived impossibility of the task means that individuals seek to focus on lower order needs. Some participants expressed their sense of regret or frustration at the compromise they were making, echoing Alderfer's notion of frustration-regression. However, as alluded to earlier, there is a sense from the comments made here that an avoidance of music in lessons was inconsequential for some educators, perhaps because music was not a personal passion they felt they must share with children, or because music was a low profile subject both nationally and at school level; issues which are discussed further in the following chapter. Conversely, an individual passion for music or the needs of children with SEND appeared to override these perceived risks, where higher order needs were placed before basic needs, exemplified by the head teacher's earlier comments that she *had* to be able to express herself creatively in her professional work. Lamont (2011) notes how research evidence supports the notion that musical ability is universal but that its development requires effort and motivation. Without any motivation or reason to use music, improve one's skills or overcome risks, it is easy to understand why the use of music appears to be a personal decision and why the use of music as an intervention or resource appeared to be led by individual passion, knowledge and experience.

5.5 Overcoming Barriers

5.5.1 Experiential Learning Opportunities

Hennessy's research (2000) indicates teachers need time to try out new ideas. The class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) described how her specialist teacher training programme had provided the safe space for her to try out different pedagogical approaches, genres and new instruments. Holden & Button (2006) advocate workshops as another way of simulating conditions in a more relaxed atmosphere where there is less threat to individual self-esteem. The head of the music service (MS003) organised a series of workshops at a TA conference run by the peripatetic teacher (A001) in order to promote the bespoke literacy support project, with the aim of getting this approach into the classroom as quickly and directly as possible, given the TA's daily contact with the child:

MS003: p.8. [...] Very practical hands on. Try it out. This is what it's about. This is how it works. Begin to take some of those skills straight into the classroom on Monday morning.

Equally, the bespoke singing project was designed as a training model to support collaboration between the SENCo and nominated class teachers or music coordinators, providing important opportunities for experiential learning for educators in the context of the classroom.

5.5.2 The Importance of an Open Mind

The training of the in-school music specialist (A003) outlined earlier, emphasised a flexible and open mind set as a key skill. The class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) noted that staff working with children with SEND in the attached specialist unit in her school were more receptive to new approaches than their colleagues working in mainstream classrooms. Whilst this might be indicative of certain personal qualities required for their role and practice, this openness might also be explained by their attitude towards music and its relevance to the children they were working with:

A009: p. 20 [...] I think the whole aspect of being a teacher in [attached unit name] means you have to be receptive to everything, you just have to sort of try your hand at everything, and the thing is what works with one child might not necessarily work with others. [...] Some of the children can be quite sensitive to noise and sound [...] I think they're [staff] more receptive to the idea of including singing in [attached unit name]. I think in a way because the singing is sort of seen as sort of an early years, a lower school sort of area, key stage one thing to do. And with [attached unit name] they are sort of pitching everything at that level [...].

This may explain why some educators were receptive to using music in relation to children with SEND, in part because they were willing to try alternative approaches where others may have failed, but also because these comments indicate that these educators appeared to have different expectations compared to their colleagues in the classroom. Holden & Button (2006) support the above participant's view noting that singing was more prevalent in Key Stage 1 classes than in Key Stage 2. However, being "open-minded" to music as the deputy head (A002) and the class teacher/ music subject leader's (A009) earlier descriptions point out, is harder for those who felt they lacked musical skills, knowledge and confidence to deliver music.

Nonetheless, feedback from the survey responses of other class teachers and other interview participants emphasised the willingness of educators to use music, particularly as an intervention or resource for children with SEND. However, they felt this desire was largely inhibited by environmental factors and/or the need for training. Their open minded attitude to a future use of music in this specific context might be influenced by their desire to ensure inclusive and positive learning environments and

outcomes for children with SEND. Like the inclusion manager (A017) and her TA, such a desire might act as a powerful motivating force in helping educators to view and use music in different ways that help to overcome fixed notions and insecurities about delivering music in their own practice, particularly if this is endorsed by school priorities in relation to early intervention or school attainment.

This discussion suggests that the use of music is not just a simple question of being able to play an instrument as some non-specialists perceive, but extends to the ability to plan and deliver musical learning, use appropriate musical resources, and manage behaviour in the musical learning environment. Just as there is an overlap between musical and professional identity, so there appears to be an overlap between musical and professional competencies with the potential for harmony or conflict. The deputy head (A002) had a clear perception that teaching music meant delivering music on a grand scale, a view reinforced by school productions and performances led by the music specialist. Whilst this was an important part of music education, music specialists in this research context drew a distinction between formal methods of music learning based on notation, and informal music-making and learning, and a multi-sensory approach evident in the use of music as an intervention or as a resource. These subtle distinctions were not always evident to the non-specialist, but could be addressed through experiential training and demonstration in workshops, or via training programmes with music and learning support specialists working together in order to differentiate the use of music as an intervention and resource from other forms of musical educational practice.

These findings challenge my view and that of other participants that an informal musical approach is easily within the capabilities of a non-music specialist. This discussion suggests that I and other participants tend to take such skills for granted, evident in the self-deprecatory view of participants who were music specialists about their abilities and the intuitive nature of their approach in this context. These insights may be helpful both in defining practice in this area and in designing training to support those educators interested in using music as an intervention or resource. However, the analysis also revealed important differences in knowledge about children with SEND, particularly between music specialists and class teachers, and more specifically about the use of music in this context; an area of music provision, which has been traditionally seen as a specialist area within an already specialist subject.

5.6 Differences in Knowledge, Training and Confidence in using Music with Children with SEND

It was notable that all participants involved in using music as an intervention or resource had current or prior experience of working with children with SEND that informed their use of music in this context. However significantly, this research has found that *music* specialists, particularly those working in peripatetic roles, were unaware of basic knowledge and understanding about the needs of children with SEND. In contrast, participants who held class teaching or learning support roles had considerable knowledge and information about the needs of children with SEND in their schools or classes. The latter drew on a different mental store of experience in their classroom or learning support practice. Thus, there appears to be separate gaps in knowledge in music and SEND music provision across each group, confirming research by Darrow (2003), McCord and Fitzgerald (2006) and Wilson and McCrary (1996). Critically, participants using music as an intervention or resource were either able to bridge this gap individually either because they possessed knowledge in both these areas (A001, A012, A017), which those in dual roles were able to bring into their classroom or musical practice (A003, A007, A009, A014), or were able to fill gaps in knowledge through collaborative projects (A019).

Just as in the general classroom, the way learning is presented in the music lesson may generate barriers that have nothing to do with the child's musical or general ability, but are the consequence of the practitioner's lack of knowledge about children with SEND, or how to adapt and differentiate their practice accordingly. Both the head of a SLCN unit (A007) and the SEND music specialist (A010) had run short training sessions for experienced music specialists about music and SEND, and reported being overwhelmed by the response and clear need for information and training. Two music service managers (MS002a and Ms002b) explained the impact the training had had and pondered the level of peripatetic teachers' understanding of basic concepts that highlight the need to prioritise this type of training:

MS002b: p. 21. [...] [SEN music service team leader name A010] has done quite a lot of work with our teachers, a lot of training. She came to one of our INSET days, it was last September, and she had literally 20 minutes to talk to our teachers, en masse, about special needs within the mainstream classroom. And the feedback she got back was immense. Teachers going "Oh, that's brilliant, you've answered so many questions, that must be why that child does this and why that child does this, and what do I need to do for this?" and she

was just bombarded, which is brilliant. They've requested that she goes back and does a longer stint this September, so we're gradually building up the training with that.

MS002a: I also sometimes wonder [...] if you say "special needs" to people, what do they think? [...] Are they thinking: people with severe autism? Are they thinking of people with severe physical disabilities? Or are they occasionally thinking, "Ah, but special needs might be dyslexia", for example? And as a musician, you may solve the problem of being unable to read notation by simply putting it into a coloured format or something. I mean, I'm not an expert, I won't pretend I am, but I know such things can work.

MS002b: And things like dyspraxia, how many of our teachers must come across children with some form of dyspraxia or dyslexia and not know, and just think, "Actually they're just struggling a bit".

MS002a: Or they're clumsy.

The head of a SLCN unit (A007) had a similar response when she tentatively gave her first lecture to a group of highly qualified music specialists:

A007: pp. 23-24. [...] very knowledgeable and experienced themselves, this group of students, but they were saying, "Oh, you should do this on every course, everybody should hear this." So I think there's great scope for people to hear this, there's great scope for music teachers, [...] for all teachers to understand SEN, I don't think there's enough done in basic teacher training, considering the need that there is and the higher inclusivity now.

Significantly, she highlights the general lack of training in special needs education in initial teacher training as well as in music teacher training, a double impact in this context. However, this knowledge gap is often filled strategically in the general classroom through the role of the SENCo, the support and expertise of visiting learning support specialists and ready-made interventions with associated training led by governmental priorities in early identification and intervention, while the music specialist often works alone. Importantly, interview data suggests this lack of knowledge is not just a question of individual training or interest on the part of the music specialist, but also the result of organisational structures within local authorities and historical working patterns, priorities and attitudes in schools that appear to restrict the dissemination of relevant information to individual music specialists working with children with SEND. This lack of basic information prevented music specialists from tailoring their practice directly to the needs of the child within the music lesson. Additionally, participants' reports suggest that SEND music provision appeared to be concentrated in the hands of a few music service specialists with responsibility for entire counties, or the outsourcing of SEND music provision to specialist agencies meant this area of music provision was and is still seen as a specialist field by music

specialists. These issues are considered in the next chapter, given their institutional nature, but are highlighted here for their impact on individual knowledge.

5.6.1 A Lack of Understanding about Music as an Intervention and a Resource

As outlined in previous chapters, identifying the use of music as an intervention or resource has proven difficult during the course of this research, given its hidden nature in existing practice and the lack of clarity in the minds of participants about how this practice might be different from music education or a wider curriculum use of music. However, as the introduction to Chapter Four explains, it is not that music was not being used in a wider context, rather the link to its wider benefit had not been made explicit, often because music specialists were focussed on musical learning outcomes or saw wider outcomes as an implicit product of musical learning. Equally, those using music for cross-curricular purposes were providing opportunities for the contextualising of learning but the use of music was focused on meeting the needs of a topic and fulfilling curricular demands rather than any overt connection to children with SEND or link to Individual Education Plans. Thus, it is the explicit connection between musical learning and learning support aims across the range of learning support settings including the classroom that appears to be missing or hidden, causing participants to view the concept of music as an intervention or resource as something different, requiring different skills or knowledge. The peripatetic teacher (A001) felt the use of music as a learning support intervention was not widely recognised or understood:

A001: pp. 17-18. It doesn't seem to be very well known. There is this move at the moment of singing everything and I think there is a danger of people thinking that's what we're doing, which we're not. We're trying to go a level deeper. I think we've got a challenge of getting a word spreading [sic] and people feeling it is worthwhile spending their limited resources on, and then another challenge that there aren't actually very many [financial] resources anywhere.

Participants highlighted a number of reasons for this. Firstly, there appeared to be a lack of awareness about the use of music in this context, typified by survey and interview comments such as “I didn't know you could”. Secondly, that using music in this targeted way required a different sort of knowledge or practice, summed up by the frequent comment “I don't know how” (A003). And thirdly, educators appeared not to have made any connection between the wider value of music and its potential use in support of individual learning support goals or early intervention: “It has never

occurred to us/me to do it.” (A002, A004). In these ways music as an intervention or resource in mainstream primary education was seen as novel.

Illustrating these points, the in-school music specialist (A003) who had adapted her use of music to accommodate children with visual impairment, felt that she too lacked confidence and knowledge about how to use music more explicitly and needed to be shown how to do this. This is surprising because this music specialist by her own account, clearly had both extensive musical knowledge and confidence in music education, particularly in providing music for children with SEND such that the visually impaired children’s support workers were no longer required to attend her music lessons. Yet she felt both she and the SENCo lacked confidence in delivering more explicit practice, which significantly she saw as different from her normal musical practice in the music room:

A003: pp. 14-15. I was speaking to the SENCo yesterday. I was seeing her about how she uses music and she’s really interested about using it more in her work. [...] I said, “Do you ever use music with SEN children?” And she said, “Well I use it as a calming technique” and I’ve written a scheme of work where music is quiet [...]. She wants us to work a little bit closer together because we haven’t done that yet really, about how it can be used in their time when SEN children are on their own with her in small groups and how she can use any of the arts really. But we’re both kind of, “Oh we don’t really know how to do that.” So we’ve got to learn about it really.

Thus, despite her concerns, the challenge in this instance is perhaps not a question of special knowledge but one of organisation. Significantly, both the SENCo and music specialist were using music in similar ways, but had yet to connect their practice in a more explicit manner. They required time to do this, something that was available to participants involved in the bespoke projects. She felt her head teacher, who was keen on music, would be happy for her to collaborate with the SENCO “if asked”; suggesting this was outside the normal remit of her music specialist role and thus a question of individual motivation. It was notable how the hand bell intervention developed through the endorsement of the visiting occupational therapist. Yet two colleagues working in the same building with the same children appeared to need permission and time to collaborate.

5.6.1.1 A Lack of Practice-Based Evidence

Unlike the peripatetic teacher (A001), the music specialist and SENCo did not have any other examples of practice to guide them and provide the reassurance and information they needed. The peripatetic teacher (A001), who had found examples on the Internet,

reported how she had met with another SEND music specialist working in another county who was also looking to develop similar practice to the literacy support project. They agreed to keep in touch and share ideas. Just as for the trainee teacher, in Hennessy's research (2000), discussed above, the importance of sharing knowledge and practice when developing new practice cannot be underestimated. Thus, there appears to be a need to develop some form of network or community of practitioners who are interested in developing this type of practice and sharing research and practice-based knowledge. This was evident in the national programme manager's observation of the need to build a network of specialist SEND trainers to cascade practice, which might also extend to the sharing of research knowledge as the following discussion indicates.

5.6.1.2 A Lack of Access to Research Knowledge

The peripatetic teacher (A001) highlighted the difficulties music specialists and educators face in accessing research information:

A001: p. 30. I drew an absolute blank with [access to] Katy Overy's [research] except that my daughter is now doing psychology at university and so I could illegally get her to download a thing. I haven't but I could. Usha Goswami gave a presentation in [city name] a few years ago and that was actually on the Internet in the public domain so I was able to read that. [...] I would have read much more if I'd had had better access.

The head of the deaf and hearing impaired unit (A012) reported that her knowledge of Carl Orff's rhythmic pedagogical approach came from a book she found in a charity shop, and from observing music specialists using this method with hearing impaired children. Searching for research information was also seen as time-consuming, with no clear points of free access to music research for educators interested in this aspect of practice. It was also a question of personal priority as the deputy head (A002) identified:

A002: p. 30. But when it comes down to what teachers have to do within a week, and what schools have to do within a week, looking for research is not on your list of priorities, when you've got 30 books to mark and you've got to plan your lesson for the next day and you've got to assess the children by whenever. [...] I know research is being done, but it needs to somehow get into schools or it needs to be flagged up somehow to a particular person within schools. I get the TES and sometimes you know there are things in that, that are really interesting but if you don't get that and read it...

She felt information should be directed toward the SENCo in schools. Even for music specialists, finding time to research information was difficult, as the music specialist (A003) working with visually impaired children explained:

A003: p. 15. I just automatically assume going on the Internet, but [...] I wouldn't know to be honest. I'd have to make that as a really big thing and make sure, get it done as a kind of summer holiday job really, what I like to call a holiday job. But I wouldn't I wouldn't really know where to find that information, I mean the only things that you get coming to schools are courses, and it would be great if there was a course where you could go and learn more about it, and music teachers and SENCo could go.

Equally, music training was not always a priority. The head of the SLCN unit (A007) indicated how much of her practice was instinctive and based on her own musical training that had been conducted in her own time, and from SEND training she had received in a previous role as a SEND specialist:

A007: pp. 22-23. [...] I probably don't know as much about research as I should do. A lot of it is sort of anecdotal, from my own experience and bits that I've heard. I have been to a lot of training. When I worked for [county council name] it was like a 3-year training course, really. We went on so much training, when we weren't delivering training we were attending training, but not an awful lot on music, I must admit. So, you know, I'd like to do more on that.

The lack of access to research and the time required to read it appear to present specific challenges that need to be addressed if key research is to be disseminated to educators in easily accessible formats. Nevertheless, two SEND music specialists (MS001c, A010) believed that knowledge and information alone was not enough to deliver music effectively to children with SEND.

5.7 A Certain Type of Practitioner

Building on the idea that educators needed an open mind and willingness to take on new ideas in respect of music, The two SEND music specialists (MS001c, A010) felt it took a certain type of person to deliver music sensitively and appropriately, underpinned by their instinctive and professional knowledge, and understanding of the potential barriers some children face. They described how often simple misunderstandings arose due to a lack of knowledge on the part of the music teacher about the child and their way of learning, which could have significant impacts on the child's desire or ability to participate musically. The SEND music specialist (MS001c) felt these required patience and skill to resolve:

MS001c: pp. 16-17. [...] Teaching an autistic child the piano is not the same as teaching anyone else. [...] It's a different thing altogether! We have people who have the patience and the skill to do that. [...] [Primary school name] has a group of severely autistic children, up to twelve of them in this class. We've worked with them all year round for many years and one boy in there is starting to learn the keyboard within that afternoon, it's a very different way of teaching.

He remembers things exactly so you've got to teach it right first time, and he only wants to play with one hand! He didn't want to come because she'd made him play with the other hand! Left hand only.

Both the SEND music specialists (MS001c, A010) highlighted how delivering music in this context necessitated a different teaching style and certain personal qualities. They felt these qualities were evident in an individual's passion for music and desire to work with this group of children, their empathetic understanding of children's needs, coupled together with an ability and readiness to deliver music in flexible, intuitive and tailored ways that could be adapted in real time. In this way, just as the head of a SLCN unit (A007) argued in the previous chapter and the SEND music specialist's earlier accounts of her responsive child-led approach (A010), the practitioner starts with what the child can do, seeing the world from their point of view.

The notion that the delivery of music to children with SEND depends on a certain personality type or certain interpersonal skills is interesting as it takes the discussion full circle to the common characteristics of participants using music as an intervention and resource, highlighted at the start of this chapter. It is perhaps significant that these participants demonstrated many of these qualities, attitudes and ways of working across a variety of roles. However, only three participants were SEND music specialists (A010, A013 and MS001c). Nevertheless, this group of participants did have some, if very limited, experience of working with children with SEND beforehand. Thus, it may be the case that these individuals were drawn towards this type of music-making because of their personal rather than musical qualities; or alternatively, their musical approach was a reflection of their personal motivations, characteristics, knowledge and training. Equally, it might also be the case that this type of music-making requires a person with these personal skills first and foremost. Interestingly, these are the same skills that the project facilitator (A011) identified as being essential for the role of leading the bespoke singing project:

A011: p. 7 [...] Now the implications in selecting a leader, somebody who went in trained, has an ability to be really flexible and adaptable, so [vocal leader name A019], who was absolutely brilliant, was an experienced vocal leader, but not necessarily an experienced special needs educator, so that partnership between the teachers and her was really important, about being able to talk and listen, and for her to understand what they needed her to do.

As already highlighted, an open mind and willingness to listen and talk, participate musically and adopt a flexible, informal and creative approach are perhaps just as important prerequisites for the development of music as an intervention or resource as

any specialist musical skill, knowledge or confidence. This poses the question raised earlier as to whether music in this context is best delivered by a specialist or non-specialist.

5.8 Specialist or Non-Specialist?

This was a subject that the peripatetic teacher (A001) and her colleague involved in the literacy support project had given careful consideration. They were both surprised at how “straight forward” they had found the project, leading them to rethink their initial belief that the project should be led by a music specialist:

A001: p. 13. We discussed it initially and thought it might be a bit specialist. I think when you have taught music for years and years [...] you just know what you are doing, without really thinking about it very consciously don't you? You know the progression [...] and something goes not quite to plan? [...] You know how to take a step back and that sort of thing and we weren't sure if the class teacher would have that specialist knowledge. [...] We have both come out and thought, “Well you know, we have had this effusive TA and really charged up children” and we've thought, “Well what do we do. It's all very straight forward!”

Nevertheless, her sister's experience of delivering the project highlighted a number of issues that again chime with issues raised earlier by non-specialists in their general use of music, and music specialists' tendency to take their skills for granted. Her experience is in contrast to that of the peripatetic teacher, which reveals differences in individual expectations both between music specialists and non-specialists and about each other:

A001: pp. 20-21. I think we are more specialist than we realise in that for example, when my sister starting doing it, [...] she'd got the sort of stopping and starting wrong, it was the sort of the wrong way round. She'd played the drum and whenever it stopped the little boy had to do a dance or something. Whereas you would have them marching in time to a drum beat and when the drum stopped the child turned, but she'd sort of- to us that seemed obvious but to her it wasn't at all so- [...] It might need some sort of specialist support for the school. Even if we trained the teachers, they might need to know they could call on us for advice or perhaps just for a planning meeting before they started a programme themselves.

Thus, this discussion suggests a need for the dissemination of practical and research knowledge, support and training on a number of different levels to meet the needs of different groups of educators with varying levels of musical knowledge and experience, who are interested in using music as an intervention and resource. However, as the following chapter makes clear educators also need organisational and leadership

support and endorsement and prioritisation of music if they are to have the confidence and opportunity to develop their practice in this area. This was evident in the examples of practice in Chapter Four and was considered an essential pre-requisite in the design of the bespoke singing project in the learning contract between schools and the national provider.

5.9 Summary

This chapter has considered how the use of music as an intervention and resource was affected by a number of individual differences among participants and between participants and other educators. This discussion has shown that having an open mind to new practice is a key starting point, alongside a willingness to participate and try out new ideas. Participants using music as an intervention worked in similar ways with similar levels of intrinsic motivation. They combined their knowledge of research evidence and pedagogical approaches and for some, their experience of working with children with SEND, in pioneering, creative ways to meet their central concern of meeting children's needs. This intrinsic motivation meant for some they were prepared to take risks, supported by their musical knowledge, understanding, confidence and strong musical identities.

This was in contrast to the beliefs expressed by less musically confident individuals who felt using music risked their professional competency, such that they sought to avoid using music; reflecting Maslow's theory that individuals will seek to protect basic needs over higher needs. A lack of musical training during teacher training, a key transition moment, meant that those without strong childhood musical experiences moved into their new professional identity as a teacher ill-equipped to teach or lead music, while others were able to draw on their more advanced musical knowledge, strong musical identity and confidence. This led to a sense of regret and guilt for those who could see the benefits of using music in their practice but felt unable to do so, whilst those who did expressed considerable job satisfaction.

Equally, where educators appeared to lack musical skills, so music specialists' lacked knowledge and experience in a basic understanding of the range of individual needs in mainstream education and more specifically, the musical needs of children with SEND. Importantly, there was a lack of awareness about how music might be used as an intervention and resource and knowledge about how this might be achieved in practice,

even amongst those with considerable musical and/or SEND experience, training and knowledge. However, these differences, whilst individual in nature, did not occur in isolation. The thematic analysis identified a number of wider environmental factors, which shaped individual attitudes to, and experience and practice of music. These factors are considered in the following chapter.

Chapter Six

Environmental Differences

6.0 Overview

The discussion has highlighted how the use of music as an intervention and resource was led by individual priorities and experience. The previous two chapters focussed on individual experiences of using music as an intervention and resource. Participants described how their past experiences of musical learning affected their current and future professional use of music, which appeared to depend on the strength of individuals' personal and professional musical identities. These identities were partly shaped by the amount and nature of musical training participants had received, particularly at critical moments of transition for some as part of their initial teacher training, which shaped their perception of music education and its wider use in the curriculum and learning support provision. Nevertheless, other participants perceived music differently, seeing it as a functional resource that enabled them to meet their objectives of equal access, rather than the performance-led perceptions of other participants. These different perceptions affected how participants used and viewed music in this context. Equally, individual ways of working and personality also appeared to affect participants' motivations for their practice. However, participants described how these individual differences did not occur in isolation but in interaction with the expectation of participants' roles, working environment and institutional musical identity, which either supported or inhibited their practice further.

This chapter considers themes that were clustered under 'environmental differences'. These themes describe how institutional attitudes and priorities in education, learning support and music provision shaped the environmental context in which participants worked, influencing participants' personal and professional identities, priorities and working styles and experience, and their opportunity to use music generally and as an intervention or resource. The analysis identified six highly interconnected main super-ordinate themes: *priorities, pressures and institutional attitudes; support; time; evidence; freedom and access to music*. The super-ordinate theme, *priorities, pressures and institutional attitudes* comprised six emergent themes: *priorities drive practice; overarching priorities; role-specific priorities; shared priorities and pressures; competing/conflicting priorities and the cost of managing priorities and pressures*.

The thematic analysis highlighted how *overarching priorities drove practice* and defined music's place, purpose and value in the curriculum and in learning support practice. This revealed that music was not a priority in learning support practice. So much so it was rarely, if ever, used due in part to a reliance on ready-made interventions based on government education initiatives, training and funding; and the advice of external learning support specialists, who from participants' accounts had yet to make the connection between the wider potential of music and learning support practice. Significantly, the use of music in this context was thought to be more relevant to special education than mainstream education.

Participants highlighted how different institutional musical priorities affected the level of *support* and *time* given to music in schools that encouraged or inhibited school music provision, individual practice, individual and school musical identities and its wider use as an intervention or resource. The bespoke interventions either complemented or developed out of overlapping strategic and individual priorities of their employers, who were seeking to increase musical access to marginalised groups of children.

Participants using music as a resource or intervention in schools were supported by a strong musical culture led by the head teacher. Conversely, some examples of integrated practice were prompted by the limited time afforded to music in some schools, leading participants to squeeze music in wherever they could in their classroom role; findings that highlight the interaction between individual and environmental factors.

Participants described how increasing *accountability* in both education and music provision drove the apparent *need for evidence* to justify and develop educational and musical practice generally, but especially the use of music as an intervention, given its focus on literacy and numeracy and priority groups of children. The analysis revealed differences in institutional priorities and perceptions about the purpose, nature and use of evidence in assessing learning in education and music and how it should be measured. Echoing the discussion regarding the need to identify a causal relationship between music and wider outcomes considered in Chapter Two, participants were divided about the need to justify the use of music beyond its intrinsic value and what form such evidence should take when assessing musical learning.

These themes collectively determined the level of *freedom* participants had to use music in their practice, explaining the gap between their aspirations and willingness to use music and their ability to do so. The analysis identified a number of institutional

gatekeepers who by their attitude towards music and its prioritisation within their particular setting, opened or closed doors to musical learning opportunities for children with SEND, described thematically as *access*. Participants working for external music providers highlighted their dependency on schools to provide access to and vital information about children with SEND which affected music specialists' ability to adopt a more tailored approach.

Institutional priorities, pressures and attitudes were dominant themes, thus, they are considered throughout this discussion, using the remaining themes (*support; time; evidence; freedom and access*) as the framework to explore and describe the environmental differences that appeared to affect the use of music as an intervention and resource at an institutional level.

The previous chapter highlighted the importance of intrinsic motivation in supporting participants' use of music in this context. This chapter considers how environmental factors shaped and affected such motivation. As discussed previously, participants explained how the different priorities described above and the expectations, freedom and pressures they generated were either in conflict or harmony with their individual and professional priorities and attitudes. This led to expressions of *job satisfaction* as participants were able to combine their personal and professional priorities in relation to music, to their work with children with SEND or their desire to provide a balanced curriculum and best practice within a supportive working environment or role. These experiences were expressed thematically as *desire becoming reality*. Some participants felt unable to change overarching priorities and priorities which was expressed thematically as *desire versus reality*. This led to expressions of guilt, fear, frustration and sadness as some participants described the *cost of managing competing priorities* and their inability to use music despite their willingness to do so. In contrast, others were able to challenge the status quo, facilitated by a supportive working environment, the expectations of their role, and/or their high levels of intrinsic motivation, expressed in their passion for music or the needs of children with SEND, discussed in the previous chapter.

Different levels of individual and institutional freedom appeared to support or thwart participants' higher aspirations in favour of more basic needs such as job security or coping with the stresses of their job, leading to the different outcomes outlined above. As already alluded to, such findings reflect Maslow's theory (1943) that individuals will seek to protect basic needs, although in so doing this may lead to what Alderfer (1972)

terms “frustration-regression”. However, as Maslow points out, human behaviour is subject to multiple motivations and thus the educator must balance competing priorities. This meant participants had to compromise and take a realistic approach to their practice, prioritising what they could achieve within the constraints of their working environment. Consequently, individual attitudes towards music also played an important part in determining participants’ responses to these different environmental conditions.

The conflict between some participants’ willingness to use music and their opportunity to use music was again further amplified in the context of children with SEND for two reasons. Firstly, the opportunity to use music conflicted with their understanding of the wider benefits of music for these children, which they saw as an essential part of educational and learning support practice. Secondly, meeting the needs of these children is a key educational priority, attracting considerable public scrutiny. Thus, attainment and progress of these groups of children and any efforts to support them were highly monitored by head teachers, school governors, the local authority and Ofsted. Consequently, individual anxieties about planning, managing and assessing musical learning, described in the previous chapter, were compounded in this context by the need to provide tangible evidence of attainment and progress, on which individual and school reputations depended. Thus, whilst participants were willing to use music as an intervention and a resource, some saw music as not just a personal, but also an institutional risk, which required evidence of its impact in order to, justify its use in this context. These issues are now considered in more detail, starting with the factors, which appeared to support participants’ use of music as an intervention and resource.

6.1 Support

This was a major theme that reflected institutional priorities, attitudes and ways of working in education, learning support provision and music education and provision that overlaps with the later discussion of the other themes of time, freedom, evidence and access. This section firstly considers the factors that supported the use of music as an intervention as outlined in Chapter Four. The discussion then moves on to consider environmental differences that affected the use of music as an intervention or resource in learning support provision, in the general classroom or school music lesson.

6.1.1 Support for Music as an Intervention

Participants described how their practice was supported by the strategic, financial and psychological support of colleagues, schools, music providers, charities and parents, and children's responses. Their endorsement was based on a shared vision, trust and mutual professional respect built over long-standing formal and informal relationships and partnerships. In the case of bespoke intervention projects, this support mirrored the personal and institutional passion, curiosity and working styles of participants' employers, who were interested in developing their organisation's practice in this area.

6.1.1.1 Shared Strategic Vision

The bespoke literacy and singing projects, whilst led by individual curiosity, knowledge and interest, developed out of, or were set in the context of wider strategic decisions amongst external music providers, who were keen to move away from an elitist model of largely traded provision towards an inclusive model of musical provision, in which all children have equal access to musical learning opportunities inside and outside school. As outlined above, this fieldwork was conducted in the months prior to the publication of the National Plan for Music Education (NPME) (DfE, DCMS, 2011a). Thus, the comments below reflect the move towards increasing access and greater inclusion expressed in the two Music Manifestos (DfES, 2004; DfES, 2006) from which national initiatives such as Sing Up and Wider Opportunities developed and upon which the NPME builds (Hallam & Hanke, 2012).

Three county music providers were interviewed. They each described how they were working with an increasing variety of partners in local authorities such as school improvement, health and social services, and with special needs and disability organisations at national, regional and local levels, through joint projects and partnerships in schools, special education and specialist learning support contexts, such as specialist centres and pupil referral units, and in the community (MS001a, MS001c, MS003, A005, A011, A013, A019). The head of the music service (MS003) described how these priorities and ways of working had changed music provision in her county and stimulated the development of the literacy support project:

MS003: pp. 2-4. We were a very traditional service [...], the majority of what we did was individual tuition, [...] 85% in terms of what we delivered was individual instrumental lessons, so [...] whether it be SEN or free school meals or looked after children [...], we just weren't reaching out to all, and so a decision was made that obviously this had to change [...] individual tuition percentage has been brought down to around about 50%. We've had a massive

increase in terms of the number of young people accessing the service as well and this is really important in terms of the [literacy support programme name] as to how we've arrived there [...] we decided from about 2007, 2008 to really expand our offer to schools and families. But we've felt that we needed something in addition to that so in [...] January of this year we decided to pilot some additional programmes, which would aim directly at pupils with special educational needs. We did six week-programmes based at our [centre name] in [town name]. This is an outdoor centre which all schools can access which has received a significant amount of funding for SEN pupils so we were able to equip that centre with suitable outdoor free standing instruments. [...] We did a number of pilot projects working with schools that we've got a good relationship with initially. We've got a really good team but at the same time it's a certain amount of skill that you need to be able to pass on [...] and from that [literacy support project name] really grew as well. We found that the world music activities that we were doing in schools were very, very popular [...] and it was that aspect of the delivery that was most attractive to special schools, not just special schools but pupils within mainstream schools with special educational needs.

She felt these changes were not just specific to her music service but typical of changes all music services were having to make; something she saw as an ethical and financial necessity: “but I think it’s a reflection of services nationally, I think most services have had to change how they operate and they should as well” (MS003, p. 21). The head of the music service described how the introduction of the Wider Opportunities programme allowed the music service to get into new schools and provided a crucial training opportunity for peripatetic teachers to gain exposure to new skills, genres and instruments that were evident in the literacy support project. Whilst the peripatetic teacher (A001) and her colleague conceived the project based on their personal curiosity, long-held beliefs and practical experience of Wider Opportunities teaching, their ideas also mirrored and complemented the strategic priorities of the music service which were led in part by the individual and professional priorities of the head of the music service (MS003). Pilot funding enabled the project to be offered to schools at no charge and provided institutional endorsement of the project, which may have encouraged schools to participate in the pilot scheme.

Likewise, the bespoke singing project also developed from individual and strategic motivations. Just as in the case of the literacy support project, the national programme manager (A005), like the head of the music service (MS003) was able to realise her personal curiosity and interest in challenging existing working relationships, through her remit to extend and develop the national music provider’s accessibility programme:

A005: p.30. [...] one thing that I've always been really interested in is linking staff in schools who wouldn't necessarily naturally link together, such as music

coordinators and special needs coordinators, and providing them with opportunities to talk, share, develop work, so that children with special needs in the mainstream context can benefit from music and singing, but it also supports their learning and therefore their achievement as well.

Her role gave her access to a network of schools, a national profile, research evidence, pilot funding and a dedicated team to facilitate, explore and endorse this individual but strategic interest; again indicating the overlap between individual and institutional attitudes and priorities.

At school level, whilst participants viewed schools' willingness to participate as an altruistic gesture or simple question of general interest, their interest appears also to have been strategically motivated. The peripatetic teacher described earlier how school staff saw a direct connection between the literacy support project and the Letters and Sounds programme used in phonics teaching, or saw it as an opportunity for free staff training. In the case of the singing project, participating schools were located in socio-economically deprived areas with little prior school musical tradition. It is not clear why schools were motivated to make such a commitment although the project facilitator (A011) noted educators' "compassion" and desire to meet children's needs (p. 14). Given the number of schools participating in the singing project and the considerable commitment required of schools and staff, it might be surmised that individual priorities to meet the needs of many different groups of children were also strategic priorities of these schools. Equally, the tailored nature of the project may have been attractive to schools to explore new approaches that were relevant to their school and children, particularly as this was made freely available to schools, an issue considered further below.

6.1.1.2 Shared Vision, Ways of Working, Learning and Understanding

In the previous chapter it was suggested that individual practice might also be an expression of an organisation's ethos or working style, to which participants may have been attracted. This reflects Maslow's observation that individuals are drawn to people and places that reflect common values and interests. The tailored, bottom-up approach of the bespoke projects reflected not just the strategic priorities of schools and participants' employers but also the collaborative and partnership working styles within organisations, which led to a shared sense of purpose, learning and understanding as the national music programme manager (A005) describes:

A005: pp.25-27. [...] One of the ways in which we would all [...] say was successful [...] was because of the partnerships, in that it responded to local

need. It wasn't a national programme imposing a model that didn't work on local areas. It was from the ground up. It was seeing what works, what's the local context, what does it look like, who's involved, how can those individuals and organisations respond to the need of the schools in their area, and how can this national programme be channelled down through those local individual and organisations to the schools so that the schools feel as though it's very responsive to their needs. [...] I can say that in terms of the partner relationships that have taken place through [national programme name] and specifically through [SEND programme name] have been very, very interesting. We've had partnerships at lots of different levels, the way in which [SEND programme name], not in isolation from the [national] programme but in the way in which the partnerships developed through [national programme name] had to be through learning from each other.

This shared vision, understanding, learning and sense of journey was also evident in the responsive, creative and bespoke working style of arts development practice, from which the CD resource developed. This approach was underpinned by the influence of the Creative Partnerships programme where creative artists worked alongside schools and individuals to develop and embed creative practice, a key component of arts development practice in this local authority. This approach influenced the working style of the SEND music specialist (MS001c) who reported to a member of the arts service team rather than the music service. The head of the arts service (MS001a) and his colleague, the head of the music service (MS001b) noted the difference between a partnership approach and the traded model that has dominated county music services provision for many years; the latter of which has arguably reinforced notions of music as a separate specialist service to be purchased by schools, rather than as an integrated part of the curriculum in schools:

MS001a: pp.2-3. [...] I know your questions are specific to music, but in terms of our approach to schools, it's difficult actually to narrow it down only to music because then we have the general [...] arts approach [...] Sometimes a music-focused project would come in through the arts development side as opposed to coming in through the music service side [...]. And on the arts development side there is a network, [...] which is supported by arts development, which is a special needs one. Now that's arts generic, that's true, but [...] very often through that network [...], ideas are generated for specific pieces of work and often then are cross-curricular in nature, or they're about supporting particular skill areas like [...] like literacy or whatever.

MS001b: The music service has for a long time been a traded service, and coming from a tradition of delivering small group work in instruments and voice, and [...] the arts people work very differently [...]. But that's why those targeted things that you're talking about will come from them, and it's not that we're adverse to it, it's just that they happen to come through them. [...]

MS001a: Yes but it has interesting implications from the schools' perspective because a relationship between us as a traded organisation and a school is one

thing, and a relationship whereby schools are [...] part of a network or there are key people in schools who know that we are very responsive to ideas and opportunities is a different sort of relationship, plus arts development are [...] very highly subsidised, so often programmes can be primed [...] financially, and the funding to support a particular project [...] would come from a number of sources, schools being one of them.

I: Whereas in your position it's the school will buy that particular service?

MS001a: Exactly. They buy the service, it's a different relationship.

This different relationship was evident in the two bespoke projects. Although the literacy support project was developed in partnership with school staff, tailoring it to the needs of the children and school, the peripatetic teacher (A001) and her colleague delivered the project in a style similar to the traded version of Wider Opportunities teaching on which it was based, where the peripatetic teacher (A001) provided the musical expertise and the TAs joined in. This project later became a trademarked *traded* service to schools. In contrast, the bespoke singing project was principally centred on training educators through the support of the vocal leader (A019), a team-teaching approach and an expectation of self-reflection and evaluation, more akin to the arts development or experiential learning approach. The singing project sought principally to explore working relationships and enable SENCOs and teachers to embed musical skills, knowledge and experience into their practice. In contrast, the literacy support project was conceived as a service to schools delivered by a specialist. Although the TA joined in enthusiastically and one school felt they would gain training from the project, this wider aim, which might help to sustain practice post-project did not appear to have been explored or exploited. Nevertheless, the promotion of the literacy support project through free workshops at the TA conference sought to diffuse the concepts of the project into everyday practice for schools that might not be able to buy the project in.

Whilst both models have their merits, the traded model depends on schools buying these services. This inevitably relies on head teachers and schools' prioritisation of music, financial budgets and the need to justify practice and demonstrate evidence of impact and value for money. These were all issues raised by the peripatetic teacher (A001) as potential barriers to the literacy support project's future development, and identified by participants' as barriers to an increased use of music generally or as an intervention. The head of the music service (MS003) attempted to overcome these barriers through a creative approach to funding, which embraces the idea of shared ownership whilst remaining a traded service. As part of her partnership with the School Improvement

Team, schools were able to purchase the literacy support project as part of the schools' Professional Development Agreement (PDA):

MS003: pp. 20-21. [...] each school buys a Professional Development Agreement, which is a number of units, and they buy it on different kind of levels and that's support and CPD for their staff. [...] They can use those units to buy our programmes. [...] So rather than schools seeing it as an additional spend it's part of an offer that they've already bought [...] so whole school training whether it be singing, or whether it be world music or team building [...] they buy that through the PDA so it's basically one unit, and if a school's investing 25 units then actually it's not seen as such a massive investment.

In contrast to the music specialist-led literacy support project, the bespoke singing project gave educators the chance to work alongside a music specialist in the classroom; to try out new or forgotten skills; gradually taking on more responsibility, building their confidence and intrinsic motivation to integrate music into their individual practice in situ; overcoming barriers; and providing a tailored and personal transition into the use of music in this context. This experiential learning approach coupled with the children's responses in their public performances provided powerful personal and public evidence to justify such practice at an individual and institutional level, and provided the intrinsic motivation to continue with such practice, based on personal experience that 'it works'; a commonly cited reason by participants in justifying their existing musical, educational and learning support practice.

As discussed in the previous chapter, research indicates that trainee teachers and non-specialist classroom educators' prefer the support of the music specialist in class over other forms of professional musical development and support, however this was considered to be a rare experience (Hennessy, 2000; Holden & Button, 2006). Indeed, Holden and Button found that of the 9% of their sample who had received in-class support from a music specialist, 83% of them felt confident to teach music independently. Thus, the singing project provides an important example, not just of how music might be used as an intervention delivered by a music specialist, but also how staff might be encouraged and enabled to sustain and embed this practice into their normal way of working; in turn justifying the time, effort and any financial investment involved. This was evident in the schools' desire to continue their practice post-project. However, the national programme manager (A005) recognised the challenge of sustaining such practice over the long term, both for the national provider and for schools once the financial support provided by the project came to an end, discussed further later in this chapter. Thus, both projects provide interesting comparisons,

particularly in considering the impact of different funding models on uptake and in sustaining practice.

6.1.1.2.1 Relationships and Partnership Working

Given concerns about short-term projects, long-term relationships between schools and the arts and music service were seen as essential ingredients in developing, embedding and sustaining musical practice within schools, evident too in the support given to the use of music as an intervention. The heads of the arts and music services and the SEND music specialist (MS001a,b,c) felt this required a *combination* of one-off, possibly traded, project work *and* collaborative, experiential programme-based work:

MS001a: p.13. [...] it's [arts development] very intensive in terms of resources from everybody, it's very intensive, it affects, if you like, one school, or one member of staff, but the chances of it making a lasting difference are huge [...]

MS001c: But we've preceded that with many years of consistent work in the schools and projects-

MS001a: Relationships, long relationships.

MS001c: Building relationships by doing high quality projects, sustained bits of, you know, going in for half an hour and going in a class for half and another class, [...], they trust you, they can work with you, they will listen.

MS001b: Where Wider Opportunities works well is where there is a partnership, or at least our teachers and somebody from the school, it's not always the teacher, sometimes it's the teaching assistant, but where they're fully involved.

Participants reported how partnership working, where artist and educator or music provider and school worked alongside each other, was also effective in challenging attitudes, cultures and working styles in both schools and artists, and embedding and sustaining practice in schools as a part of the school identity. These findings confirm research by Thompson, Hall, Jones & Sefton Green (2012) outlining the benefits of 'fusing' artistic and educational pedagogical approaches and skills. The SEND music specialist (MS001c) felt partnerships helped to overcome gaps in individual or institutional knowledge and provided important opportunities for shared learning for all parties. They helped to develop new and shared visions and working relationships that increased educators' levels of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to prioritise music and the arts as an integral part of the curriculum, as she reflects:

MS001c: p.13. It will just be a principle of 'this is how you work'. This particular school have already [...] budgeted so much money for it [music project] for next year. They want me to go to their developmental meeting next week, and talk about it, and it's all come out of doing the Creative Partnerships project in the last three years [...] So that money in Creative Partnerships has made the school look at issues, because the Creative Partnerships has so much

paperwork and evaluation with it, it's really made them answer difficult questions. The communication specialist school status has made them look at the questions from another angle, and they suddenly decided they actually know what they're doing, and we do too because we've gone along the process together, it's been really useful.

These comments are particularly valuable and relevant in this research context, not just in their similarity to the approaches used in the singing project and to a lesser extent the literacy support project, but in highlighting the importance of both approaches in changing attitudes, developing skills and embedding music practice such that it becomes an integral part of daily school and classroom life, identity and ethos, rather than something that depends on the individual priority of a head teacher to buy in a musical service. These participants appeared to be challenging traditional notions of music education and provision and historical relationships with schools that reflect an increasingly wider move towards cross-agency working in education, local authorities and government. At a time of dwindling financial resources and increasing accountability for educators and music providers, these participants felt partnership working offers the opportunity to share resources and share the perceived risks associated with developing new practice. This is important in this context as it was clear that schools, learning support and music specialists were united in their desire to provide equal access to high quality learning opportunities for all children, but especially those with SEND. Thus, the bespoke projects provide valuable insights into how music in this context might be developed through partnership working, which may be of potential interest to those working in new regional music hubs, especially given schools' increasing freedom to determine their own practice. However, as the comments above indicate this relies on effort and prioritisation by both schools and music providers at local, regional and national levels.

6.1.1.3 Trust and Respect

The discussion so far has highlighted the importance of long and personal relationships in developing practice that helped to develop *trust*, *mutual respect* and personal contacts. The peripatetic teacher (A001) had spent many years teaching in the schools that participated in the pilot project: "They were interested. They know me and they were just happy to help really." (A001, p. 8). The need for trust is important because developing new practice, particularly in relation to music, was seen by some as a risk. Although the vocal leader (A019) was new to the schools involved in the bespoke singing project, the profile and reputation of the national provider and the local

knowledge of the area leader, who became the project facilitator (A011), provided similar long-term relationships, trust and respect, which appeared to be a central supporting element of these bespoke projects. The music service manager (MS002a) also pointed out the importance of individual relationships between schools and music providers: “I think it comes down, like so many things, down to people, face to face, if they like you, they’ll use you.” (MS002a, p. 24).

On a personal level, participants were grateful for the professional support and trust they received from schools and their employer, which was in contrast to their frequently isolated practice as peripatetic and freelance musicians, as the vocal leader (A019) describes:

A019: p. 4. When I work for myself it’s never that well organised and structured, so it was absolute luxury having so many people working on this project. It was really well structured and kind of timetabled. But having said that [...] the actual timetabling, and going into schools was left up to me, and how many sessions each school would have and what material I would work on was left in my hands.

The vocal leader experienced the best of both worlds. She had the freedom to determine her own practice, supported by her employer’s strategic vision and trust in and respect for her abilities, and the luxury of working in a team who gave her the practical and emotional support, which she felt she lacked when working alone. The SEND music specialist (MS001c) was also glad of the support of her team in helping to share her increasing workload, develop skills in other staff and meet the demand for music in relation to children with SEND, which she felt she could not achieve alone.

6.1.1.4 External Endorsement

The SEND music specialist (MS001c) and the head of the music service (MS003) reported how their work had started to extend into musical partnerships with colleagues in health, mental health, social services and School Improvement Partners. These external partners were becoming valuable advocates for the wider use of music in tackling key educational issues. This was a welcome but surprising source of support that reflected relationships built up over time, through networks developed across the city and an increasing awareness of the wider potential of music amongst health professionals in particular:

MS001c: p. 7. I had an interesting meeting yesterday morning with [...] all the people in the CAMHS, Children’s Adolescent Mental Health [Service], at a therapies meeting and they weren’t sure why I was there. I was glad to be there, and several of the psychotherapists said that “We know that music reaches these

difficult children, we don't need to prove it at all", and I couldn't stay for the afternoon they said "It's alright we'll make the case for music, we're so pleased to see you." And these are mainstream children that they're looking at right down to 0. I know If I'd gone there years ago they'd have gone: "Don't know what you're doing", but there were certain people in that room, in fact one lady produced a document for the whole group to read on the neurological benefit of using the arts to reach children with mental health. I read about half of it, and it was intriguing and I'm kind of coming across this more and more so there is a body of people out there that know it absolutely reaches-

The development of a SEND city-wide arts network had led to a considerable increase in demand for the SEND music team's services:

MS001c: p. 17. [...] It just keeps growing. [Person name's] network [...] is producing more contacts and more work and it's a bit scary actually because we have these [network name] meetings where we all gather together with people from all over the city- [...] we met all sorts of new people and they've all been ringing me up and it's like- argh! More work!

I: Letting the genie out of the bottle?

MS001c: It is a bit, that's been a bit surprising because it wasn't, sort of, expected and suddenly there's people like physiotherapists that we kind of know of, occupational therapists, people that run clubs at weekends, all wanting to, sort of, come and see us.

The views of these external specialists were considered important as they acted as powerful allies in promoting the use of music as an intervention and resource to schools; particularly, given the frequency of their visits to schools and schools' apparent reliance on their expertise and knowledge in shaping their learning support provision, outlined in Chapter One.

The head of music service (MS003) worked in the same building as the School Improvement Partners (SIPs) team. She described how informal conversations in the corridor had developed into a more formal partnership where the literacy support project and other musical services were offered as an integral and traded part of the School Improvement Programme, discussed earlier. This is important because participants described how the raising of standards and focus on results inhibited the use of music in schools. Thus, this integrated approach not only highlights the wider value and role of music in the context of school improvement, of which learning support provision is a key element, but it also provides vital endorsement and the extrinsic motivation to use music, particularly for head teachers and schools under pressure to improve, but nervous of using music:

MS003: p. 6. [...] We've got schools in [county name] that were in special measures and [...] have embraced Wider Opportunities and the evidence from the SIPs is it's having a real impact in raising the standards within the school in

general. [...] Once you get the School Improvement Service also agreeing and understanding and the school advisors and the school improvement partners working with the head teachers I think that's when you make the difference.

Similar to the inclusion manager's (A017) constant quest for accessible resources, so the head of the music service (MS003) was constantly searching for opportunities to develop relationships with other agencies who could provide access to the children she sought to target, and to develop opportunities to share funds, ideas and resources:

MS003: p. 25. I'm trying to be a fly on the wall at as many possible things we can be [...] whether it be conferences or network meetings or even training days here, [...] I know it's hard work isn't it but you've just got to keep at it.

In this way, like participants in the arts and music service (MS001a,b,c), she was also seeking to develop understanding and awareness of the wider educational potential of music at a strategic level by building networks and engaging key opinion leaders such as school improvement teams, whose endorsement was seen as vital in developing and promoting a more inclusive and targeted music approach within schools.

6.1.1.5 Financial Support

Financial support played a critical role in supporting the use of music as an intervention. Pilot funding from the music service and national provider enabled both the bespoke projects to be offered to schools free of charge. The development of the ready-made CD resource, materials and associated training was also provided free to schools, supported through external funding targeted towards developing communication skills that was identified by the SEND music specialist (MS001c). A creative approach was deemed essential in accessing new forms of financial support, something that relied on contacts, knowledge, trust and reputation, which this participant had built up through her network of partnerships and contacts.

The provision of free musical services appeared to be a major psychological factor in encouraging schools to participate as it reduced the overwhelming need to justify expenditure and practice, discussed later. However, as the project facilitator (A011) of the bespoke singing project pointed out "It looks like it was free to the school, but in actual fact there was quite a significant cost in their time as well" (A011, p.5). Schools provided time for the delivery of the project, for staff to attend a half-day training session and teacher reflection and project evaluation. Participants noted how *time costs money*, in buying teaching cover to release teachers for training or participation in projects such as this. In this instance, the national music provider paid for some cover

for teachers, but otherwise the provision of time was at the school and individual's expense, indicating their individual and strategic commitment.

As mentioned above, the literacy project became a traded part of the music service's provision to schools, receiving a small subsidy to schools to maintain its affordability, something the head of music (MS003) was keen to protect in respect of the literacy support project:

MS003: p.5 [...] there is a cost. [...] Nationally, funding has been reduced and if schools and settings want high quality programmes we can't put the subsidy in that we have in previous years. So [literacy support project name] is one of those, but also using those skills to be able to support teacher assistants and so on in mainstream primary schools [...] but we're looking to deliver the [literacy support project] concept at the teachers assistants conference within [county name] so we can begin to spread the concept of what we're trying to do into schools without schools having to purchase it, because ultimately you just want them to be aware of it, you don't really want finance to be an issue for them not using that way of working.

This participant and the head of the arts service (MS001a) acknowledged schools' and head teachers' use of music was constrained by external factors such as finance, that necessitated new strategic approaches to overcome such barriers:

MS003: pp. 9-11. [...] We don't need to lecture schools and head teachers about the benefits of music. The majority know it and I think sometimes we need to take a fresh approach, [...] especially as music services and music education is beginning to be challenged. [...] We lost £500,000 this financial year so we need to look at different ways of working and how we can reach out to that child regardless of whether the school can afford to buy us or not and I feel a responsibility really, [...] the same reason why I'm putting programmes in place for looked-after children. [...] I know many of the looked-after children will never access our standard service, but they should.

The head of the music service (MS003) was not alone in offering 50-100% remission of music charges for such children or for those receiving free school meals, reflecting the funding support that was available for this work and its growing priority in both mainstream and community-based music. However, she explained how funding for children with SEND was not so clear cut and children needed to fall into a certain category to receive such support, something she felt needed "more research" in order to offer similar remissions to this group of children (MS003, p. 10). Nonetheless, she felt fee remission alone was not enough to increase access to musical learning opportunities and recognised the strategic value of projects such as the literacy support project in developing relationships, which she hoped would bear fruit in the short and long term:

MS003: pp.11. So these additional programmes working directly with other departments within school, School Improvement, it's that that makes the

difference, not just offering the remission. [...] With some of the SEN projects that we've been doing [...] to be able to bring them to a central space [outdoor centre], which is a neutral space with a school and the class teachers and it's seen as something [...] in addition to what they'd be doing in their mainstream schools, they've then got more chance of buying in to that at a later date if that makes sense as well.

Just as participants using music as an intervention and a resource met children where they were, meeting their needs and matching their interests as a way in to other learning through musical engagement, so it appears that a similar approach is taking place at a strategic level between music providers and schools and educators. As discussed earlier a “neutral space” away from school appeared to help to redefine and challenge preconceived ideas of music education or provision for all parties through experiential, shared learning. Music providers hoped this would act as a catalyst or seedbed for long-term relationships where schools would be happy to spend limited school financial resources on music, fully aware of its wider benefits, based on personal experience and a sense of shared ownership.

At school level, the provision of financial support was not only vital in reducing the risk associated with diverting funds to music, but also in providing basic access to musical resources for children with SEND, highlighting institutional attitudes and priorities towards music in schools and in learning support provision. The inclusion manager (A017) reported how funding only paid for support staff costs, thus she was dependent on charitable donations to purchase specialist musical resources:

A017: p. 6. The Quintet Box which was a couple of thousand came from someone who had died and left a dowry and we applied for the dowry and we got some money from that. The Variety Club have helped us in the past with bits and pieces and it's just going out there and asking for extra funding so that we can find the money to do it [the children] attract enough funding [...] to employ someone to support them, and that's it, so the rest is charities and other people supplying.

This participant worked in the only resourced specialist mainstream unit in the city for children, some of whom were quadriplegic or unable to communicate verbally, where inclusion was a high priority. So it was surprising to find that specialist music technology, which enabled children to participate fully in music lessons and the wider musical life of the school, was dependent on the passion and fundraising efforts of this participant and her team. A recent report by Ofsted (2012b) noted how the use of music technology in schools was poorly understood and underutilised. Had it not been for these individuals' efforts, these children would not have been able to access musical learning opportunities in the Wider Opportunities guitar lessons for example, with its

attendant benefits. Whilst the school had a sensory room, the portability of resources such as the Quintet Box meant they could be taken into a variety of settings and integrated into music and class teaching. This is very important because, as the inclusion manager (A017) noted, some children would not be able to access singing or clapping but could join in using assistive technology. Given the predominance of singing and clapping in the examples described in Chapter Four, this has important implications for the use of music as an intervention and as a resource in the general and music classroom. Whilst such materials do not have to be expensive and use can be made of existing musical resources and technology within schools (Drake Music, 2012), this example highlights the lack of financial support for specialist resources, which were considered to be highly effective in this context. The SEND music specialist (MS001c) described how she was constantly sourcing money from different charities or grant making bodies, making connections to wider charitable aims around which she developed her musical practice with children with SEND; but this required time and commitment in what she described as an already pressurised role.

Other participants reported a similar lack of funding for music in their schools. The class teacher/ peripatetic teacher (A004) reported how he had bought school music books and instruments at his personal expense, as he had had no music budget for the last two years. Similarly, the in-school music specialist (A003) was raising money via school concerts and CDs to convert a junk room into a music room with instruments. Whilst this relates to the use of music generally, it indicates the limited school budgets for music, even where music was an integral part of the curriculum (A009), which appeared to affect schools' ability, and willingness to buy traded musical services, discussed above and later in the section on evidence.

The Pupil Premium, introduced in 2011, might provide a valuable financial resource for music and learning support specialists to draw upon to support the targeted use of music as an intervention or resource. The Pupil Premium is designed to support children receiving free school meals or children whom the local authority has looked after for more than six months. Schools receive £900 per eligible child per year. Participants were asked about the impact of the recently introduced Pupil Premium on their practice. The in-school music specialist (A003) had never heard of it, while the external learning support specialist was unsure how it might be used (A006). The class teacher/ peripatetic teacher (A004) felt it would be directed towards "the basics" (p. 23), while

the SEND music specialist (A010) felt any musical use depended on government and school attitudes towards music.

A very recent review of the Pupil Premium programme (Carpenter et al., 2013; Ofsted, 2012c) found that schools used funding in a variety of ways, targeting individual children or groups of children, sustaining existing provision, the cost of extra staff or starting new initiatives, such as enrichment and extra-curricular activities of which music might be a part. The use of Pupil Premium funding to support the use of music as an intervention and resource offers considerable potential to address funding difficulties and support for music in this context. Carpenter et al's report (2013) found these choices were based principally on school and head teacher's experience of 'what works', although some schools used research evidence to support and inform their support. Interestingly, the head teacher (A014) and deputy head (A002) based their decision to adopt a creative curriculum based on their understanding of 'what works' and their observations of the way in which children learn and their experience and training in creative educational approaches. Such observations highlight once again, the overlapping influence of individual attitudes, understanding and knowledge on the strategic use of music in schools.

6.1.2 Support for Music in Learning Support Provision and Practice

The discussion thus far has focussed on overarching issues, which have direct and indirect implications for the use of music as an intervention and resource. Nevertheless, participants expressed their willingness to use music as an intervention and a resource, that was evident in schools' support of the pilot bespoke singing and literacy projects. Thus, the use of music as an intervention did not appear to be hampered by any real lack of support or opposition, but as already identified by several other factors: namely, a lack of knowledge ("I don't know how" (A003)), discussed in the previous chapter; a lack of awareness ("I didn't know you could" (A006)); or because participants, including some music specialists, had not made an explicit connection between their existing use of music and learning support objectives ("It has never occurred to us to do it" (A002, A004)). These comments, whilst individual also appeared to reflect prevailing institutional priorities, attitudes and working styles in learning support provision. Participants described how learning support provision relied heavily on government initiatives and the advice of external learning support specialists and clinical therapists, which collectively shaped institutional learning support priorities, attitudes and practice at school level.

6.1.2.1 The Influence of National Policies

The deputy head (A002) described how the priority of successive governments to drive up standards in schools and target the attainment of groups of children in schools had shaped learning support provision and ways of working in her school:

A002: pp. 7-8. We've got about 22 % of the children on the SEN register. [...] We've got quite an early identification programme and our nursery staff are very good at identifying issues early on and we refer, any child we are concerned about to our speech and language therapist from [town name] practice and she comes in and assesses them [...] and she writes IEPs for them and we put those in place and work through those, because the idea is you would rather identify them early and try and do everything we can to get them off the SEN register as they go through school and that's having an impact at the moment [...] We have the Reading Recovery programme, which is one-to-one. [...] And we've also got Every Child a Counter [Every Child Counts], which is one-to-one at the moment. [...] I mean throughout the rest of school it's just a variety. Some children go to intervention groups: things like Numacom, which is a maths intervention group. Some children, it's that they require an IEP because they need to do extra reading, some children it's a spelling one, some children it's a phonics one depending on which year group they're in.

This practice was echoed by other participants' descriptions of their school's learning support priorities and provision. These ready-made interventions and programmes were introduced as part of the National Strategies programme over a period of 14 years. The programme ceased in 2011 on the basis that it was now time "to consolidate resources and decision-making at school level, allowing schools to determine their own needs and to commission appropriate support" after a period of 'central provision and initiatives' (DfE, 2011b, p.3). It is important to point out that the National Strategies programme provided non-statutory guidance, however these early identification, intervention and school improvement programmes became key priorities for schools and learning support practitioners attracting funding, training, resources and monitoring as part of school inspections by Ofsted. From participants' accounts, such initiatives reinforced a focus on core skills of literacy and numeracy and defined ways of working and understanding of best practice, particularly in learning support provision.

6.1.2.2 A Reliance on Ready-Made Interventions

The National Strategies, whilst non-statutory were led by national government and local authorities supported by training and funding, and monitored as part of school inspections carried out by Ofsted. Given schools' reliance on ready-made programmes and interventions, of which there appeared to be few musical interventions, the focus on core subjects and the pressure of Ofsted, it is easy to understand why it had never

occurred to the deputy head (A002) or her school to use music as a learning support intervention:

A002: p. 21. To be honest, it's something that's never- never really struck us to do. [...] A lot of our teaching assistants would be the ones doing the intervention programme so we'd need to give them some sort of training to give them, to enable them to feel confident to do something with music. Obviously if someone approached me and said 'Oh I'm thinking of this with my group', I'd have absolutely no problem with them doing that. [...] But a lot of them have been trained in different programmes such as Numacon and different things that we have. And it tends to be a set programme that is followed or it tends to be a planned particular way of working that a teacher's got in mind and it is usually to enhance maths and literacy skills really. Because obviously, come the end of Year 6 that's where we're judged and that's where we have to get the children to a certain level before they go on to high school. That's the issue unfortunately, is the focus is always pulled back to those core subjects.

As intimated above, her explanation, echoed by other participants such as the inclusion manager (A017), reveals the prescriptive and ready-made nature of learning support practice and a dependency on interventions that were “followed” by TAs, who had received dedicated training in how to deliver the programme. Her comments and those of others suggest a one-size-fits-all approach, which is in contrast to the tailored bespoke musical interventions described in Chapter Four. This different approach may account for the TA's reported tearfully enthusiastic response to the bespoke literacy support project: “This is really wonderful, this is great, this is just what they need” (A001, p. 8). As outlined in Chapter One, learning support provision is based on a graduated system of increasing intervention and tailored practice consisting of three ‘waves’ or levels of action, starting with an inclusive classroom and learning environment (Wave 1), the provision of interventions for small groups of children (Wave 2) and tailored interventions for specific children needing more intensive support (Wave 3) (DfE, 2011b; DfES, 2001). The use of music identified in this research might easily fit within this model as a resource in the classroom or music lesson or as a group intervention in the learning support or music lesson, yet its use appears to be poorly understood and lacking in prioritisation at a strategic level.

6.1.2.3 Fixed Ways of Working

The class teacher/ peripatetic teacher (A004) described how the focus on core subjects shaped his thinking as a class teacher *despite* his considerable passion for music, knowledge and practical skills as an instrumental music teacher:

A004: pp. 21-22. The objectives you tend to get have always been numeracy or literacy based and I have never to my shame, put down music as one of the ways

as achieving the target. [...] The way in which you are expected to help SEN kids is so much geared towards specifically literacy and numeracy targets- there doesn't seem to be much of a look in, but I'm sure in different settings and in special schools etc. that there is much more scope for doing it. But you have to put down support strategies in place, which can be performed by a wide range of people.

He expresses his “shame” at not having made the connection to wider learning outcomes, in part because music had not been identified as a means of meeting such goals, but also because, importantly he feels interventions need to be deliverable by a wide range of people in a variety of settings. These comments reflect the lack of musical confidence and skills amongst educators identified earlier and the recurrent overlap between individual and institutional attitudes and priorities. Significantly, he believes that educators in special schools or other settings had more “scope” to use music in this way compared to the mainstream primary classroom where he felt restricted in his ability to adopt a more flexible approach. This view was echoed by a number of other participants, discussed further below in the section examining participants’ freedom to use music.

The in-school music specialist (A003) also reported that she was not expected to link her work to children’s IEPs, even though her work had recognised benefits for the visually impaired children in developing their independence, described in Chapter Four:

A003: p. 9. I don't think I am expected to look at those [IEPs] really-, [...] I guess this is kind of a negative thing really that where I'm just coming in to do music with them and then I'm off again [...] I don't really get the full information on the children, which would be better.

The SEND music specialist (MS001c) found it difficult to build her practice in mainstream schools because she felt mainstream schools had yet to make the connection between the wider potential of music and core subjects, or appreciate subtle distinctions between music therapy and its use in an educational context to support the development of core skills, as the head of the music service (MS001b) and SEND music specialist (MS001c) consider:

MS001b: p.8. Am I right in my view that they [mainstream schools] tend to see literacy, numeracy and whatever the other core subjects is- as the route to that, rather than thinking creatively and thinking actually music and arts can be really useful for kids and help them with their literacy, they don't think like that it's just too sideways for them?

MS001c: They're happy to bring the children to one off taster days, getting them to see how we could work with them after that is the task to be done really. This is mainstream now, special schools we have a bigger relationship with but the mainstream- little patchy areas where people know that the music contribute,

they'll ask about music therapy- are very small and it needs to grow. [...] I mentioned therapy because sometimes that is what we have to offer them but it's both [educational and therapeutic] and it's getting them to understand the difference actually, and too, you know, can I always explain the difference?

Again the issue of relationships is raised. Relationships helped to develop understandings of subtle but important differences in musical practice that even the SEND music specialist struggled to define. As already discussed, articulating the use of music in this context is a central challenge, echoing the discussion at the end of Chapter Two and Bunt's observation that head teachers did not often understand the difference between music education and therapy (2003). The head of the arts service (MS001a) felt this lack of understanding was evident at all levels within mainstream primary schools, including SENCOs. The SEND music specialist (MS001c) and the head of the arts service (MS001a) noted the complexity of the issue, which they felt required demonstration and experiential learning in order to understand the difference between music for music education's sake, and its more targeted use as an intervention. The range of musical understanding and interest among head teachers meant that any wider use of music was felt to arise out of individual interest and opportunity rather than any strategic motivation. Reflecting the earlier discussion, the head of the arts service (MS001a) highlighted the difficulties of providing traded services to schools that have yet to understand the concept on offer and felt an arts development approach offered a more flexible, tailored partnership approach that was useful in overcoming such barriers and sustaining practice in the long term:

MS001a: pp.7-8. We've got a number of heads who are very committed to music, a number of heads that are very committed to arts and sometimes they're the same thing, and sometimes they're not, and those heads will work with us on whatever. [...] They're the ones that will come to us and say "We've got children with this that and the other, what can you do about it?" There are also a lot, I'm afraid more heads out there who don't actually yet see musical arts as a means to an end for their kids, there's a job to be done in getting that message across. I think that, it's true of the specials [special schools], although we're talking about mainstream but it's true about the SENCOs, people responsible for special needs within the mainstream-, [...] it is even more difficult now because of the new changes that are coming in [increasing school freedom], that what kids get is defined by the gate keeper, [...] who's the head actually in the end. Sometimes that's overcome by somebody who's really enthusiastic whether it could be a SENCO or a teacher, or a head of department or whatever who in spite of the head makes things happen, but always it comes down to individuals.

Several key strands emerge from this discussion. Firstly, individuals and schools are not averse to using music as an intervention or resource in their practice but are not always aware that music might be used in this way. This appears to be a combination of

personal and institutional priority, determined by the national focus on core skills driving educational and learning support practice in schools. The introduction of nationwide intervention programmes appears to have determined ways of working and a reliance on ready-made interventions. Whilst music has played a subsidiary role in providing cross-curricular support, the use of music as an intervention or resource did not appear to be an institutional priority in mainstream learning support provision and was seen as novel, and notably, a practice more relevant to special education settings, even by those engaged in musical practice and as learning support specialists. Nevertheless, the class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) highlighted earlier the open-mindedness of staff in the specialist unit attached to her school compared to music specialist teaching staff. However, as this discussion indicates, staff are not unwilling to use music in this context, but for the variety of reasons outlined above and discussed further below, have yet to make this connection to their existing practice. Whilst these participants focussed on individual knowledge and awareness, this lack of understanding might also be due to the influence of external learning support specialists, who appear to play a highly influential role in determining learning support practice in schools.

6.1.2.4 The Influence of the Learning Support Specialist

The inclusion manager (A017) explained that music was not used in her mainstream school “because the speech therapist supplies the programme” (p. 35). Participants’ accounts of school learning support provision highlighted the influence of and reliance on the visiting therapist, clinician or learning support specialist, who visited the school on a regular basis delivering programmes, providing consultancy, monitoring and advising on practice or devising interventions for individual children.

External specialists appeared to recommend certain intervention programmes that they had been trained in and used or were in addition to those introduced by government initiatives. The head teacher (A014) noted how music had not been suggested by visiting specialists despite a focus on multi-sensory approaches in the classroom, an approach, which was evident in many of the examples of music as an intervention or resource:

A014: p.19. They [external learning support specialists] haven't done yet [suggested anything musical]. We've got someone coming in from [name of service] to help one little boy who's got pretty moderate learning difficulties [...] on multiple levels and music hasn't really been suggested there, it's all

been about visual timetables and things like that but you know that's not to say there aren't any but [...] but I haven't come across them-

The external learning support specialist (A006) confirmed that music was not used in mainstream schools to support children with SEND. She points out that children would access music through school music lessons as part of inclusive practice. She acknowledges the variety of school music provision but felt it was not part of her role to ask schools about their use of music:

A006: p. 18. It's not used specifically to support children with special needs, I wouldn't say. It's just that the children with special needs are in the school music lesson, so in some schools it will be done particularly well but [...] I don't go into schools and say what music do you do?

Despite her considerable knowledge of latest research evidence in learning support, her own research and knowledge of best practice in learning support expressed in her interview, she was unaware of any musical interventions in learning support practice: “Well, I haven't perhaps been looking so I don't know” (p. 29). Her comment that she had not been looking for musical resources, suggest that music was not a personal or institutional priority:

A006: p. 26. I think maybe if I read an article or I got a- I suppose I just haven't really thought about it! [...] I might investigate it. At the minute you know, I've got other things on [...] but it might be something else that I look in to because I can see the connection, I can see that there are certain skills that some children with specific learning difficulties lack which would- could be developed through music.

She suggested a number of ways in which music might be used in the learning support context but these appeared to occur as spontaneous thoughts during the interview rather than as the result of any previous deliberation on her part. Her comments suggest that any use of music was an individual decision, echoing the earlier discussion about the overlap between individual priorities and practice.

A006: p.19. [...] I think it depends on personal opinion doesn't it? And so I think there are some teachers who are very well qualified in music, so they might be more likely to that view than others. [...] I think it's quite a personal thing. Whereas something like maths, [...] everybody knows that it's got to be done.

I: [...] is there a difference in terms of what the priority is for the teacher?

A006: Yes, yes.

She sees music as “a personal thing” whereas “maths has to be done”. She highlights differences in musical abilities, the distinction in educators' minds between core and foundation subjects and the different institutional and individual priorities and

expectations associated with them. These attitudes were echoed by other participants and appear to have been shaped by national priorities and schools' freedom to decide the level of priority they afford to music, which are discussed further below.

The effect of these individual and institutional attitudes on practice is important as the external learning support specialist held a highly influential outreach and consultancy role in determining practice in the learning support setting and classroom. She worked with 39 primary schools encouraging class teachers and SENCOs to develop classroom practice and for class teachers to take individual responsibility for the needs of children with SEND. By her own admission she held a powerful position helping teachers to create a positive learning environment within the classroom, recommending interventions and developing personalised programmes for some children based on an assessment of the key underlying sources of difficulties. She was aware of the impact of auditory processing difficulties on other learning, yet appeared to be unaware of how music might play a role in supporting the development of auditory function.

Nevertheless, the external learning support specialist felt that "it would be really easy" (A006, p. 31) to recommend the use of music as a learning support resource because of her close and influential relationship with schools, indicating the professional freedom she enjoyed in her advisory role. However, she felt this required evidence:

A006: p. 28. I think if somebody said 'We've done this, have a go' and they've got proof that it really works then we would take it on, you know, tomorrow.

These views appear to validate the value of the partnership and experiential learning approach described by the heads of arts service and music service (MS001a,b, MS003) with schools and agencies, such as School Improvement Partners (MS003) or with health professionals (MS001c). This was evident in the development of the hand bell intervention. The passing comment of a visiting therapist about the wider potential of the hand bell gave the inclusion manager (A017) the endorsement and confidence to develop its use in a number of ways outlined in Chapter Four.

6.1.2.5 A Need for Leadership and Shared Vision

The head teacher (A014) felt that music could be used as an intervention, evident in her own use described in Chapter Four, but she felt this needed to be led by the head teacher and a collective shared vision amongst staff, in order to adopt a different approach. She recognised the pressures on schools in demonstrating progress, which she felt made schools fearful of deviating from practice norms:

A014: p. 25. If you've got two teachers in year three you need one of them to be on side and skilled up and when school resources are so scarce, there's so much pressure on heads and if you're doing things like EAL [English as an Additional Language], if you've got a large EAL intake, there's so much pressure on you to do everything else, the fact that you can teach English through music goes at the bottom of the list. [...] I don't think they dare take a step outside you know so they have the EAL people in to support the EAL teaching and, and I think it takes a brave and gifted teacher to step outside that.

Her comments suggest a lack of knowledge and expertise amongst schools and educators about learning support practice and the needs of children, which like music provision is sometimes delegated to external specialists to manage and deliver.

6.1.2.6 The Role of the Music Specialist

The in-school or visiting music specialist is an existing resource in many schools, which as the examples in Chapter Four demonstrate can provide advice, guidance, training and specialist input, tailored interventions and ready-made programmes. These were factors which survey respondents said would encourage them to use music as an intervention and resource. However, some participants felt the full potential of the music specialist has yet to be fully defined or investigated in the learning support context. The music specialist (A003) felt that the use of music in support of children with SEND was:

A003: p. 26 [...] an undiscovered area that could potentially be quite exciting, and I think there's a lot of potential for it to move forward and for music to be just part of their natural development really.

The music service manager (MS002b) felt any lack of music in this context was also due to music services and providers who have concentrated their efforts historically on special education:

MS002b: p. 3. Before I came here I was a primary school teacher, and I worked in a school with a lot of SEN and EBD, and I was a music specialist, [...] and actually coming to a different kind of organisation where, interestingly our focus by our SEN team leader has been on music in special schools. [...] And my view is that we need to be targeting, also, the children with SEN in mainstream.

The national programme manager (A005) held similar views, highlighting the challenges and potential of the singing project:

A005: p. 31. [...] There were also challenges such as how do we continue this, what do we need in order to do this, yes this is great but not all of the school team are taking singing on board. So it was kind of a [...] toe in the water of what the possibilities could be, and if we think [...] how things are going to develop with not great budgets in schools, cost effectiveness. Is the link between music coordinators and SENCo a really interesting approach to be able to say, in order to improve the attainment levels, self-esteem, social skills of your

children, whether they have special needs or not? Is actually this a really amazing way to do so, and has very positive outcomes that can be seen by the entire school? I think it's just an untapped area myself.

These different accounts highlight the range of perceptions, which surround the use of music as an intervention. The examples in Chapter Four suggest ways as to how music might make a contribution to learning support practice, particularly through the collaboration of the music specialist and SENCo.

6.1.3 Support for Music as a Learning Support Resource.

The discussion so far has considered environmental factors influencing the use of music as an intervention. Attention now moves to consider how these factors affected the use of music as a resource in the classroom.

The examples in Chapter Four demonstrated how music was used as a resource to provide a positive learning environment, contextualising learning as an integrated part of the curriculum or school day in supporting class routine, regulating behaviour and mood, as well as targeting specific needs implicitly through musical learning and activities within the music or general classroom. Whilst such practice appeared to be motivated by individual priorities, it was notable that those who used music in these ways worked in schools where music was supported by the head teacher and had a strong musical or creative identity and way of working. In nearly all these cases, these participants were active in developing this positive musical environment, and their use of music in this context was an extension of their normal working style or role. Thus, just as for those participants leading the bespoke projects, there was a shared vision, working style and ethos within their schools, which supported, reflected and nurtured their use of music as a resource in this context. However, other participants who were keen to use music as a resource, or had done so in the past, described how their desire was thwarted by the pressures of their role, the focus on core skills and results, and institutional attitudes towards music in their schools that conflicted with their own sense of best practice.

The recent Ofsted music report outlined the variability of music provision in mainstream primary education (Ofsted, 2012b). Participants confirmed this variability: some describing how music was assigned to a single 30-40 minute slot in the curriculum; or was provided in blocks over the year sometimes as part of creative or thematic curricula, such that there might not be any music in a term, while others

adopted an integrated approach where music was an integral part of the curriculum, school life or class routine as the examples in Chapter Four attest.

6.1.3.1 School Musical Identities, Vision and Ethos

Participants' accounts described how the level of musical provision and participation in their schools was led by and reflected in their schools' musical identity and overall vision. For some schools this meant an all-embracing approach to music within the curriculum and school life as the in-school music specialist (A003) described:

A003: p. 14. [...] it's just, yes part of our school makeup really and you know we're a singing school.

The in-school music specialist mirrors the language used to describe the aims of Sing Up to create "singing schools", indicating the programme's influence and impact, reflected also in the school's decision to apply for a Sing Up Award. The in-school music specialist (A003), like the head teacher (A014), worked in a school where music was an integrated part of the curriculum, facilitating the use of music as a resource to support and contextualise learning and as an intervention in the classroom. The music specialist describes some of her colleagues as "proactive" (p. 13) and how her head teacher "really wants" to embed musical practice within the curriculum (p. 14). Half the children in her school had some form of special need, in addition to the specialist visually impaired unit, which appeared to influence the school's inclusive approach to education:

A003: p. 20. Where I am now, they look at the development of the whole child and the arts is important and creativity is important and it just wasn't at my last school.

The head teacher's (A014) decision to adopt a creative approach was supported by her staff's shared vision, and her experience in tackling disengagement in poorly performing schools. She also received endorsement and support from the local authority and the National College of Teaching and Leadership who provided vital funding for her staff to take time to plan and develop the curriculum:

A014: p.28. [...] it was important that we developed our own drivers. This thing is driven by your own beliefs and so at the beginning of every topic is our four drivers: [...] diversity, sustainability, community and creativity, and those underpin every single topic.

Once again, these examples indicate the entwined influence of individual and institutional priorities on musical practice, which helped to determine the musical identity and ethos of their schools and supported their use of music as an intervention

and resource in the classroom. The music service managers (MS002a and b) felt this support was essential:

MS002a: p. 14. [...] if somebody in the school is on board with it then it's more likely to go somewhere, but you've still got a problem, when you're talking about cross-curricular, you need everyone on the staff to feel that as well.

MS002b: And this is where [...] the SIP [School Improvement Plan] comes in, and when they've set their School Delivery Plan, is music in there? Is it listed as important, is it valued? And if [...] if a head and leadership team are valuing it, it will permeate through the staff, it will have to. If they don't... does it? I mean, again, it comes down to those individuals, doesn't it. [...] When they go, what happens then?

Such comments highlight the influence and endorsement of external support agencies and the importance of developing relationships with these external partners in developing new practice at a strategic level.

6.1.3.2 External Pressures on Schools

Other participants had different experiences, reporting the lack of a music coordinator or subject leader and/or school musical ethos. Instead, they relied on the occasional visit from outside musical providers or peripatetic teachers to fulfil their statutory obligations through the Wider Opportunities scheme, as the head of the deaf and hearing-impaired unit (A012) described:

A012: pp. 9-10. [...] Unfortunately the school isn't sort of into the ethos of music in fact there isn't one assembly when they sing. [...] They have somebody who comes in, a peripatetic music teacher. Every class gets 20 minutes or whatever, quick dud, dud, dud finished.

This participant had used music in the past in other deaf and hearing-impaired units, as described in Chapter Four, but felt unable to do so in this school. She had been brought in to manage the unit temporarily following tensions between the unit and the school so she had to be diplomatic in her approach, aware of the priorities of the school over which she had no control:

A012: p. 7. This school is a bit unfortunate, because it's classed as a failing school, reading, writing and maths basically, so there's a lot of pressure on everybody here to make sure we do reading, writing and maths all [sic] times.

A music group visited the unit but the school were unhappy at the fact that it had taken up an afternoon. She highlighted the pressures schools and head teachers face, particularly in schools which are deemed to be failing and the effect this had on children in the unit and her own ability to use music:

A012: p. 11. [...] It was very difficult. They [music group] came in specifically for the deaf children, but because our deaf children are obviously achieving even less than the other kids, we're under constant pressure to you know access as much as possible- and you know- and stuff like that is just seen as pff you know. It's sad- but it's tricky. I don't want to blame the school. [...] It's the government. They're [school] under a lot of pressure themselves. They're asking children to be under that amount of pressure, and they feel by showing that we're constantly efficient and constantly doing what- we're doing what we can, and actually it's not working. That's the sad thing.

She felt once she had completed her restructuring of the unit she would try to use music again and that she had filed away her past experience of using music for future use when the opportunity arose:

A012: p.27. You have it there and ready, and then when the right opportunity comes you go for it. I'd love to influence a school in doing more singing generally, in assembly, because kids do enjoy it don't they, and learning the stuff and everything is so good.

In a similar vein, the class teacher/ peripatetic teacher (A004) described how external pressures at one school he visited had led the head teacher to cut the school's instrumental provision, while other head teachers within the same geographical area and socio-economic conditions retained and prioritised music:

A004: p. 13. The head has got slight budget problems so she scrapped all the music tuition, which is so bad because so many of the children really benefit from it. But she is really blatant, saying, "How can I justify spending this much when I am spending this much on numeracy?" And so she scrapped every bit of peri teaching relevant to Wider Opps stuff. "It's not important, you know, we've got to get our numeracy levels up." [...] Sadly the whole Ofsted [sic] is based around the numeracy, literacy and science levels and as much as I don't approve of it, you can sympathise with the Head thinking, "That's what I've got to do", because the foundation subjects [...] are fairly low down on the radar. Even though you and I know how much music can boost learning in other areas.

However, not all head teachers took this approach. As outlined above, the head teacher working in a small rural school (A014) faced similar educational challenges and pressures, but chose to tackle them in a different way, based on the school's vision, her own experience and the support of her staff and external endorsement from the National Teaching College described earlier:

A014: p. 24. [...] This school was in a hiatus situation as well. We were getting rid of an underperforming teacher, which was more or less half the teaching staff, and so we had to drive standards up. We had to start looking at new and innovative ways to use the scarce resources we've got and to try and address standards, and none of us believed in just driving up standards in numeracy and literacy, we wanted to tackle the standard issues as a whole curriculum.

These accounts once again reveal the overlapping nature between individual and institutional priorities and perceptions. These comments also highlight how a school's musical identity supported or inhibited individual and school musical practice, much like individual musical identities appeared to do, as discussed in the previous chapter. These comments also indicate the influential role of the head teacher and the need for leadership in driving musical practice.

6.1.3.3 Musical Leadership in Schools

Participants' accounts highlight the importance of musical leadership in supporting their use of music, providing important role models for staff and children in their musical participation, as well as practical and financial support. The head teacher (A014) felt that musical leadership was essential in distilling such values to her staff:

A014: p.8. [...] I think if the leadership doesn't have the belief in the music then it doesn't come down through the school.

The class teacher/peripatetic teacher (A004) described how the attitude of head teacher referred to above who had cut her school's music provision was not typical of all head teachers:

A004: p. 13. [...] As I said the three I have done for the last two or three years have all signed up again [for Wider Opportunities teaching] next year. In each case the head teacher is openly supportive. [...] Two of the Heads are musical in varying ways. One plays the flute, one plays the guitar. But they actually get in there, they get involved. And the one I have been in all morning, the Head is not musical but she joins the ukulele club and has put money into it and supports the children doing it.

However, the head of the deaf and hearing-impaired unit (A012) disagreed with the idea that the head teacher was the only musical leader or gatekeeper in schools:

A012: p.23. You can't wait for the Heads necessarily [...]. No I think individuals have to have a go and often you find an enthusiastic person who will then spread the word and say "Have a go" cos lots of people are scared of music aren't they?

As already discussed in the previous chapter, participants noted how some TAs could also act as important musical leaders and gatekeepers, particularly given their daily contact with children with SEND and their role in delivering interventions. Their potential role was highlighted in Chapter Four in their participation in and leading of the literacy support project in another school and in the development of the lunchtime CD.

The class teacher/music subject leader (A009) explained how she had taken responsibility for music in addition to her role as a class teacher in the absence of any

other staff interest, building up the school's music provision through the use of school assemblies and concerts to performances on children's television and in the Royal Albert Hall with the school's upper and lower choirs. The class teacher/music subject leader noted the support of her head teacher and parents, which in turn supported her personal passion for music. This support was the driving force behind her considerable development of musical provision within the school; her use of music within the classroom in support of two children with autism; and as a resource to support class routine, regulate mood and behaviour and the development of music listening journals. She was keen to share her skills, using her research as a vehicle for staff training in using singing in their own practice and delivering training in the attached unit about the wider application of music for learning in the SEND context. She described using school assemblies as another training and teaching opportunity for children and staff, to support her colleagues' use of music-making in the curriculum. However, the deputy head (A002) identified the vulnerability of depending on one individual specialist to provide a school's music provision, not just for the effect it might have in reinforcing the specialist nature of the role discussed in Chapter Five, but also in sustaining musical practice and their legacy once music specialists move on. This was an issue of particular concern to in-school music specialist (A003) who was already thinking about how she could ensure the practice she had developed could be sustained should she leave the school.

6.1.3.4 A Need for Musical Training

The head of the deaf and hearing-impaired unit (A012) felt that teachers needed training, but as the class teacher/ peripatetic teacher (A004) and the music service manager (MS002a) noted school training budgets had been cut. The head of the deaf and hearing-impaired unit (A012) suggested a tailored approach to training:

A012: p. 23. I think courses will be brilliant, courses that maybe even [city name] could offer part time or whatever, or peripatetic music staff who could work with the school for a week and [...] that has happened here. The school has always made use of stuff that came free, and then you have to hope that somebody says, "Ooh that was brilliant! I'll continue with that!"

This latter suggestion reflects the arts development approach and the bespoke singing project, discussed at the start of the chapter. Interestingly, this participant worked in the same local authority as the arts and music service, indicating the demand for this approach reported by the SEND music specialist (MS001c). This participant highlights how schools were happy to take up projects and support when offered without charge.

As discussed earlier, this may have encouraged head teachers to support the bespoke projects and appears to be a key issue as participants reported how they were under increasing pressure to justify their expenditure; pressures that were evident in the head teacher's decision to cut her school's Wider Opportunities teaching, and the external learning support specialist's (A006) perceived need for evidence to support the use of music as a learning support intervention in schools.

6.2 Time and Freedom

The discussion has highlighted how support was a vital element in motivating and sustaining practice. However other factors were identified which affects music's place in the curriculum and individuals' freedom to innovate. Two highly connected themes of time and freedom emerged from the analysis, which appeared to play a pivotal role in determining an individual's use of music generally and as an intervention or resource.

6.2.1 Increasing Prescription

Participants felt that successive governments' continued prioritisation of core skills, attainment and progress its continuous monitoring through performance league tables and Ofsted inspections, had led to an increasingly prescribed and tightly packed curriculum. As discussed above, this focus appeared to lead to distinctions between different subjects and determined the nature of education and learning support training and practice, and thus ways of working within schools. Participants felt this reduced their time and freedom to determine their own practice and negatively affected their ability to use music. Along with other participants, the class teacher/ peripatetic music teacher (A004) expressed his concern at this level of prescription, which he felt defined his professional status and freedom to determine how he delivered his lessons.

Interestingly he also felt this was one of the main challenges facing children with SEND in mainstream primary education:

A004: p. 7. About five to six years ago there was a lot more flexibility to do what you thought was right, but now it's not only the confines of the curriculum, but the very manner of its delivery. It seems to be much more defined, I mean even if you look at when I started teaching 15 years ago, the knowledge that different teachers worked in different ways with results that was fine, but now if you look at say Ofsted criteria- what constitutes a good lesson- it is so specific. And even if you get the results, if you don't teach in that particular way you are seen as satisfactory or failing.

This was a commonly held view amongst participants and external pressure on participants and schools where the “relentless push for results” appeared to dominate as the deputy head (A002) explained:

A002: p .24. [...] If you spoke to an Ofsted inspector they would say you shouldn't narrow the curriculum, but then at the same time the only way of getting outstanding is to get your results to aged 10 and above [...]. Unfortunately that's constantly the bind that schools are put in. We know as practitioners that you want a broad and balanced curriculum with lots of enjoyment, and that children will want to be motivated and engaged and want to be at school. But by the same token, [...] to get an outstanding you have to have your results at a certain level. You can have lots of other things that are outstanding about the school but if those results aren't where they need to be then you won't get 'outstanding' or you won't get necessarily 'good' [...] and so the relentless push for results does take precedence unfortunately.

6.2.2 A Fear of Ofsted

Ofsted appeared to be an ever-present concern in the minds of educators when determining their school and individual practice as the deputy head (A002) explains:

A002: p.11. We had an Ofsted inspection in December, so touch wood we should be OK for a couple of years but that that's only based on whether our results stay where we are, or whether they dip or go up.

However, in contrast to the deputy head's view, the current Ofsted schedule makes only one requirement for a school to be outstanding: “The only exception is that teaching must be outstanding for overall effectiveness to be outstanding” (Ofsted, 2013, p. 28).

The current Ofsted School Inspection Handbook (Ofsted, 2013) indicates that inspectors are encouraged to draw on a wide range of evidence. Indeed, the current schedule warns against using the descriptors as a checklist; rather they should be applied adopting a best fit approach. However, this relies on the professional judgement of the inspection team, which adds another layer of uncertainty for educators, in anticipating how this might be determined. The gathering of data and maintaining records appeared to be a key managerial and classroom priority for local authorities, school governing bodies, head teachers and schools and a key expectation within learning support and early intervention practice. This is evident in the list of quantitative data measures Ofsted inspectors may draw on to assess the attainment and progress of children over the three years prior to a school's inspection (Ofsted, 2013). This list supports participants' perceptions of the on-going need to provide evidence of progress through quantifiable measures centred on the Assessment For Learning and Assessing Pupil Progress measures. The head of the deaf and hearing impaired unit (A012) felt the

assessment criteria used by Ofsted were too narrow, which had implications for the self-esteem of child with SEND and the teacher's personal and professional reputation:

A012: pp. 10-11. [...] on the evidence of this very narrow assessment they're saying "Oh this child is no good at..." or "He's not achieving" or "He's failing and you're failing this child," which I think is a devastating thing. Because a child can't recite their times tables or spell so many words correct [sic] or put a piece of work on paper this child's failing and you're failing this child and you're a failing school.

Participants reported how this need for tangible evidence directly affected their practice. This was particularly relevant to their use of music, as music was seen as intangible and difficult to measure due to participants' and senior managers' limited level of musical knowledge and experience. Thus, there appear to be inherent conflicting priorities in both the stated aims of the National Curriculum and the inspection regime for schools in the desire to recognise and support a broad and balanced curriculum on the one hand, whilst simultaneously focusing on standards, attainment and progress on the other. Whilst these are not necessarily mutually exclusive goals, they are made all the more difficult to achieve by the prioritisation of core subjects over foundation subjects such as music and the quantifiable evidence of results over other evaluation measures and purposes. Despite assurances from Ofsted noted above, in practice, participants were clear that the pressure to show attainment, progress and results impacted ultimately on their individual and school reputations and job security, that in turn affected the time allocated to music and other foundation subjects and their freedom to use music in their practice.

6.2.3 The Place and Value of Music in the Curriculum

As a statutory foundation subject all schools are required to provide music education but are free to decide how music can be delivered and organised. Thus, as discussed earlier, music, along with other foundation subjects, appeared to be dependent on head teachers' and school priorities as the deputy head (A002) explains:

A002: p. 16. The schools do very much what they can do to deliver certain things and it's like with languages as well. With some schools, all the class teachers are expected to deliver languages; other schools have a language assistant. It's just whatever works for the individual school I think.

The class teacher/peripatetic teacher (A004) felt there was less scrutiny of music practice because senior managers were also insecure about their musical knowledge and ability; highlighting again the influence of individual musical identities on professional practice discussed in the previous chapter:

A004: p. 8. [...] Because those senior managers, they are terrified of it, I think you probably have got a bit more leeway just to do what you think is right.

The recent Ofsted report on music education (Ofsted, 2012b) found that head teachers did not scrutinise the quality of music provision, particularly that provided by external providers, nor its impact or cost-effectiveness. Participants described how some head teachers were happy to leave music to the experts, which potentially gave music specialists greater freedom, but helps to explain how class teachers were able to avoid using music.

The status of music as a foundation subject also appeared to affect the way musical learning was assessed. As outlined at the start of this chapter, whilst all schools are routinely inspected, foundation subjects are inspected in a small number of schools across the country in order to report on the state of these subjects nationally, in contrast to the individual scrutiny of teacher and school performance in school inspections. This difference in priority was evident at school level. The deputy head (A002) noted how her school did not have any assessment of music or other foundation subjects:

A002: p. 13. We don't have musical assessment as such, just as we don't have foundation subject assessment as such either but I think what we would need to do really is have hubs [creative curriculum hubs] look more carefully for all of those foundation subjects including art, music and so on, is really to look at and say 'What are my objectives at the start of this? Where do I expect them to be?' [...] because I think sometimes you don't do that as much in the foundation subjects as you do in a lot of your other subjects.

The deputy head (A002) felt this lack of individual scrutiny at national and school level provided little extrinsic motivation for schools and class teachers to use music:

A002: p.29. And it isn't judged at the end of the year. You know you shouldn't be doing it [avoiding teaching music] but in the grand scheme of things, you'll probably be told off internally but your school won't be judged on the basis of it.

Music was seen as difficult to assess quantitatively. Participants reported that as music was rarely mentioned in Ofsted reports, coupled with the focus on core subjects and results, there appeared to be little incentive for schools to prioritise its use, other than personal or professional interest and philosophy. This presented challenges for external music providers trying to work with schools, highlighting difficulties already discussed in this chapter regarding traded models of service and how some schools have yet to make connections between music and core subjects. The descriptions used by the two music service managers suggest that overcoming these issues was a battle:

MS002a: pp. 14-15. Because I think that we're quite open, we tend to say music is important, but that doesn't mean it's more important than maths or English,

but I'm afraid from the other side we often get "Sorry, music isn't as important as maths or English".

MS002b: We're trying to be objective, we're trying to say we know music isn't riding high above everything else, but why isn't it an equal, and why can't you use it in that way? And I think the creative curriculum was going to do exactly that, but then it got axed. [...] So goodness knows what position we would be in now if that had stayed.

6.2.3.1 Time for Music

The traditional timetabling of music as a single slot within the curriculum also appeared to restrict opportunities for a more integrated use in the classroom. However, several participants (A002, A004, A007) reported how music was vulnerable to other time pressures as well as the attitude of the head teacher and teachers responsible for teaching music within the classroom, as the two music service managers consider:

MS002b: p. 8. It's tricky, isn't it, because it all comes down to the value of music within schools and it also comes down to specialists and non-specialists, and whether they have the interest to even bother with it. You talk to most primary school teachers and what's the first subject that goes if they've got a busy week, out of their timetable? Music. It's gone. [...] I was literally having a conversation yesterday with somebody about "Why is music placed as a subject for a 45 minute block in a week?" Regardless of special needs or mainstream, why is it put as a 45 minute block? Well of course you've got to teach the principles of music that way, but why is music not used across the curriculum? Why is it not used throughout every other subject, which will be interesting to see what the National Curriculum Review comes up with, to see where we end up.

MS002a: [...] Though, if the head teacher believes music is that important, they will try to use it in all sorts of different ways.

To overcome such difficulties, as already discussed, some participants (A002, A003, A014, A007) had chosen to adopt creative curricula in order to deliver a more balanced and integrated curriculum, but they explained that this took considerable time and monitoring to maintain. Nevertheless, these participants described how this time and effort was rewarded by a greater sense of professional freedom, control and ownership of their practice, based on a shared vision and shared responsibilities that generated considerable job satisfaction and facilitated the use of music as a resource. Both the head teacher and the deputy head spoke of how they were able to "plait" (A014, p. 2) and "build in" foundation subjects into the curriculum (A002, p. 4). This was a new experience for the deputy head (A002) that helped her move towards achieving her desire to provide a broad and balanced curriculum:

A002: p. 30. I've definitely noticed a real difference in being able to design your own themes, which we've done in school this year. So the way we've redesigned

our curriculum has definitely helped with the incorporation of things like music into that because you feel you're having a more creative approach. You feel that [...] you could teach all your literacy in a day and then have the other days to do something else.

The head teacher felt that adopting a thematic approach enabled a more efficient use of the timetable:

A014: p. 12. Well I very often block things and then we don't do them for a few weeks and then we do something else and it will be blocked so it's just a more effective way of, of using time. If you try and stick to an hours lesson or half hour lesson or whatever, you spend the first five, ten minutes of every lesson reminding them what they did last time, whereas if you work for two hours solid you don't have to do that, you've potentially saved a good half hour of time. So I just find it a more effective way of managing the timetable.

Nonetheless, even for participants working in schools that had adopted creative or thematic curricula and were passionately interested in music, the pressures on the curriculum meant this was difficult. This prompted some participants, such as the head of a SLCN unit (A007) and the class teacher/music subject leader (A009) to use their class teaching roles to squeeze music in at every opportunity:

A007: p. 8. Again, just not enough time. Not anything like as much emphasis on music as there should be, really. And it was quite a musical school, so they were getting a lot in assemblies, a lot with the music teacher, they were getting me as well, and a lot of very musical staff, as well. But even so, the curriculum is just so heavily packed, and you've got to get this in, you've got to get that in, and we were lucky in the sense that the whole school had decided on this approach of being topic-based, so with the whole school's topic, and the idea was to make things much more flexible. But even so, the amount that you've got to cover really leaves very little time to concentrate specifically on music, so I would tend to use music perhaps to teach other things, like, in number facts, it was very useful for that. I would do a bit of singing register. Just get it in any way that I could.

This participant, like others holding multiple roles, was able to bring her musical knowledge into her classroom practice. However, despite her experience and passion for using music with children with SEND, she, like the head of the deaf and hearing impaired unit (A012), found it difficult to use music as frequently as she would have liked in the SLCN unit due to the competing priorities of her role:

A007: p. 7. I think the heart is willing, but there just isn't time, very often. [...] I found it an impossible job, really, trying to run the unit and have the full teaching timetable, and I didn't do as much with music as I'd have liked to have done.

Her experience provides an important example of the pressures on classroom educators and school managers and shows how the use of music in this context is not just a question of interest or ability, but also one of opportunity and reality, highlighting the

compromises she had to make in this context, despite being a very keen and experienced musician. The deputy head (A002) explained the conflict between teachers' desire to use music and the reality of their working environment:

A002: p. 1. [...] I think this will be the case for a lot of teachers, is that you would like to use more music or like to be more creative but it's often the time factor and the drive for standards in maths and literacy really that overrides an awful lot of what we do.

This generated pressures that affected educators' ability to use music in their classroom practice even for those with a vested interest in music, such as the class teacher/peripatetic music teacher (A004):

A004: p. 2. So I do teach music in my class teaching job but I've got 11 other subjects as well and it's with the pressures of the curriculum being as they are it's not a massive part of my teaching workload. Most of my SEN related stress is related to numeracy and literacy.

As intimated at the start of this section, music specialists, in and outside school, appeared to have greater freedom to determine their own practice than their classroom educators. This was evident in the examples of musical practice outlined above and the development of the bespoke singing and literacy support projects. Similarly, the in-school and external learning support specialists also appeared to enjoy a greater professional freedom, which supported the inclusion manager's problem solving and innovative approach, that was evident in her use of music:

A017: pp. 23-25. I just tend to dip in and out of everywhere so as you're going past you'll look at a lesson and go, "Hmmm, he could be thinking a bit more inclusively, right we'll have a chat" or if I spot some planning or something going on for a week I'll have a look at it [...]. I don't have to get bogged down in what the QCA says they should be teaching or what they should be teaching, I can stand right back and say "Well you should be teaching that but you really should be thinking about how these people are pushed" and "Do you know, have you noticed you're not pushing your gifted and talented? Could they not be doing something a bit more?" So it's that sort of overview that's nice.

Notably, these participants rarely spoke of the pressures raised by those in class teaching roles. Nevertheless, the music specialist appeared to be subject to different restrictions on their time and freedom, considered below.

6.2.3.2 A Lack of Time for Planning, Collaboration and Evaluation

Music specialists described how the focus on core subjects and the often serving nature of the external and in-school music specialist roles meant they were dependent on schools and colleagues making time in the timetable to enable them to develop their practice. This was evident in the bespoke projects and the need for the in-school music

specialist (A003) to ask for time to collaborate with the SENCo, discussed in the previous chapter. Prioritising time for more formal collaboration appeared to be a clear need.

Notably, both bespoke projects built time in for planning and the singing project formalised this commitment in a written agreement with the head teachers in order to ensure the delivery of the project, and training and evaluation time. The national programme manager (A005) felt that schools were not “gifted with the opportunity to do things like this often [the singing project] and they aren’t gifted with the reflection time” (A005, p. 32); something she felt was essential if learning was to become embedded into daily teaching practice. However, the peripatetic teacher (A001) had to fit the project into her peripatetic teaching timetable. She described how this prevented her from talking to teachers in the unit and gaining valuable feedback about the project. The class teacher/peripatetic teacher (A004) similarly described how he did not have time to look at IEPs to inform his peripatetic music teaching: “I haven’t got the time to go round looking at SEN portfolios. I get a feeling for who needs what” (A004, p. 3), which he gathered from his observations of children in the classroom and impromptu conversations in the corridor, often after the lesson had taken place. This is important, as the music specialists were keen to share their skills and knowledge.

Other music specialists described how they were dependent on the individual attitudes of staff to use music, or had to squeeze music into assemblies to support staff in their use of music (A009) or their own classroom practice (A007, A009) due to the lack of time for music in the timetable. Only where schools had adopted creative or thematic curricula, partnership working or in the planning for the bespoke projects, did there appear to be any opportunity formal musical collaboration between schools, staff and music specialists.

As noted earlier in the bespoke singing project, *time costs money*. The head of the music service (MS003) felt guilty at the time cost involved in planning at a strategic level, but felt it was essential if practice was to develop:

MS003: p.13. I think that’s the worry isn’t it, because it all takes time and without sounding awful the time is also finance and for every meeting you’re attending and for every session that needs a particular amount of planning. I worry that long term we’re not going to be able to put that amount of effort into those programmes. At the moment I’ve made the decision that we will, but long term I’d need to seek additional funding for that, but everybody else is going to have to seek additional funding, [...] but it has to be done it really does. [...] You can’t make the assumption just because the children look to be enjoying it,

that we're necessarily making the impact that we need to make. So of course it is about what next and the promotion, but I think it's at a much basic level of making sure that we're pitching it right, the class teachers are involved, [...] even as far as how the parents are engaged in that, because ultimately, if you want it to be a long term decision you're going to need the parent and family involved.

On an individual level, participants in school-based roles have described the environmental constraints on their teaching and the prescriptive nature of the curriculum that limited their freedom to deliver a balanced curriculum or be creative in their approach. Yet schools arguably, have always had the freedom to determine the nature and organisation of the curriculum, evident both in legislation (Education Reform Act, 1988) and evident here in participants' different approaches that suggest this was a question of individual passion at a strategic level. This was due in part because participants such as the head teacher (A014) and the deputy head (A002) were the drivers of practice at this strategic level. However, the other examples considered here indicate how different attitudes and levels of musical leadership at a strategic level within schools influenced school musical identities and cultures that in turn supported or inhibited the use of music as an intervention or resource and thus children's access to music and its potential wider benefits.

Those in specialist roles had arguably greater freedom than their colleagues in the classroom, but as outlined above, any use of music in the learning support setting depended on individual interest. Music specialists relied on the musical identity of schools and the organisation of the curriculum to give them time to develop their practice. However, even for those participants who were highly motivated to use music (A004, A007, A012), they were sometimes unable to overcome the external pressures, forcing them to adopt a pragmatic and realistic approach that restricted their use of music. This freedom appears to have been curtailed principally by a fear of Ofsted and the need for evidence, both of which were recurring themes, and which have important implications for the use of music in this context.

6.3 Evidence

This discussion has highlighted how educational practice was driven by the need to provide tangible evidence of learning, and how attitudes towards music amongst senior managers and its place in the curriculum as a foundation subject meant music was not

subject to the same level of internal or external scrutiny as other subjects, such as literacy and numeracy.

6.3.1 Justifying Music as an Intervention

Despite the promise of increasing educational freedom as part of educational reforms, participants described how schools still needed to demonstrate impact and justify expenditure. Participants described how a lack of individual and institutional knowledge about how to assess musical learning meant that music was seen as a risk, and even a threat to reputations and job security. Even for those participants who had adopted creative or thematic curricula they were aware of the risk they were taking, as the head teacher (A014) explained above and in the previous chapter in describing the need to defend practice. The deputy head (A002) highlighted how this had even greater significance in the learning support context:

A002: p. 21. The concern would be that if you did something slightly different and you used music, if you couldn't demonstrate that that had the impact that a straightforward maths or literacy intervention had, would that have been a waste of time to some degree? I mean I'm not saying that that is the case but it's that kind of, the unknown, the untried [...] It's then being able to justify that.

She makes an important and valid point. However, a House of Commons Science and Technology Committee report (2009) investigating the evidence base for early intervention found that the Reading Recovery intervention, part of the Every Child A Reader government initiative mentioned earlier was implemented nationally without any cost-benefit analysis or comparison with other interventions. The report indicates the cost of Reading Recovery, a one-to-one intervention, to be approximately £2,600 per child per year. In contrast, the six-week literacy support project for a small group of six to eight children cost £200 per school or one unit of the school Professional Development Agreement, discussed earlier. Participants never spoke about the cost of funding these interventions; indeed the head teacher (A014) described finding the Big Writing intervention abandoned in a cupboard. This may be due to the fact that some nationally implemented interventions attracted government funding and were thus free to schools; or in the case of interventions recommended by external learning support specialists, the specialist's influence and the priority assigned to this work justified any associated cost. This appears to be an important issue that may affect the development of music as an intervention that merits further investigation in future research.

The literacy support project had been delivered to six schools in the first year, but only one in the following year, with one booking confirmed for the forthcoming academic

year; an uptake which the peripatetic teacher had found disappointing. The reasons for this remain unclear. It may have been because there was a lack of associated evidence attached to the project that schools appeared unwilling to take on the project, despite the link to the PDA and School Improvement Partners, but this is not clear. This goes back to the disadvantages of the traded model, where schools see music as an extra service to be bought rather than as an integrated part of learning support priorities and budgets. The peripatetic teacher (A001) indicated that one of the key challenges in developing the project lay in the difficulty of identifying the long-term impact of the musical intervention on children's learning, in part due to a lack of suitable evaluation measures and a reliance on schools to provide such data. The House of Commons report mentioned above, highlighted the need for random controlled testing to determine the efficacy of different interventions, despite the practical and ethical challenges of carrying out such testing in schools, highlighted in Chapters One and Two.

The singing project developed from research commissioned by the national music provider and was evaluated by participating schools and by staff post-project as an integral part of the training and pilot aims of the project. However, the national programme manager (A005) earlier highlighted the difficulty of identifying a causal link between the singing project and the children's learning, despite a wealth of qualitative data from teachers' diaries, children's performances and audience reactions and other commissioned research. The head of the arts service (MS001a) was forthright in his view that music's intrinsic value and contribution did not and should not need to be justified, echoing Schellenberg's view expressed in Chapter Two. However, this was debated by his colleagues, the head of the music service (MS001b) and the SEND music specialist (MS001c):

MS001a: pp. 9-10. [...] The issue is not that that teachers need proof, the issue is that somebody has not experienced it in such a way that they know that it makes a difference to their kids and therefore it makes a difference to them as a teacher. They've not internalised it, they just do not have that experience. Now there are some people who even if you offer that experience don't actually see it or they need more of that. [...] I think we have for a number of years gone past that point where we need to justify what we do. Personally, I refuse to enter into a conversation like that, of that nature, with anybody in education and particularly anybody in school. If they have a problem, it's not my problem, they have a problem and the fact they're blocked, they're using it as a block, you know, "there's no time" or "there's no money" for actually keeping their practice closed.

MS001b: There's another dimension to that because there are those that say, "Yes it does work, doesn't it, I'll find the money to make sure it happens", and

there are those who think “Oh yes it does work, but we haven’t got the money to make it happen”. So there is also a financial pressure.

MS001c: Also there’s the thing that it will save them money in the long run and that is the really important thing isn’t it? Because if you can reach a child that’s severely autistic and is in your mainstream lesson, [...] through music and help them progress, you’ve actually saved yourself a lot of stress because they start to engage and that’s quite exciting, and we do see that. That’s what we’re about really.

These comments go to the heart of this discussion, revealing the individual and environmental perceptions, priorities and challenges that affect the use of music in equal measure and which raise important questions about how such individual or environmental obstacles to the future use of music in this context might best be tackled. In the above extract, each of these participants’ comments reflect their own working style: the head of the arts service (MS001a) takes an experiential view, characterised by his arts development approach; the head of the music service (MS001b) focuses on how schools find the money to buy traded services; and the SEND music specialist (MS001c) considers the benefits for the child and the cost-effectiveness of a tailored approach in the long term. Each approach has its merits and are evident in the examples of practice as an intervention and resource, suggesting perhaps a place for all these approaches. Thus, these comments highlight not just differences between school and government expectations about the need to demonstrate impact and value for money, and the perceived need for tangible evidence to satisfy external pressures on schools, but also differences in attitudes and approaches between different music and arts practitioners. Music services have been fortunate to some degree to have been free of the pressures of their colleagues in education; however, they too are subject to increasing accountability and external pressures as participants’ earlier accounts attest. At the same time, schools are being given potentially greater freedom in the new primary curriculum due for implementation in 2014 (DfE, 2013).

6.3.2 Increasing Financial Accountability in Music

As already discussed, music services have offered traded services, which have been bought by schools and parents with little external scrutiny, aside from the more recent voluntary self-evaluation of music services (Hallam, 2012; Hallam & Hanke, 2012). The head of the music service (MS003) described the increasing pressure on music providers to demonstrate levels of musical access and impact, not just to gain funding for specific projects but also to ensure basic funding of the music service:

MS003: pp. 14-15. [...] we've never had to do that before. I think it's part of the Henley Review, [...] I think in terms of- this National Music Plan that's going to be announced next week, I think one of the core requirements is obviously- equal access, accountable for every child and first access- so we need to report on SEN, looked after children, free school meals- gifted and talented as well [...] it's just like a nightmare- and obviously you can't be asking those children SEN status you know that's not how we operate- but in terms of all of our other objects of Wider Opportunities, music, all of that I'm going to develop the percentage as to the number of pupils on the SEN registers.

Contextual interviews with community music providers revealed how demonstrating the impact of music through non-musical outcomes was a necessary part of their role in securing funding from grant-making bodies. Thus, this group of music specialists may also provide another source of valuable expertise in this context.

6.3.3 A Lack of Access to Data about Children with SEND

The two music service managers (MS002a, MS002b) were under similar pressure to the head of the music service (MS003), and outlined the challenge of gaining access to key data about children with SEND. Due to organisational structures within the local authority they were also dependent on schools to provide this data, the ease of which depended on the school's relationship with the service:

MS002a: pp. 22-23. [...] Because we're not within the same directorate as the schools, they can see us as somebody coming in from outside.

MS002b: So we sit within Cultural Services, we don't sit within Schools and Learning [...].

MS002b: We can't access their databases. And schools don't necessarily see us as having the automatic right to seeing an IEP or anything like that. So instantly you've got this massive barrier to overcome, and it just depends on the relationship with that school and between the teacher, our teacher, and their music co-ordinator or class teacher or whatever.

MS002a: You can ask the question, and they say, "Why do you need to know that?" and you think, "Well, it's blindingly obvious, isn't it? I'm trying to teach 30 children, you know, some of them might have struggles with notation or whatever it might be." [...]

MS002b: But again, it comes down to the value of music, doesn't it?

These comments provide important insights about the challenges music providers and visiting music specialists face at an organisational and strategic level in generating evidence. If typical, these findings have significant consequences for the future development of music in relation to children with SEND at a strategic and school level in generating the evidence required by head teachers and funding bodies.

On a practical level, the success of the bespoke projects relied on having information about the individual needs of children with SEND, which was supported by the vision and understanding of the schools involved. However, the in-school music specialist (A003) who worked in a school with an attached visually impaired unit, earlier described how she was not party to information about children with SEND in her classes, nor was it considered to be part of her role. Instead, she relied on the TA, like other visiting music specialists for information, who acted as a vital gatekeeper to children, discussed in Chapter Four. The in-school music specialist felt having access to information about individual children's needs was essential for good planning:

A003: p. 9. I think it would be a good thing really, having more information. [...] You can plan in advance a little bit better. [...] I know the classes quite well now because I've been teaching them a year and I've got to know the children, but if you've got that information straight away you don't have to spend the first four weeks of term figuring it out.

6.3.4 The Challenge of Generating Evidence

The external learning support specialist (A006) highlighted how she would be happy to use and promote the use of music as an intervention or resource, but needed to be shown *how* to do this and like the deputy head (A002) above, needed evidence that it *worked*; which echo the basis on which schools made decisions about how to spend the Pupil Premium and their choice of interventions, discussed earlier. This suggests a need for not just quantitative evidence but *experiential* evidence, as exemplified by the bespoke projects where staff were able to see and understand this use of music, developing skills alongside the music specialist. The project facilitator (A011) noted the power of personal testimony in supporting new practice, evident in the reactions of staff, parents and children who were shocked and moved by the children's achievements. However, these anecdotal reactions, whilst powerful, need to be captured in some tangible form to harness their power as evidence. Equally, the project facilitator (A011) highlighted the value of journals to capture and reflect teacher's learning that were used in the singing project as a vital means of embedding teachers' learning into their practice and acted as a reminder and reference to these experiences. However, the external learning support specialist (A006) and deputy head (A002) referred to the need for quantitative evidence, in order to meet the perceived requirements of Ofsted, particularly as children attending learning support provision were closely monitored. Despite increasing freedom, the deputy head anticipated even greater scrutiny of financial spending, particularly in respect of the Pupil Premium. Equally, participants' expressed their concern that any

such interventions required training and materials in order to be delivered, which also needed to be justified. In this and the previous chapter, the discussion has highlighted the challenges of measuring and assessing musical learning.

6.3.5 The Challenge of Assessing Musical Learning

Musical learning was seen as difficult to assess, due to its aesthetic and intangible nature, but also due to participants' reported lack of musical knowledge and understanding of musical development, which discouraged the deputy head (A002) and other educators from using music as an intervention. Swanwick (1999) highlights the challenge of assessing musical learning, particularly the hidden processes involved in making music. Nevertheless, he argues that formative assessment of musical learning is an on-going and implicit part of the music teacher's interaction with their students within music lessons, guiding them students in their technical development or mastery of a piece of music. However, the deputy head (A002) described the difficulty in making formative and summative assessments when the educator has little musical knowledge on which to base such judgements, or in deciding how best to capture such learning or progress in a tangible form. Swanwick suggests this is also difficult for musicians: "It is when we find ourselves moving away from informal assessment that things start to get tricky" (p. 71).

This is relevant in this context because some survey respondents and interview participants used music to develop 'soft' skills, such as self-esteem, engagement or explore emotions and develop social skills, which are difficult to assess both in an educational and research context, as the discussion in Chapter Two highlights. The deputy head (A002) describes the challenge of assessing 'soft' skills and the need for tangible data:

A002: p. 23. [...] So you could do the most lovely art group with different children and you could say these children really learnt to get on there and they've really learnt to work together, but if those results aren't seen somewhere tangible in end of year results, in something that's measurable then it would be very difficult to justify the cost of doing that particular intervention [...]. But that's our difficulty all the time, is we've got to be able to measure impact and we've got to say we're targeting children who have free school meals or targeting a particular type of child. It's not good enough anymore that schools just put on a nice activity, that everyone enjoys- which is quite sad but-

Her comments highlight a number of interesting perceptions. Firstly, the notion that learning only has value if it can be measured and show impact. Secondly, activities which she describes as 'fun', 'nice' and 'lovely' cannot be justified on the basis of their

intrinsic value alone, which underestimates the wider educational value and impact of children's engagement with learning, which is a key learning support priority. It is precisely because these activities are enjoyable and engaging that artistic activities such as music can provide a meaningful, alternative and positive learning environment and gateway to other learning; as exemplified in the use of music as an intervention or resource within the classroom and curriculum. Thirdly, the need to prioritise and plan creatively to find different ways of capturing learning that may not be obvious or intangible or hidden. The head teacher (A014) felt that school inspectors and advisors did not give enough recognition of the processes by which outcomes had been achieved:

A014: pp. 8-9. I think that they are more focused on seeing the progress accelerate rather than dwindling down to the individual strategies that are creating that accelerated progress. Does that make sense? [...] I mean we've got some very good practice here and I have been approached by some-advisors to share that, develop it and disseminate it but unless it happens to strike a chord with their area then I think they just don't, you know they just want the helicopter view, they just want the progress. [...] well when did you last see an Ofsted inspection being-improved by mention of the way music was used, it's not often.

These views echo the debate amongst researchers, alluded to in Chapter Two, about whether music should be justified or valued in its own right. Participants' comments suggest understanding music's intrinsic value requires experience of its benefits. This discussion indicates the need for evidence of music's wider impact if the practice described in Chapter Four is to move beyond individual practice to a more strategic use in the learning support context. It would appear that it is not just the nature of the musical activity itself, which presents particular challenges, but also the attitudes and priorities that surround its assessment that may hinder the potential contribution music might make to the goals of learning support provision.

6.3.6 New Methods of Assessment

Despite these concerns, or perhaps because of them, both the deputy head (A002) and Head teacher (A014) had started to develop alternative measures to assess creative learning as part of their school's creative curriculum. However, the deputy head (A002) felt that attempting to do this for all subjects was time-consuming and difficult. In contrast to the head teacher's view expressed above, she noted how in her school's last inspection, Ofsted had commented on children's levels of engagement and attendance, something she felt came from a constant focus on "base lining" (p. 31), by recording children's attendance or level of engagement before and after interventions and noting

how quickly children moved off the SEN register. The head teacher (A014) described how she had developed a variety of innovative assessment methods to capture all forms of learning, such as exemplar folders and portfolios of creative work, including video and audio recordings of children's own compositions and performances that were also posted on the school website. This child-led approach is important because Ofsted inspectors ask children about their learning as part of the inspection process, which prompted the class teacher/ peripatetic teacher's decision to use written and verbal learning objectives at the start of his music lessons. However, the head of the deaf and hearing impaired unit (A012) like the head of the SLCN unit (A007) considered the verbal use of learning objectives to be problematic for children who may have communication difficulties or are non-verbal. The class teacher/ music subject leader (A009) earlier described how she used journals for children including autistic children, to express their emotions in response to the music playing as they arrived in class. This might be difficult for children with writing difficulties, but might be easily overcome using an audio or video recordings, as the wet playtime CD demonstrates, which was used to showcase and include these children.

The Sounds of Intent framework provides an innovative and child-led means of assessing musical development for children with SEND, which has particular potential for application in the mainstream learning support setting. This free online assessment tool assesses aspects of musical development simultaneously through a radiating model made up of three sectors or "dimensions" (Ockelford, 2008, p. 77): reactive, proactive and interactive, indicating a child's response, intention and social or musical interaction with music. Children's progress can be individually tracked across these three dimensions via the software in the classroom during or after a musical activity. The dedicated website explains the aim of the framework is:

to enable those working with children with learning difficulties or autism both to offer more effective support in engaging with music as an activity in its own right, as well as better enabling them to use music as a scaffold to structure other learning and development.²⁸

The value in this context lies in the opportunities to record imitative musical behaviour, intentions and social interactions and communication, all of which are inherent musical

²⁸ Available at: <http://soundsofintent.org/about-soi>

activities in the types of interventions studies outlined in Chapter Two and in the practice-based examples discussed in Chapter Four. Whilst this assessment tool uses musical descriptors, it might be possible to link the framework to meet non-musical goals in speech and language and other areas of cognitive, physical and social development. In so doing, it might provide evidence of the impact of musical learning on children's wider learning over time, thus addressing the need for tangible, quantitative but musical evidence of musical and non-musical learning outlined above.

The issue of evaluation is important not just in meeting the needs of educators, inspectors or funders in justifying the use of music as an intervention, but as a fundamental element of good music educational practice (Swanwick, 1999; Ofsted, 2012b), which head teachers are being urged to prioritise (Ofsted, 2012a; Ofsted, 2012b). This view was shared by the national programme manager (A005) and the head of the music service (MS003). This is important given the decision in June 2013 by the Secretary of State for Education to dis-apply the content of the National Curriculum in preparation for the new curriculum in 2014 and remove the present system of assessment levels with immediate effect, leaving schools to choose their own formative assessment methods, although statutory assessment and end of key stage assessments remain. Thus, given this greater potential freedom there is perhaps a greater need to engage head teachers and educators, as the National Plan for Music Education (DfE & DCMS, 2011) states:

Great music education is a partnership between classroom teachers, specialist teachers, professional performers and a host of other organisations, including those from the arts, charity and voluntary sectors. [...] Schools cannot do everything alone: they need the support of a wider local music structure. (p. 3)

Whilst this statement from the National Plan for Music Education is accurate, the discussion here has highlighted not just the considerable variety in music but also the growing partnership between education professionals and music specialists and providers. It also has demonstrated how these relationships are often determined by the attitude of the school and head teacher towards music and overarching institutional attitudes and priorities within education. Accounts from this small group of participants suggest the potential for music to contribute to key educational goals within learning support provision or more widely has yet to be fully realised. It remains to be seen whether schools and music providers, given their greater freedom to work in partnership, continue to rely on historical working styles and priorities towards music,

or embrace new shared ways of working, described in this chapter and in the examples of practice presented in Chapter Four.

6.4 Access

This thesis has been prompted in part by multi-disciplinary research evidence that is highlighting and explaining the wider potential of music and which has led to calls for equal access to music and increasing reference to its use as an intervention. This study has also been informed by my own research and an increasing recognition of the need to understand the experience and practice of music in the real world context of the classroom.

Access to musical learning opportunities has been a dominant, multi-faceted theme running throughout this thesis, which provides a fitting conclusion to this chapter. The findings of this thesis highlight how simply calling for equal access to musical learning or recommending its use in the learning support setting is not as simple as it sounds and which appears to depend on a range of interconnecting individual and institutional factors. Participants' desire to ensure equal access to high quality learning opportunities for all children, but especially those with SEND, was a key motivator in participants' use of music as an intervention and resource. Critically, this vision was echoed at an institutional level in schools, and by regional and national music providers giving vital endorsement to individual practice. This discussion has shown how access to support, time, freedom and research and experiential evidence supported participants' use of music as an intervention and resource. At a pedagogical level, access to multi-sensory musical resources and pedagogical approaches, coupled with research evidence and information about the needs of children facilitated the development of bespoke interventions and targeted musical practice. Access to a shared vision, ways of working, resources, understanding and learning opened doors to collaborative practice and new partnerships and ways of working that were evident in the bespoke interventions and use of music as an integrated part of the curriculum. Significantly, participants described how a lack of access to these different enabling factors inhibited their use of music in this context.

A focus on core subjects, results and school performance reinforced by the influence of Ofsted, National Strategies and national schemes of work were seen as the key drivers of educational practice, that shaped the timetable and working styles within schools and

ultimately, the place and value of music within the curriculum and learning support provision. From participants' accounts, a lack of time, the prescribed nature of the curriculum, external pressures and fixed ways of working appeared to provide little incentive to use music and limited schools' and educators' opportunity to provide access to musical learning opportunities generally and specifically in this context. Participants described how historical institutional attitudes within education and music provision defined the role and working style of the music specialist. This in turn limited access to opportunities for collaboration between schools and music providers to develop new practice and access to information about children that would enable music providers and specialists to tailor their existing practice towards individual needs.

Equally, a lack of access to research evidence about the wider impact of music, accounted in part for the limited use of music as an intervention and resource and lack of knowledge about how music might be used as an intervention and resource. On a practical level, the focus on core subjects appeared to limit access to musical training opportunities during teacher training at a critical point of professional transition, which appeared to reinforce participants' childhood musical identities and informed their professional musical practice and identity. Music was seen as difficult to plan, deliver, manage and assess, and therefore a risk to personal and professional reputations, limiting access to musical learning opportunities for the child in the context of learning support provision.

The impact of National Strategies on education and learning support provision and associated ways of working appeared to be considerable, leading to a reliance on ready-made interventions and initiatives. A lack of ready-made music interventions meant learning support specialists did not have access to resources that might have encouraged the use of music in this context. Critically, the use of music in learning support provision did not appear to be a priority and there was a lack of knowledge, awareness and endorsement of such use amongst this sample of learning support specialists, educators and even music specialists. Thus, whilst participants said they were willing to use music as an intervention and resource, the prescriptive nature of mainstream education and learning support practice appeared to constrain their ability and opportunity to use music in their practice. However, the external learning support specialist (A006) described how it would be easy to introduce music into learning support practice, highlighting both the importance of individual and strategic

endorsement and the need for partnership working and collaboration that provided strategic support to the bespoke singing and literacy support projects.

Participants described how the use of music in this context required evidence of impact, yet learning support interventions were not subject to scrutiny at a national level, suggesting inconsistencies in practice and attitudes towards music in this context. Equally, the perception that such use of music was more typical of special education meant that music was not normally considered as a part of mainstream learning support practice. This in part was influenced by a historical focus by music providers on children with SEND in special schools rather than those attending mainstream schools. Compounding these difficulties, organisational structures in local authorities and institutional attitudes towards music within schools restricted music providers and music specialists' access to data about children. This in turn affected the music specialist's ability to tailor existing use of music to individual needs and ensure teaching was accessible and relevant.

The introduction of the new primary National Curriculum (DfE, 2013) and the freedom to determine assessment methods at school level may enable the removal of some of the institutional barriers to equal access identified here but this appears to depend on head teacher attitudes and school policies. Nevertheless, national and regional music providers face new organisational, funding and reporting challenges, expressed in the need to demonstrate the provision of equal access to music. Whilst challenges do exist in the use of music in this context, participants' accounts also highlight particular opportunities. Working in partnership or collaboration was seen as an effective way of overcoming gaps in knowledge and expertise, and in enabling schools, learning support specialists and music educators and providers to meet shared objectives of providing equal access to learning for all children, but especially children with SEND, who are a key priority group within mainstream education and music provision. This thesis provides examples of how this might be achieved at an individual, school, regional and national level, but also identifies the key challenges that may affect such practice and suggests ways in which they might be overcome.

This discussion, however, relies on the accounts of a small sample of individuals who, whilst representative of the roles and settings to be found in mainstream learning support provision, and music and general education, may not be representative of other individuals' views or practice. As discussed in Chapter Three, my analysis inevitably reflects my own understanding and experience in this area of musical practice.

Nevertheless, participants' accounts provide valuable insights into their use of music in this context, which it is hoped will be of value to researchers, policy makers and practitioners with an interest in developing practice in this area.

Chapter Seven

Discussion and Conclusions

7.0 Introduction

This thesis set out to explore the use of music to support children with SEND as a learning support intervention and resource in mainstream primary education in England. Given the limited research in this specific context, the thesis took a broad focus in order to identify examples of practice across a variety of music, educational and learning support settings and roles within primary education. In contrast to other studies, which have focussed on examining the wider outcomes of musical learning or the identification of a causal relationship and the isolation of mediating factors, this thesis adopted a largely qualitative, yet mixed methods approach to explore the educator's perspective of using music in this context with two key aims. Firstly, to identify and explore examples of musical practice in support of children with SEND in the contexts outlined above, examining the opportunities and challenges music presents in these contexts for educators and children. Secondly, to explore educators' experiences, attitudes and perceptions of such musical practice, in order to gain an understanding of individual and institutional attitudes and thus the factors, which might inhibit or promote such musical practice. The following discussion considers the key findings of the thesis. It examines the limitations and implications of the research and makes suggestions for future research.

7.1 Key findings

This thesis has explored educators' practice and experience of using music in support of children with SEND in mainstream primary schools and the individual and institutional attitudes which surround such practice through three interrelated broad research questions. The first of these questions centred on identifying whether music is used as an intervention and resource to support children with SEND in mainstream primary schools in England; exploring how music is or might be used, by whom, in what setting and for what purpose. The second and third questions respectively sought to identify the opportunities and challenges such practice might present to educators and children; and the wider factors, which might promote or inhibit such practice. The discussion returns to these research questions to provide the framework for this concluding chapter.

7.1.1 Practice

The thesis has identified that music is used as an intervention and resource to support children with SEND of all ages in mainstream primary schools in England. The study identified a small number of valuable examples where music was used as an intervention or resource to target a wide variety of individual cognitive, social, physical and emotional learning needs through an intuitive, informal, multi-sensory and creative active and passive musical approach. The use of music was not confined to music specialists as might have been expected, but used by individuals working in a variety of specialist, leadership, teaching and support roles and settings in mainstream primary learning support, education and music provision. This thesis has also highlighted the opportunities and challenges such practice presents for educators and children. More broadly, the thesis identified a range of interrelated individual and environmental factors, which supported or inhibited participants' use of music in this context and thus children's access to such musical learning opportunities.

A number of difficulties were encountered in finding examples of practice. The IPA analysis of interview data revealed a number of reasons, which centred on the nature of music itself; individual participants' levels of awareness and knowledge of using music as a learning support intervention and resource; and individual and institutional ways of working and perceptions about the use of music in this context. Relevant practice was often hidden within participants' existing practice, where explicit and implicit wider objectives were disguised by the enjoyable nature of the musical activity, but also by the way participants perceived and described their practice. Thus, such practice was seen as a normal part or an extension of participants' existing musical practice, despite the bespoke nature of some examples and its use outside the music lesson in learning support settings, the general classrooms and attached specialist mainstream units. This invisibility was further reinforced by the informal use of music, where the focus was centred as much on the process or the functional value of music as the outcome. A lack of paper-based planning and verbal or written learning objectives highlighted differences in individual and institutional ways of working between music specialists, educators and learning support specialists that appeared to affect existing and future practice in this context.

Nevertheless, as discussed in Chapter Four, a profile of explicit and implicit practice emerged from the IPA analysis of interview data. Similarly, a profile of a certain type of practitioner was identified, where participants were united in their passion, working

style, professional knowledge, relative freedom and their opportunity to use such skills. Their practice was enabled and endorsed by the support these participants received from their employers, schools, external organisations, colleagues, parents and children. However, it is important to point out again that these are tentative distinctions, which hide a fluidity in practice and perceptions about the use of music in this context, and the complex interaction between a range of individual and environmental factors, which appeared to be influenced by the individual and wider context in which participants worked, discussed further below. The study confirms the findings of existing research studies in music education about musical training, educators' levels of musical confidence and music specialists' lack of experience and knowledge about the use of music with children with SEND. However, given the lack of evidence in this specific research context area and the small sample of this study, it is difficult to verify whether these tentative definitions and findings of this research are typical of practice and experiences in other schools or represent isolated examples. Further small and large-scale research would be helpful to develop a body of practice-based evidence to aid comparison and understanding of practice and experience in this specific research context. Nevertheless, these individual accounts, through the systematic process of reflection and interpretation that IPA analysis offers, does allow the identification of a number of common characteristics and differences, which it is hoped will be of value to researchers, practitioners and policymakers interested in developing or researching musical practice in this area. With this in mind, the key findings in relation to practice are now considered in more detail.

7.1.1.1 Purpose

Participants' accounts suggest that music can offer a versatile, inclusive and individually relevant medium through which to target and support a wide range of individual needs in explicit and implicit ways. Three broad categories emerged from the analysis. Firstly, examples were identified where music was used explicitly as a bespoke or packaged intervention or targeted resource to support a wide range of individual or collective cognitive, social and emotional learning needs in in-school learning support settings or as a targeted resource in attached specialist mainstream units and the general classroom. Secondly, participants described using music as an integrated resource in the general classroom, specialist unit and class music lesson for non-musical purposes that were relevant to the needs of the teacher, class or school, although participants revealed such practice was often informed by individual and

collective needs. For example, participants reported using music to provide a positive, creative and enjoyable learning environment in support of the curriculum, to regulate mood and support class routine, signalling transitions between activities and overcoming language and comprehension barriers through the singing of instructions. Participants reported how this helped to keep children engaged and ready to learn with reported similar benefits for the rest of the class. Thirdly, the thesis also identified implicit practice in class music lessons or the musical life of the school as part of statutory music provision, where wider musical outcomes of relevance to individual needs arose as a consequence of musical learning and the child's musical abilities or interests.

Collectively, these examples indicate a spectrum of musical activity of differing degrees of focus that suggest ways in which existing and bespoke musical practice within schools might support the graduated system of learning support provision outlined in Chapter One; whilst also meeting whole school priorities for inclusion and equal opportunity in the classroom and school life. Such practice suggests music might be linked directly to IEPs to support and target learning at different levels of focus and for different purposes. However, although music was tailored in some instances to individual needs, no examples were identified in the interview data where outcomes of musical learning opportunities had been formally assessed or recorded as part of Individual Education Plans. This was due in part to the hidden nature of much of this practice but also the challenge of generating evidence of musical learning in this context and music generally. Both these issues are considered further below.

7.1.1.2 Delivery and Resources

Such practice was largely but not exclusively, focussed on rhythm, song and movement, using percussion instruments but also specialist multi-sensory musical resources and technology to ensure equal access to musical learning opportunities. Interestingly, the use of song, rhythm and movement corresponds with the theoretical and empirical research evidence reviewed in Chapter Two, although only the literacy support project appeared to be informed directly by such research evidence.

Participants reported drawing on a mental store of musical resources, knowledge and understanding, which they used intuitively in close observation of the child, allowing them to adapt their practice in real time in a variety of settings. This flexible, multi-sensory, child-centred and informal approach appeared to be a particular characteristic of participants' practice, which reflected individual ways of working in musical,

educational or learning support settings. These participants highlighted the need for a creative, flexible yet structured approach; a planned but instinctive and responsive delivery; a readiness to adopt a child-led focus; and an ability to adapt or use resources relevant to children's individual or collective needs. The provision of dedicated small group sessions and intervention-based activity enabled children to gain access to high quality tailored music-making opportunities, that appeared to boost their learning in other areas.

Although the majority of practice was individually led, some examples were found where individuals shared their skills in a spirit of collaboration, focussed on the shared vision of the child and equal access. Both the school music specialists (A003, A009) supported staff in their musical practice especially in creative or thematic curricula but also in specialist attached units. They were keen to share their skills and work in collaboration but were constrained by the part time nature of their role or their responsibility for the whole school's music provision. Notably, the bespoke projects built in time for planning and collaboration, although they were dependent on the goodwill of schools to provide it.

7.1.1.3 A Certain Type of Practitioner

The thematic analysis revealed that those using music as an intervention or resource displayed common characteristics, priorities and working styles, evident in the discussion in Chapter Five. This group appeared distinct from other participants in that they expressed an intrinsic motivation to innovate and take risks, fuelled by their reported passion for music and/or their desire to meet the needs of children with SEND that was reinforced by their personal satisfaction at seeing children succeed.

Thus, participants appeared to be highly motivated, pioneering, creative individuals, with a strong musical and/or creative professional and personal identity. Individuals in a variety of educational, learning support and musical roles, described how they were motivated not only by a passion for their work but principally by a desire to provide equal opportunities to high quality learning opportunities for children, their long-held beliefs and a personal interest in developing their practice and knowledge in this area.

However, these participants were modest in their self-appraisal and tended to take their particular skills and experience for granted. Participants emphasised the need for an open mind, a willingness to participate musically and consider new ideas and approaches. These factors appeared to override any need for specific musical skills or

knowledge. This was in contrast to other participants who were more self-critical of their musical abilities due to negative musical identities and a lack of professional musical development at critical moments of transition, which appeared to negatively affect their use of music generally and in this context, discussed further below.

7.1.1.4 Motivations for Practice

Participants using music as an intervention and resource appeared to be led by a range of individual and in some cases, strategic motivations. Practice appeared to be informed in a number of ways: by the expectations of individuals' roles; participants' musical training; individual experience of working with children with SEND; and/or academic or commissioned research evidence in this context. However, the majority of practice appeared to be shaped predominantly by participants' experience of working with children with SEND and their understanding and use of informal multi-sensory musical and pedagogical approaches.

Although some saw music as an essential part or extension of their educational or musical approach, others perceived music in a more functional way, using musical resources to ensure equal access; or spontaneously, to meet specific needs as required. This was evident in the resource-led development of the hand bell intervention and the spontaneous production of a CD of children's voices recorded during wet playtime, both of which led to wider learning outcomes and opportunities to showcase children's musical abilities and participate in whole school events.

7.1.2 Opportunities and Challenges

7.1.2.1 Opportunities for Children

The external learning support specialist (A006) highlighted the need to identify and address underlying causes of difficulty. She and the head teacher (A014) identified how a personalised approach was considered best practice in learning support provision. Participants described how the different approaches outlined above offered a variety of opportunities to address and support individual needs and key learning skills at different levels of intensity as described above and in Chapter Four. The small group setting of the bespoke interventions appeared to provide dedicated time and access to tailored music-making opportunities through which to simultaneously target a range of skills in a social context, where the underlying objective was disguised in an enjoyable activity. Participants described how they felt music provided a safe place for children to explore

and express emotions, providing educators with a window into children's emotional understanding.

Importantly, participants felt that music was something that children enjoyed and had a talent for. Thus music was seen as an important way of developing non-musical skills by engaging children and boosting their self-esteem and confidence. Similarly, the use of music technology provided opportunities for children's work and musical abilities to receive public recognition and allowed them to participate equally alongside their peers in class, in concerts and elsewhere, fulfilling wider school aims of inclusion, cohesion, engagement, equal opportunity and access to learning. Thompson, Hall, Jones and Sefton Green (2012) explain how creative pedagogical approaches provide spaces in which to develop "the capacities of young people to 'become somebody'" (p. 16). This was evident in the singing project where children's musical performances challenged preconceived notions held by parents, staff and children.

7.1.2.2 Challenges for Children

Participants noted the importance of ensuring that musical learning is accessible and sensitive to the needs of the child. This was considered to be a particular skill that not all music specialists possessed. Participants described how children may respond differently to music or loud sounds or they may want to learn in a particular way. Some children may require specialist musical resources to participate equally with their peers, thus having different ways for children to engage musically was essential if non-verbal children were not to be excluded from a singing activity, for example. Whilst these are not necessarily challenges for the child, they can become challenges if the music provision is not sufficiently accessible. Similarly, attending extracurricular music activities after school was problematic for some children, often due to transport difficulties, which prevented them being able to access these opportunities. This prompted the inclusion manager (A017) to run nurture groups at lunchtimes. Such challenges lie principally with the educator and demonstrate the need for knowledge and sensitivity of the child's needs.

7.1.2.3 Opportunities and Challenges for Educators

For educators, using music in this context allowed them to use their roles and musical, professional and research knowledge, training and experience to tailor their musical practice to meet the specific needs of children with SEND. In so doing, they were able to realise personal and professional goals, which gave them considerable job

satisfaction. Similarly seeing children achieve and make progress was equally satisfying and motivating, fuelling their practice and enabling them to overcome external pressures and challenges, discussed further below. This was a central theme to emerge from the analysis, expressed thematically as *desire becoming reality*.

Nevertheless, some participants described how TAs, whilst seen as a vital link between music specialist and child, were sometimes difficult to manage in their lack of participation or keenness to help the child, which restricted their opportunity for musical independence. Similarly, a lack of teacher participation was identified as a key challenge, particularly in overcoming negative attitudes towards music and the development of practice in schools or in the classroom.

Although practice appeared led by individual passion, this research highlights the important influence of the environment on individual musical practice, skills, confidence and opportunities to use it. Personal and strategic support, funding, trust, long relationships, mutual respect and goodwill from employers, schools, colleagues and parents emerged as important themes and factors that enabled the use of music as an intervention or learning support resource. Participants described how this shared musical, educational, strategic or personal vision motivated and sustained their practice and led to shared priorities, ways of working and understanding. This in turn allowed individuals the time and opportunity to innovate and pioneer new practice and share the perceived risk associated with their innovative practice.

This research comes at a time of considerable change and potential opportunity in education, learning support and music provision. Partnership working is being promoted as a model for the development of practice across a range of agencies in education, health and music provision. The opportunity to collaborate with others sharing similar goals appeared to be satisfying in developing new practice, sharing skills knowledge and vision between educators and music specialists, particularly for the latter, who often worked alone. This was evident in the bespoke projects and the development of the CD resource, but also in music specialists' support of their colleagues in the classroom and curriculum.

This study identifies an interest and willingness at all levels to develop use of music as a specific resource and intervention to support children with SEND in mainstream education. Some participants felt this to be an exciting, undiscovered and untapped area for future development, although this may be indicative of their personal interest and

passion. Nevertheless, a number of themes or factors emerged, which appeared to both inhibit and promote the use of practice in this context. They presented both opportunity and challenge for all participants in different ways, and so are considered together.

7.1.3 Key Affecting Factors

Participants highlighted a number of interrelated individual and environmental factors, which positively or negatively affected their use of music generally, but which also had implications for its wider and targeted use as an intervention or resource. These different factors emerged from the analysis as contrasting themes (for example, training/lack of training). However, the combination in which they affected individual practice appeared to be specific to the individual and the context in which they worked. Thus, whilst these themes are helpful in understanding educators' different experiences they also reflect a degree of complexity that reflects the real world setting of school life, making it difficult to draw definitive conclusions. However, this is also a key advantage of the IPA approach, in being able to draw out themes through a systematic process of interpretation and reflection, which mirror common experiences, meanings and perceptions but which still retain a sense of the individual lived experience of the phenomenon under study.

7.1.3.1 The Invisibility of Music - Challenge and Strength

As discussed in the Introduction to this chapter, identifying examples of practice of music as an intervention and resource has been difficult for a number of reasons that only became clear when participants were probed about their practice and perceptions of the use of music in this context in interviews.

7.1.3.1.1 A Lack of Awareness and Knowledge

Interview data highlighted the perceived novelty of the concept of music as a learning support intervention and resource proposed by this study, particularly as the class music lesson was seen as the main source of music provision in schools. Providing separate musical activities appeared to run counter to efforts to include children in school music provision. A key challenge appeared to be a lack of individual and institutional knowledge and awareness about how music might be used in this way that was reinforced by limited awareness and access to research evidence amongst educators and music and learning support specialists alike.

Likewise, a lack of endorsement by external learning support specialists, upon whom schools appeared to rely in the design and delivery of learning support provision also appeared to account for a lack of practice, as participants reported that it had not been suggested, typified by comments such as “I didn’t know you could”; “It has never occurred to me”; or “No one has ever suggested it”. A lack of commercial musical interventions and institutional endorsement from external learning support specialists compounded this issue. Furthermore, the targeted use of music was seen as more typical of special education than mainstream education.

Nevertheless, interviews did reveal examples of relevant practice, but these were often hidden in existing musical, learning support or classroom practice, by the way in which individuals described their practice, as well as their instinctive approach to their music-making, in contrast to the paper-based and visible planning of classroom educators. Significantly, such practice, although tailored to individual needs, was not defined or perceived as an intervention or a learning support resource. Even individuals who were using music overtly for non-musical purposes in learning support settings (A001, A003, A005, A009, A011, A013, A014, A017, A019) as a bespoke intervention or targeted resource did not define their use of music in this way. Instead they perceived such practice to be a normal part of their normal inclusive musical, educational or learning support practice (“I use music for...”). Participants engaged in the bespoke projects saw their work as an extension of their existing musical practice, which they described as “projects” rather than interventions.

The thematic analysis also revealed differences in the ways musicians and educators worked and different notions of best practice in music and education, which appeared to be endorsed by different arms of Ofsted, who participants identified as a key driver of educational practice. This was evident in a lack of verbal or written learning objectives and paper-based planning and evaluation by musicians, who by their own accounts adopted an outwardly, intuitive approach to their practice. Nevertheless, as the examples of targeted practice attest, such practice was planned very carefully to meet individual needs, but this was not always obvious to the observer. Notably, Ofsted’s review of music education (2012b) emphasises the importance of music as the target language in the music lesson, which corresponds with participants’ use of music to support class routine through song. However, this potentially hides the underlying learning objective and planning further, reinforcing the need for experiential understanding of musical learning amongst educators and observers, in order to see the

hidden educational and musical aims. Music was perceived as a fun activity by educators that was difficult to assess tangibly. Music was thus considered to be a risk for this reason but also for reasons relating to professional competency and reputation. In this particular context, recording the learning objective in some form may help educators and observers to understand the musical intention, even if this is conveyed implicitly in practice.

Nevertheless, although the hidden nature of such practice was a key research challenge, participants also identified it as a key strength. Participants felt music's most valuable contribution lay in its capacity to target individual needs simultaneously without any child being aware of such differentiation, and to disguise the learning objective in an engaging activity. These findings echo Rabinowitch, Cross and Burnard's conclusions from their study (2013) of the wider potential of long term musical group interaction to develop empathy in children through the disguise of a fun musical activity. This is an important issue, which has implications for the way music in this context is perceived and valued, as participants described how they would need evidence of its impact to justify its use, discussed at the end of this chapter.

7.1.3.2 Knowledge, Confidence and Training

7.1.3.2.1 The Influence of Childhood Musical Experiences

The thematic analysis highlighted the influence of childhood musical experiences on personal and professional musical identities. Participants described how limited musical training in initial teacher training programmes reinforced negative childhood musical identities and levels of professional musical confidence at critical periods of transition into professional practice. For some, this led to fixed notions of musical practice and professional musical identity that affected their attitude towards and use of music in their professional practice. Concerns about managing behaviour in the free context of the music lesson, coupled with personal insecurities about individual musical abilities and the time required to plan and find suitable resources, discouraged class teachers from using music in their practice. Participants reported how their fear of music overrode participants' understanding of the benefits of music and children's enjoyment, leading to expressions of guilt and regret by some participants. In contrast, as outlined above, participants using music as an intervention and resource appeared to have strong musical identities, which appeared to inform, motivate and sustain their musical practice in this context.

7.1.3.2.2 A Lack of SEND Music Knowledge

The analysis also revealed a significant lack of knowledge, experience and training amongst music specialists in respect of the individual musical needs of children with SEND that also appeared to restrict access to musical learning opportunities. The thesis highlighted the limited number of SEND music specialists in music services. The national programme manager (A005) identified the need to develop a network of SEND music specialists as a priority in order to cascade practice amongst music specialists and educators. Music specialists, educators, SENCos and learning support specialists called for the opportunity to collaborate and train and develop joint practice. The SEND music specialist (MS001c) identified the growing demand and interest in such practice and like the national programme manager, the need to develop a team of experienced individuals in order to meet demand for greater collaboration and support.

The analysis also highlighted the value of experiential learning, as exemplified by the bespoke singing project and the TA workshops associated with the literacy support project, which sought to enable practice into the classroom the next day. The TA workshops associated with the bespoke literacy support project provide an example of how training might be delivered outside the classroom in the short term to a range of individuals working with children with SEND. TAs appeared to be important gatekeepers to children, given their daily contact with children, their knowledge of the child and their role in the delivery of key interventions. The thesis also revealed the vital role the in-school and external music specialists can play in supporting educators in their classroom practice, in specialist units or in learning support settings, as exemplified by the bespoke projects and individual participants' practice in support of the curriculum. In this way, the music specialist was also identified as an important gatekeeper to musical knowledge training and resources.

7.1.3.2.3 Specialist or Non-Specialist?

These issues raise the question of whether music should be delivered in this context by a specialist or non-specialist, discussed at the end of Chapter Five. Although music appeared to be delivered in simple, informal and intuitive ways and was not confined to music specialists, the peripatetic teacher (A001) and vocal leader (A019) highlighted how this required knowledge, experience, confidence and a certain personality to deliver. SEND music specialists (A010, MS001c) noted the need for a sensitive, patient personality in order to respond effectively to the individual needs of the child with SEND. The peripatetic teacher's own perceptions of her level of skills and degree of

specialism were challenged by her sister's experience of delivering the literacy support programme. This thesis has provided an insight into the personal challenges musically inexperienced educators face, which are compounded by external pressures and expectations, such that music is seen as a risk to their professional competency as an educator. Like the peripatetic teacher above, these findings have also challenged my own perceptions of the underlying musical knowledge and skills required to deliver what appears outwardly to be simple music-making.

Nevertheless, other participants perceived music in a functional way, where musical resources facilitated and led musical practice, as in the case of the inclusion manager (A017), that contrasted with the deputy head's (A002) perceptions of the need to stage large scale musical performances, which were based on her observations of in-school music specialists. However, the inclusion manager's view and experience of using music may also reflect the greater freedom she experienced in her role, away from some of the external pressures that classroom educators faced and the perceived expectations of the music room. Thus, whilst musical confidence, knowledge and training appeared to be a key issue, particularly surrounding the wider use of music in the classroom where such use is dependent on the class teacher, the use of music in this context also appears to depend on how music is perceived, discussed further below.

7.1.1.3 Support

Another major theme to emerge from the analysis was the level of support participants encountered in schools, from colleagues and from their employers. As discussed above, participants' practice was enabled by the considerable practical and personal support they received; expressed in terms of time, resources and the freedom to plan and collaborate, innovate and share practice. A shared vision, funding, understanding and ways of working through partnership or school-based collaborative practice appeared to lead to a sense of collective ownership and personal and strategic endorsement of practice. The lack of all or any of these different factors appeared to affect participants' opportunity to use music, even for the most musically motivated and knowledgeable participants. Thus, these findings highlight the role environmental and institutional factors played in participants' ability to use music in this context and more generally.

7.1.1.3.1 A Lack of Time, Freedom and School Attitudes to Music

In contrast, other participants complained of a lack of time to plan or collaborate. Time was seen as important for collaboration in building joint knowledge and the

development of new practice and for teacher reflection and evaluation of musical learning. The demands of a full curriculum and a focus on core subjects reduced the time available for a more frequent use of music, which conversely in some instances actually prompted its wider use in the classroom to overcome such difficulties. However, as noted above some participants working in specialist SEND music or in-school learning support roles appeared to have greater freedom to collaborate and innovate than their colleagues in class-based roles. Nevertheless, participants in peripatetic music roles described how they lacked the time to discuss children's needs with educators or gain valuable feedback in the case of the literacy support project, while others cited the lack of time to develop rapport with children in music lessons. The vocal leader (A019) noted the luxury of having a support team and time to plan, in contrast to her normal experience as a freelance vocal leader. Participants highlighted the need for musical leadership. They indicated how the head teacher's personal attitude to music appeared to be a key factor in supporting or inhibiting musical practice in schools, particularly given schools' freedom to determine music provision.

7.1.1.3.2 Funding

Funding was also a key factor, implicit in resourcing, time and planning and reflected in the need for evidence to justify cost-effectiveness, discussed below. Notably, all the examples of practice were funded as pilot projects, through grant funding or via the individual's existing role. Schools were very keen to participate when services were offered freely. When the literacy support project became a traded service, demand fell, despite the support of an innovative means of shared funding with School Improvement Partners through schools' professional development agreements.

7.1.1.4 External Pressures

Participants described how their musical practice was affected by the external pressures on schools, the focus on core subjects, the pressure to demonstrate tangible results and accountability in terms of funding and impact, which even the most musically enthusiastic of participants felt unable to overcome. This was evident in participants' fear of Ofsted, which appeared to drive educational practice. Participants described how overarching priorities in their schools or in education generally, meant they had to make difficult and pragmatic choices in managing conflicting priorities, which sometimes meant compromising their notions of best practice in favour of protecting

their job security. These different pressures and priorities positively and negatively affected attitudes to music in participants' schools and music's place in the curriculum. Thus, two key contrasting themes emerged: *desire becoming reality* and *desire versus reality*. These reflected participants' intention and opportunity to use music in this context. This appeared to be affected by a variety of interconnected individual and environmental factors, which were personal to the individual and the context in which they worked and which reflected past and current experiences and personal and professional priorities. Nevertheless, participants expressed their willingness to use music in this context, but they explained this required training, resources, time and evidence.

7.1.1.5 A Need for Evidence

The external learning support specialist (A006) and the deputy head (A002) highlighted the need for tangible evidence of music's impact on learning to justify its use in learning support provision, particularly as children receiving learning support are highly monitored and constitute a key priority in determining school performance. As discussed above, the intuitive approach adopted by participants meant the wider potential of musical practice was often hidden. Whilst this disguise was valuable for the child, it presents difficulties in providing tangible evidence of wider learning. Moreover, participants highlighted how musical assessment in schools was not a priority and by its very nature was perceived to be difficult to assess, even for music specialists.

An observational approach was a key element of participants' intuitive and responsive approach in tailoring their practice to the needs of the child. It is also an important means of gaining evidence particularly from children who cannot vocalise or write down their feelings. Ockelford (2008) notes how music educators in special schools noted children's musical development through the child's sensory responses or behaviour. Whilst the effects on social behaviour are potentially easier to observe, cognitive and emotional effects are less visible, unless manifested in behaviour or captured in some way. These difficulties may explain why musical learning was not linked to IEPs. Chapter Six identified examples of alternative assessment measures used by the head teacher (A014) and deputy head (A002), which might be applied to this context. Further research is required in this area to generate a list of suitable evidence tools but also to gain a better understanding of the different types of evidence required. This is an important issue given schools' collective need to show evidence

and justify expenditure. However, as discussed earlier in Chapter One, existing learning support interventions are not subject to such scrutiny and as the head teacher (A014) found, are sometimes abandoned in a cupboard. This raises the question about what sort of evidence is required and whether music should or needs to be justified, as discussed in Chapter Six. However, without such evidence music's potential wider contribution risks going unnoticed and undeveloped, particularly by those who may be best placed to advocate its wider use in school or endorse its use through school inspections or through the endorsement of external learning support specialists in learning support settings.

Conversely, music hubs are now also under pressure to provide evidence that they are providing equal opportunity and access to musical learning opportunities. However, the discussion in Chapter Six highlighted the challenges of gaining access to information about children with SEND. Thus, the need to provide evidence appears to be a key priority for both educators and music providers, and where researchers conducting intervention studies may be well placed to make a contribution.

As Chapter Six highlights, these overarching priorities and attitudes are difficult contradictions for educators to resolve alone particularly in a competitive educational market at a time of fiscal restraint. This study highlights a need for musical knowledge and understanding, and active endorsement at strategic levels of the particular value of different educational and creative approaches or "signature pedagogies" (Thompson, Hall, Jones & Sefton Green, 2012) if such tensions are to be overcome. However, as music services and providers experience greater accountability and scrutiny as a consequence of the new funding arrangements for music, so schools are being given greater freedoms through the new primary National Curriculum in which schools will be free to assess learning by whatever method they believe appropriate; decisions which Ofsted must respect. However, despite such changes, the need for accountability will no doubt continue, particularly, within music education, such that how musical learning and its wider outcomes are measured will continue to be a key issue.

7.1.1.6 A Different Model of Practice

The use of music as an intervention described here suggests a different model of musical provision and educational and learning support practice, however such practice may already occur elsewhere but remains hidden in existing musical practice.

Nevertheless, these examples appeared to represent new ways of working for some participants, evident in the changes described by the head of the music service (MS003)

in respect of increasing access to the music service. For example, music services have historically participated in a serving, traded relationship with schools, focussing purely on the provision of music education. In the examples presented in this thesis, music specialists were in some cases an integral part of collaborative practice and able to work as part of a team, where they were valued for their particular expertise and knowledge. Similarly, bespoke projects provided opportunities for experiential musical learning and reflection for educators to build their musical confidence and skills. This in turn appeared to challenge attitudes to musical learning held by class teachers, head teachers, and parents as they saw participants using music in ways that were relevant to their children or their school. Most significantly, such practice appeared to challenge stereotypes and attitudes about children with SEND, particularly in respect of their musical ability, even amongst music specialists.

More specifically, this practice challenges notions that SEND music provision is an area of particular musical expertise confined to those working in special schools. These examples in their variety show how music specialists and others are proactively applying and sharing their knowledge of music and the child in learning support settings, specialist attached units, the mainstream classroom, music lesson and school life. Whilst the musical needs of children with SEND may be being addressed as part of inclusive mainstream music provision, these examples in their small way indicate how music can make an important contribution to the wider educational needs and experiences of children with different needs and disabilities; an area that the national programme leader considered to be ‘untapped’ (A005, p. 31). However, the discussion has also highlighted how simply calling for equal access to musical education is not as simple as it might seem. This thesis has highlighted how such calls are only a starting point and such access relies on a number of interrelated individual and institutional or environmental factors if children are to have access to and gain from the wider benefits of music-making.

7.2 Research Evaluation

This thesis has endeavoured to provide a broad, but in-depth, holistic perspective of the opportunities and challenges of using music to support children with SEND in mainstream primary education. It has also drawn attention to a potentially hidden area of musical practice, and generated a tentative profile of individual and collective practice and practitioners, revealing new musical learning settings, musical practitioners

and ways of working within mainstream learning support settings and primary education and music provision. This thesis has sought to give a voice to educators' lived experiences of using music in this context, their motivations and perceptions and the factors that affect such practice. It is hoped that in so doing this thesis provides helpful insights into the nature of musical practice in this context and the opportunities and challenges such practice presents for educators and children, that will be of value to educators, researchers and policy makers working interested in developing music practice in the mainstream learning support context.

The research process at times has been challenging, particularly in recruiting participants, finding examples of practice and negotiating the fine line between general music practice and the use of music as an intervention and resource. However the hidden nature of practice has turned out to be a key finding of this research in part defining practice itself: in the opportunities it offers children through its capacity to disguise other learning; and in the challenges it presents to researchers and music specialists in identifying and defining such practice. From a personal research perspective, gaining the necessary level of experience to carry out the analyses and manage the amount of data generated by the IPA process has been demanding. This experience would lead me to select a smaller sample in any future studies, and focus on providing a more in-depth analysis of individuals' accounts than it has been possible to do here.

Nonetheless, the research and analysis process has been rewarding and challenging. As I have moved through the IPA process participants' accounts have challenged and informed my own understanding of how music might be used in this context. This has given me a deeper appreciation of the challenges educators face in their desire to use music and meet children's individual needs. Smith, Flowers and Larkin (2009) note that the gradual closer involvement of the researcher with the data means that the analysis should be considered as a collaborative effort between participants and researcher, in which they move towards a new understanding of the phenomenon by the end of the final writing up of the analysis. This is a vital part of the hermeneutic circle around which IPA is based and was evident not just in changes in my own fore-understanding but also in the perceptions and understanding of participants, as their interview accounts attest.

7.2.1 Research Limitations

This research is based on a small sample, which whilst representative of the different range of roles and settings to be found in mainstream learning support provision, may nevertheless not represent experiences or practice of other practitioners elsewhere. The thesis has highlighted the challenge of identifying and defining such practice and the impact of complex interrelated individual and environmental factors upon such practice. This analysis is not intended to be a definitive account of practice but an exploration of individual lived experience. Thus, another analysis with a different sample might yield different conclusions. As discussed in the Preface and Chapter Three, the reader must take into account the experience in this area as a researcher and practitioner, which I have brought to this research process and its potential influence on the interpretative analysis and in the final writing up of the data. Thus, further research is required to verify and explore the preliminary definitions of music as an intervention and resource made here, and to build a body of evidence to compare and inform existing and future musical practice in the mainstream primary educational and learning support context.

7.3 Considerations for future research

Reference has been made to areas for future research at relevant points throughout this thesis. However, researchers might also consider the following areas for future study:

- 1) The musical attitudes, abilities and practice of the TA;
- 2) The identification of other examples of practice in the learning support setting, classroom and music lesson as identified here, in order to generate a wider evidence base of practice for comparison and the development of practice;
- 3) The exploration of different educators' experiences of delivering music in this context, through teacher diaries for example.
- 4) To explore the experience of participating in such musical practice from the child's perspective;
- 5) The efficacy of different musical interventions;
- 6) The identification and testing of different evaluation tools for specific musical and learning support purposes.

Alternatively, these findings might support the commercialisation of research-based intervention programmes in order to meet the need for ready-made musical

interventions and programmes, similar to the examples of the CD resource to develop communication skills or the trademarked literacy support project.

Given the difficulties of gaining access to schools, researchers might consider working in collaboration with educational researchers who already have the contacts; something that this research lacked. The rise of social media and associated research methods may make it easier to gain access to individual educators, rather than relying on local authority networks or schools to promote research, as was the case in this study. At a doctoral level, practical training in the IPA method as a first year task through a very small-scale analysis would be helpful in gaining experience in the process itself and the challenge of managing large amounts of data over a defined period of time. As Reid, Flowers and Larkin (2005) point out IPA is used and reported in different ways and therefore individual in nature, thus I am grateful to my supervisors for their guidance during the statistical and thematic analysis stages of this thesis.

7.4 Considerations for practice and policy

This research has highlighted the complex interplay between individual and environmental factors that appeared to motivate and discourage musical practice in this context. It has considered the effect of childhood musical experiences, musical training, knowledge, confidence, personal characteristics and individual motivations on musical practice, all of which appeared to be affected by an individual's working environment and personal experience. In so doing it has highlighted the challenges these participants faced in their schools, which resonate with research findings in respect of musical confidence, training and knowledge from studies conducted in other mainstream primary schools. These findings highlight the need for music training, particularly for SEND music training and for TAs. The thesis also suggests ways in which the issues raised by participants might be addressed, as exemplified by participants' own experiences, teacher training, school musical leadership in schools and relationships between music providers and schools, on which practice in this context appears to depend. The fieldwork for this thesis took place at a time of considerable change in primary and music education. These changes are on-going, as regional music hubs, external music providers, agencies and schools explore and develop new relationships and practice, stimulated by the policy, practical and funding changes initiated by the NMPE and the new Primary National Curriculum.

This thesis has sought to identify examples of practice across the different learning support settings in mainstream primary schools and the opportunities and challenges music can offer to children with SEND and educators in supporting the development of key learning skills and supporting wider cognitive, emotional and social development. It has also identified a number of key gatekeepers to such practice. The move towards partnership working and a holistic child-centred approach provides a possible framework and opportunity for individuals to come together focussed on the shared goal of the child and equal access, however, this appears to depend on individual and institutional priorities at all levels if such practice is to move beyond examples of individual practice into a more strategic approach. It is hoped that this thesis, in the examples of musical practice it presents and its analysis of the factors, which appear to affect such practice, may make a positive contribution to increasing knowledge in this area of music provision, and complement and inform existing and future research in this growing and exciting area of multi-disciplinary research.

List of References

- Agee, J. (2009). Developing qualitative research questions: a reflective process. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 22(4), 431-447.
- Alderfer, C. P. (1972). *Existence, relatedness, and growth; human needs in organizational settings*. New York: Free Press.
- Allen, G. (2011). *Early intervention: The next steps. An independent report to Her Majesty's government*. London, England: Cabinet Office.
- Anvari, S., Trainor, L., Woodside, J. & Levy B. (2003). Relations among musical skills, phonological processing, and early reading ability in pre-school children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 83, 111-130.
- Bamiou, D-E., Musiek, F., Luxon, L. (2001). Aetiology and clinical presentations of auditory processing disorders. A review. *Arch Dis Child*, 85, 361–365
- Banai, K., Hornickel, J., Skoe, E., Nicol, T., Zecker, S. & Kraus, N. (2009). Reading and subcortical auditory function. *Cerebral Cortex*, 19, 2699-2707.
- Barwick, J., Valentine, E., West, R. & Wilding, J. (1989). Relations between reading and musical abilities. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 59, 253-257.
- Besson, M. & Schön, D. (2001). Comparison between language and music. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 930(1), 232-258.
- Bialystok, E. (2011). How does experience change cognition? Evaluating the evidence. *British Journal of Psychology*, 102, 303 – 305.
doi:10.1111/j.20448295.2011.02008.x
- Bialystok, E. & DePape, A.M. (2009). Musical expertise, bilingualism and executive functioning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance*, 35, 565-574.
- Bilhartz, T. D., Bruhn, R. A., & Olson, J. E. (2000). The effect of early music training on child cognitive development. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 20, 615-636.
- Bradlow, A., Kraus, N. & Hayes, E. (2003). Speaking clearly for children with learning disabilities: sentence perception in noise. *Journal of Speech, Language and Hearing Research*, 46, 80-97.

- Brandler, S. & Rammsayer, T.H. (2003). Differences in mental abilities between musicians and non-musicians. *Psychology of Music*, 31, 123-138.
- Bregman, A. (1993). Auditory scene analysis: hearing in complex environments. In S. McAdams & S. Bigand (Eds.), *Thinking in sound. The cognitive psychology of human audition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1983). *Child's Talk: Learning to Use Language*. New York: Norton.
- Bugos, J.A., Perlstein, W.M., McCae, C.S., Brophy, T.S. & Bedenbaugh P.H. (2007). Individualised piano instruction enhances executive functioning and working memory in older adults. *Aging and Mental Health* 11, 464-471.
- Bunt, L. (1997). Clinical and therapeutic uses of music. In D.J. Hargreaves & A.C. North (Eds.), *The social psychology of music* (pp. 250-267). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bunt, L. (2002). *Music Therapy. An art beyond words*. Hove: Brunner-Routledge.
- Bunt, L. (2003). Music therapy with children: A complementary service to music education? *British Journal of Music Education*, 20(2), 179-195.
- Bunt, L. & Hoskyns, S. (2004). *The handbook of music therapy*. (2nd ed.). Hove: Brunner-Routledge.
- Burland, K. & Davidson, J. W. (2002). Training the talented. *Music Education Research*, 4, 123-142.
- Burland K. & Pitts S.E. (2007). Becoming a music student: Investigating the skills and attitudes of students beginning a music degree. *Arts and Humanities in Higher Education*, 6(3), 289-308.
- Burnard, P. (2002). Investigating children's meaning-making and the emergence of musical interaction in-group investigation. *British Journal of Music Education*, 19(2), 157-172.
- Butzlaff, R. (2000). Can music be used to teach reading? *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34(3-4), 167-178.
- Bywater, T. & Sharples, J. (2012). Effective evidence-based interventions for emotional well-being: lessons for policy and practice. *Research Papers in Education*, 1-20.

- Carr, C. & Wigram, A. (2009). Music therapy with children and adolescents in mainstream schools: A systematic review. *British Journal of Music Therapy*, 23(1), 3-18.
- Chan, A.S., Ho, Y.C. & Cheung, M.C. (1998). Music training improves verbal memory. *Nature*, 396, 128.
- Chermak, G. D. (2001). Auditory processing disorder: An overview for the clinician *Hearing Journal*, 54(7), 10-25.
- Choksy, L. (1981). *The Kodály Context*. Englewood Cliffs New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Corrigall, K.A., Schellenberg, E.G. & Misura, N.M. (2013). Music training, cognition and personality. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 4, 222.
- Corrigall, K.A. & Trainor, L.J. (2011). Associations between length of music training and reading skills in children. *Music Perception*, 29, 147-155.
- Corriveau, K.H. & Goswami, U. (2009). Rhythmic motor entrainment in children with speech and language impairments: tapping to the beat. *Cortex*, 45(1), 119-130.
- Costa-Giomi, E. (1999). The effects of three years of piano instruction on children's cognitive development. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 47, 198-212.
- Costa-Giomi, E., Gilmour, R., Siddell, J. & Lefebvre, E. (2001). Absolute pitch, early musical instruction, and spatial abilities. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 930, 394-396.
- Craft, A. (2000). *Creativity across the primary curriculum*. London: Routledge.
- Cunningham, J., Nicol, T., Zecker, S., Bradlow, A. & Kraus, N. (2001). Neurobiologic responses to speech in noise in children with learning problems: Deficits and strategies for improvement. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 112, 758-767.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. (2002). *Flow: The classic work on how to achieve happiness*. London: Rider.
- Dalcroze, E.J. (1916). *The technique of moving plastic*. Paris: Durand et Cie.
- Daniels, H. & Hedegaard, M. (2011). Introduction. In H. Daniels & M. Hedegaard (Eds.), *Vygotsky and special needs education. Rethinking support for children and schools* (pp.1-8). London: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Darrow, A. (2003). Dealing with diversity: The inclusion of students with disabilities in music. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 21, 48-60.

- Davidson, J.W. & Good, J.M.M. (2002). Social and Musical Coordination between Members of a String Quartet: An Exploratory Study. *Psychology of Music*, 30, 2, pp. 186-201.
- Degé, F. & Schwarzer, G. (2011). The effect of a music program on phonological awareness in pre-schoolers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 2, article 124. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2011.0124.
- DeNora, T. (2000). *Music in everyday life*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) (2008). *The Bercow review of services for children and young people (0-19) with speech, language and communication needs*. Annesley, England: DCSF Publications.
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) (2009a). *Lamb Inquiry. Special educational needs and parental confidence*. Annesley, England: DCSF Publications.
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) (2009b). *Identifying and teaching children and young people with dyslexia and literacy difficulties. An independent report from Sir Jim Rose to the Secretary of State for Children, Schools and Families*. Nottingham: DCSF Publications.
- Department for Children, Schools and Families (DCSF) (2010). *Salt review: Independent review of teacher supply for pupils with severe, profound and multiple learning difficulties (SLD and PLMD)*. Annesley, England: DCSF Publications.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2001a). *Special educational needs code of practice*. Annesley, England: DCSF Publications.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2001b). *SEN toolkit*. Annesley, England: DCSF Publications.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2004). *Removing barriers to achievement. The government's strategy for SEN. Executive summary*. Annesley, England: DCSF Publications.
- Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2005). *Primary national strategy. Excellence and enjoyment: social and emotional aspects of learning*. Norwich: HMSO.

- Dyson, A. & Milward, A. (2000). *School and special needs: Issues of innovation and inclusion*. London: Chapman Publishing Ltd.
- Ecclestone, K. (2012). Emotional wellbeing in education policy and practice: the need for interdisciplinary perspectives and a sociological imagination. *Research Papers in Education*, 27(4), 383-387.
- Engestrom, Y., Miettinen, R. & Punamaki, R. (Eds.). (1999). *Perspectives on activity theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Esperson, P.P. (2006). The pleasure of being differently able: Integration through music therapy in primary schools. *Music Therapy Today*, VII(2), 413-428.
- Fassbender, C. (1996). Infants' auditory sensitivity towards acoustic parameters of speech and music. In I. Deliège & J.A. Sloboda (Eds.), *Musical beginnings: Origins and development of musical competence* (pp. 56-87). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fitzgerald, M. (2006). "I send my best Matthew to school every day": Music educators collaborating with parents. *Music Educators Journal*, 92, 40-45.
- François, C., Chobert, J., Besson, M. & Schön, D. (2013). Music training for the development of speech segmentation. *Cerebral Cortex*, 23(9), 2038-2043.
doi:10.1093/cercor/bhs180
- François, C., Tillman, B. & Schön, D. (2012). Cognitive and methodological considerations on the effects of musical expertise on speech segmentation. The Neurosciences and Music IV: Learning and Memory, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1252, 108-115.
- Gaab, N., Gabrielli, J.D., Deutsch, G.K., Tallal, P. & Temple, E. (2007). Neural correlates of rapid auditory processing are disrupted in children with developmental dyslexia and ameliorated with training: an fMRI study. *Restorative Neurology and Neuroscience*, 25(3-4), 295-310.
- Goleman, D., (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. New York, NY, England: Bantam Books, Inc.
- Gorard, S. & Taylor, C. (2004) *Combining Methods in Educational and Social Research*. Maidenhead, England: Open University Press.

- Goswami, U. (2010). *Rhyme, rhythm and dyslexia*. A paper given at British Dyslexia Association Conference: 'What's the Score? Music and Dyslexia: Theory and Practice'. Royal Academy of Music, London.
- Goswami, U., Wang, H-L., Cruz, A., Fosker, T., Mead, N. & Huss M. (2010). Language-universal sensory deficits in developmental dyslexia: English, Spanish, and Chinese. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 23(2), 325-37.
- Gromko, J.E. (2005). The effect of music instruction on phonemic awareness in beginning readers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 53(3), 199-209.
- Hallam, S. (2010). The power of music: its impact on the intellectual, personal and social development of children and young people. *International Journal of Music Education*, 38(3), 269-289.
- Hallam, S., Robertson, A., Saleh, C., Burnard, P., Davies, V., Rogers, L. & Kokatsaki, D. (2007). *Trainee primary school teachers' perceptions of their effectiveness in teaching music*. A paper presented at the 5th International Research in Music Education Conference, Exeter, April 2007.
- Hannon, E. E., & Trainor, L. J. (2007). Music acquisition: effects of enculturation and formal training on development. *Trends Cogn. Sci. (Regul. Ed.)* 11, 466-472.
- Hargreaves, D.J. & Aksentijevic, A. (2011). Commentary: Music, IQ, and the executive function. *British Journal of Psychology*, 102, 306-308.
- Hart, S. (1992). Differentiation. Part of the problem or part of the solution? *Curriculum Journal*, 3(2), 131-142.
- Hayes, E., Warrier, C., Nicol, T., Zecker, S. & Kraus, N. (2003). Neural plasticity following auditory training in children with learning problems. *Clinical Neurophysiology*, 114, 673-684.
- Helmbold, N., Rammsayer, T. & Altenmuller, E. (2005). Temporal information processing and pitch discrimination as predictors of general intelligence. *Canadian Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 60, 294 – 306.
- Hennessy, S. (2000). Overcoming the red-feeling: The development of confidence to teach music in primary school amongst student teachers. *British Journal of Music Education*, 17(2), 183-196.

- Hetland, L. (2000). Learning to make music enhances spatial reasoning. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 34,(3-4), 179-238.
- Hillier, A., Greher, G., Poto, N. & Dougherty, M. (2012). Positive outcomes following participation in a music intervention for adolescents and young adults on the autism spectrum. *Psychology of Music*, 40(2), 201-215.
- Hitchcock, C., Meyer, A., Rose, D. & Jackson, R. (2002). Providing new access to the general curriculum: Universal design for learning. *Teaching Exceptional Children*, 35(2), 8-17.
- Ho, Y. & Cheung, M. (1998). Music training improves verbal memory. *Nature*, 396, 128.
- Ho, Y., Cheung, M. & Chan, A. (2003). Music training improves verbal but not visual memory: Cross-sectional and longitudinal explorations in children. *Neuropsychology*, 17(3), 439-450.
- Holden, H. & Button, S. (2006). The teaching of music in the primary school by the non-music specialist. *British Journal of Music Education*, 23, 23-38.
- Honing, H. (2012). Without it, no music: Beat induction as a fundamental musical trait. The Neurosciences and Music IV: Learning and Memory, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1252, 85-91.
- Howe, M. J. A., Davidson, J. W. & Sloboda, J. A. (1998). Innate talent: Reality or myth? *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, 2, 399-442.
- Howe, M. J. A. & Sloboda, J.A. (1991). Young musicians' accounts of significant influences in their early lives: 2. Teachers, practising and performing. *British Journal of Music Education*, 8, 53-63.
- Husain, G., Thompson, W.F. & Schellenberg, E.G. (2002). Effects of musical tempo and mode on arousal, mood and spatial abilities. *Music Perception*, 20, 151-171.
- Jakobsen, L.S., Cuddy, L.L. & Kilgour, A.R. (2003). Time tagging: A key to musicians' superior memory. *Music Perception*, 20(3), 307-313.
- Johnson, R.B. & Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2004). Comment: Mixed methods research: A research paradigm whose time has come. *Educational Researcher*, 33(7), 14-26.
- Johnson, R. B. & Turner, L. S. (2003). Data collection strategies in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *Handbook of mixed methods in*

- social and behavioral research* (pp. 297-319). Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications Inc.
- Jonides, J. (2008). Musical Skill and Cognition. In C. Asbury & B. Rich (Eds.), *How Arts Training Influences Cognition in Learning, Arts, and the Brain: The Dana Consortium Report on Arts and Cognition* (pp.11-16). New York/Washington, D.C.: Dana Press.
- Keslair, F., Maurin, E. & McNally, S. (2011). *Every child matters? An evaluation of "special educational needs" programmes in England*. IZA Discussion Paper No. 6069. Bonn, Germany: Forschungsinstitut zur Zukunft der Arbeit: Institute for the Study of Labor.
- Kirschner, S. & Tomasello, M. (2009). Joint drumming: Social context facilitates synchronization in preschool children. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, *102*, 299–314.
- Kirschner, S. & Tomasello, M. (2010). Joint music-making promotes pro-social behaviour in 4-year-old children. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *31*, 354–364.
- Koelsch, S. & Stegemann, T. (2012). The brain and positive biological effects in healthy and clinical populations. In R. MacDonald, G. Kreutz & L. Mitchell (Eds.), *Music, Health and Wellbeing* (pp. 436-456). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kraus, N. & Anderson, S. (2013). Treatment for auditory-based learning impairments: Evidence supports efficacy. *The Hearing Journal*, *66(11)*, 40
- Kraus, N. & Chandrasekaran, B. (2010). Music training for the development of auditory skills. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *11*, 599-605.
- Kraus, N. & Hornickel, J. (2012). Meaningful engagement with sound for strengthening communication skills. In D. Ross-Swain & D.S Geffner (Eds.), *Auditory Processing Disorders*. (pp. 693-718). San Diego: Plural Publishing Inc.
- Kraus, N., Strait, D. & Parbery-Clark, A. (2012). Cognitive factors shape brain networks for auditory skill: Spotlight on auditory working memory. *The Neurosciences and Music IV: Learning and Memory, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1252*, 100-115.
- Kreutz, G., Quiroga Murcia, C. & Bongard, S. (2012). Psychoneuroendocrine research on music and health: An Overview. In R. MacDonald, G. Kreutz & L. Mitchell

(Eds.), *Music, Health and Wellbeing* (pp. 457-475). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lahmar, F. (2010). *Negotiating access to Islamic schools: A muslim female researcher's account*. A paper presented at the Interdisciplinary Graduate Conference, Cambridge: 'Diverse Engagements: Drawing in the Margins', 28-29 June.

Lamont, A. (2002). Musical identities and the school environment. In R. MacDonald, D. Hargreaves & D. Miell (Eds.), *Musical Identities* (pp. 41-59). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lamont A. (2011). The beat goes on: Music education, identity and life-long learning. *Music Education Research*, 13(4), 369-388.

Lamont, A., Hargreaves, D.J., Marshall, N.A. & Tarrant, M. (2003). Young people's music in and out of school. *British Journal of Music Education*, 20(3), 229-241.

Lamont, A., Leighton, G., Underhill, J. & Hale, R. (2009). *The impact of whole-class instrumental tuition in primary schools: An evaluation of a Wider Opportunities initiative*. Paper presented at the Research in Music Education conference, Exeter, University of Exeter, 14-18 April.

Lapka, C. (2006). Students with disabilities in a high school band: "We can do it!" *Music Educators Journal*, 92, 54-59.

Lecanuet, J-P. (1996). Prenatal auditory experience. In I. Deliège & J.A. Sloboda (Eds.), *Musical beginnings: Origins and development of musical competence* (pp. 3-34). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lord, P., Sharp, C., Dawson, A., Mehta, P., White, R. & Jeffes, J. (2013). *Evaluation of In Harmony: Year 1 Interim Report*. Slough: NFER.

MacDonald, R., Hargreaves, D. & Miell, D. (Eds.). (2002). *Musical Identities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MacDonald, R., Kreutz, G. & Mitchell, L. (2012). What is health music and wellbeing and why is it important? In R. MacDonald, G. Kreutz & L. Mitchell (Eds.), *Music, Health and Wellbeing* (pp. 3-11). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

MacDonald, R. & Miell, D. (2002). Music for individuals with special needs: a catalyst for developments in identity, communication and musical ability. In R.

- MacDonald, D. Hargreaves & D. Miell (Eds.), *Musical Identities* (pp.163-178). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- MacDonald, R., Miell, D. & Wilson, G. (2005). Talking about music: A vehicle for identity development. In D. Miell, R. MacDonald & D.J. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Musical Communication* (pp. 321-338). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Magee, W. (2002). Disability and identity in music therapy. In R. MacDonald, D. Hargreaves & D. Miell (Eds.), *Musical Identities* (pp.179-195). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Magne, C., Schön, D. & Besson, M. (2006). Musician children detect pitch violations in both music and language better than non-musician children: Behavioral and electrophysiological approaches. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 18, 199–211.
- Maslow, A.H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50, 370-396.
- Mather, M.C. (2007). *An Exploratory Study into the Use of Multi-sensory Music in a Mainstream Learning Support Setting*. (Unpublished masters dissertation). University of Sheffield, Sheffield.
- Mather, M.C. (2013). Music as a specific learning support resource for children with special educational needs and disability in mainstream primary education: Practice and Attitudes. In M. Stakelum (Ed), *Developing the Musician* (pp. 171 – 189). Farnham: Ashgate.
- McAdams, S. & Bigand, S. (1993). Introduction to auditory cognition. In S. McAdams, & S. Bigand (Eds.), *Thinking in Sound. The Cognitive Psychology of Human Audition* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCord, K. & Fitzgerald, M. (2006). Children with disabilities playing musical instruments. *Music Educators Journal*, 92, 46-52.
- McCord, K. & Watts, E.H. (2006). Collaboration and access for our children: Music educators and special educators together. *Music Educators Journal*, 92, 26-33.
- McMahon, E., Wintermark, P. & Lahav, A. (2012). Auditory brain development in premature infants: The importance of early experience. The Neurosciences and Music IV: Learning and Memory. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1252, 17-24.

- Meyer, M., Elmer, S. & Jäncke, L. (2012). Musical expertise induces neuroplasticity of the planum temporale. *The Neurosciences and Music IV: Learning and Memory, Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1252*, 116-123.
- Meyer, M., Elmer, S., Ringli, M., Oechslin, M.S., Baumann, S. & Jancke, L. (2011). Long term exposure to music enhances the sensitivity of the auditory system in children. *European Journal of Neuroscience, 34*(5), 755-765.
- Miell, D. & MacDonald, R. (2000). Children's creative collaborations: The importance of friendship when working together on a musical composition. *Social Development, 9*(3).
- Miles, T.R. & Westcombe, J. (2002). *Music and dyslexia. Opening doors*. London, England: Whurr Publishers.
- Mirandola, C., Del Prete, F., Ghetti, S. & Cornoldi, C. (2011). Recollection but not familiarity differentiates memory for text in students with and without learning difficulties. *Learning and Individual Differences 21*(2), 206-209.
- Molnar-Szakacs, I., Green, V. & Overy, K. (2012). Shared affective motion experience (SAME) and creative, interactive music therapy. In D. Hargreaves, R. MacDonald & D. Miell, (Eds.), *Musical imaginations: Multidisciplinary perspectives on creativity, performance and perception* (pp. 313-331). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Molnar-Szakacs, I. & Heaton, P. (2012). Music: a unique window into the world of autism. *The Neurosciences and Music IV: Learning and Memory. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1252*, 318–324.
- Molnar-Szakacs, I. & Overy, K. (2006). Being together in time: Musical experience and the mirror neuron system. *Music Perception, 26*(5), 489-504.
- Montgomery, J. & Martinson, A. (2006). Partnering with music therapists: A model for addressing students' musical and extra-musical goals. *Music Educators Journal, 92*, 34.
- Moog, H. (1976). *The musical experience of the pre-school child*. (transl C. Clarke) London. Schott.
- Moreno, S. & Besson, M. (2006). Musical training and language-related brain electrical activity in children. *Psychophysiology, 43*, 287–291.

- Moreno, S., Bialystok, E., Barac, R., Schellenberg, E.G, Cepeda, N.J. & Chau, T. (2011). Short-term music training enhances verbal intelligence and executive function. *Psychological Science*, 22, 1425 – 1433.
- Moreno, S., Marques, C., Santos, A., Santos, M., Castro, S-L. & Besson, M. (2009). Musical training influences linguistic abilities in 8-year-old children: More evidence for brain plasticity. *Cerebral Cortex*, 19, 712–723.
- Murnighan, J.K. & Conlon, D.E. (1991). The dynamics of intense work groups: A study of British string quartets. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 36(2), 165-186.
- Nantais, K.M. & Schellenberg, E.G. (1999). The Mozart effect: An artefact of preference. *Psychological Science* 10, 370-373.
- Neville, H.J., Andersson, A., Baggdade, O., Bell E., Currin, J., Fanning, J. & Heidenreich, L. (2009). How can musical training improve cognition? In S. Dehaene & C. Petit (Eds.), *The origins of human dialog: Speech and music/Parole et musique : Aux origines du dialogue humaine*, (pp. 277-290). Paris: Odile Jacob
- Nicol, T. & Kraus, N. (2005). How can the neural encoding and perception of speech be improved? In J. Syka & M.M Merzenich (Eds.), *Plasticity and signal representation in the auditory system*. New York: Kluwer Plenum.
- North, A.C. & Hargreaves, D.J. (2008). *The social and applied psychology of music*. (pp. 313-354). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Ockelford, A. (1998). *Music moves: Music in the education of children and young people who are visually impaired and have learning disabilities*. London: Royal National Institute for the Blind.
- Ockelford, A. (2000). Music in the education of children with severe or profound learning difficulties: Issues in current UK provision, a new conceptual framework, and proposals for research. *Psychology of Music*, 28(2), 197-217.
- Ockelford, A. (2008). *Music for children and young people with complex needs*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ockelford, A., & Markou, K. (2012). Music education and therapy for children and young people with cognitive impairments: Reporting on a decade of research. In R. MacDonald, G. Kreutz, & L. Mitchell (Eds.), *Music, Health, and Wellbeing* (pp. 383-402). New York: Oxford University Press.

- Oglethorpe, S. (2002). *Instrumental music for dyslexics. A teaching handbook*. (2nd ed.). London, England: Whurr Publishers.
- O'Neill, S. (2002). The self-identity of young musicians. In R. MacDonald, D. Hargreaves & D. Miell (Eds.), *Musical identities* (pp. 79-97). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Orff, C. & Keetman, G. (1950). *Musik für Kinder*. Mainz: Schott.
- Osborne, N. (2012). Neuroscience and “real world” practice: Music as a therapeutic resource for children in zones of conflict. The Neurosciences and Music IV: Learning and Memory. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1252, 69-84.
- O'Toole, J. (2009). Multi-literacies in the arts. In C. Sinclair, N. Jeanneret & J. O'Toole (Eds.), *Education in the arts: teaching and learning in the contemporary curriculum* (Chapter 4). Australia: Oxford University Press.
- Overy, K. (2000). Dyslexia, temporal processing and music: The potential of music as an early learning aid for dyslexic children. *Psychology of Music*, 28, 218–229.
- Overy, K. (2003). Dyslexia and music: From timing deficits to musical intervention. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 999, 497–505.
- Overy, K. (2010). Music, the brain and MAP: A musical activities programme for the language classroom. *A paper presented at the British Dyslexia Association Conference: What's the Score? Music and Dyslexia: Theory and Practice*. Royal Academy of Music, London, England.
- Overy, K. (2012). Making music in a group: synchronisation and shared experience. The Neurosciences and Music IV: Learning and Memory. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1252, 65-67.
- Pacherie, E. & Dokic, J. (2006). From mirror neurons to joint actions. *Cognitive Systems Research*, 7(2-3), 101-112.
- Pantev, C., Ross, B., Fujioka, T., Trainor, L.J., Schulte, M. & Schulz, M. (2003). Music and learning-induced cortical plasticity. The Neurosciences and Music: Mutual interactions and implications of developmental functions. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 999, 438-450.
- Papousek, M. (1996). Musicality in infancy research: biological and cultural origins of early musicality. In I. Deliège & J.A. Sloboda (Eds.), *Musical beginnings: origins*

- and development of musical competence* (pp. 37-55). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parbery-Clark, A., Skoe, E. & Kraus, N. (2009a). Musical experience limits the degradative effects of background noise on the neural processing of sound. *Journal of Neuroscience*, *29*, 14100-14107.
- Parbery-Clark, A., Skoe, E. & Kraus, N. (2009b). Musician enhancement for speech-in-noise. *Ear Hear*, *30*, 653-661.
- Patel, A.D. (2012). The OPERA hypothesis: Assumptions and clarifications. The Neurosciences and Music IV: Learning and Memory, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, *1252*, 124-128.
- Patel, A.D. & Iverson, J.R., (2007). The linguistic benefits of musical abilities. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *11*, 369-372.
- Patterson, A. (2003). Music teachers and music therapists: Helping children together. *Music Educators Journal*, *89*, 35.
- Pavlicevic, M. (1997). *Music therapy in context. Music meaning and relationship*. London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Piaget, J. & Inhelder, B. (1969). *The psychology of the child*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Pitts, S. E. (2009). Roots and routes in adult musical participation: Investigating the impact of home and school on life-long musical interest and involvement. *British Journal of Music Education*, *26*(3), 241-256.
- Portowitz, A., Lichtenstein, O., Egorova, L., & Brand, E. (2009). Underlying mechanisms linking music education and cognitive modifiability. *Research Studies in Music Education*, *31*(2), 107 - 128.
- Rabinowitch, T-C., Cross, I. & Burnard, P. (2013). Long-term musical group interaction has a positive influence on empathy in children. *Psychology of Music*, *41*(4), 484-498.
- Rauscher, F. H. (2002). Mozart and the mind: Factual and fictional effects of musical enrichment. In J. Aronson (Ed.). *Improving academic achievement: Impact of psychological factors on education* (pp. 269-278). New York, NY: Academic Press.

- Rauscher, F.H., Shaw G.L. & Ky K.N. (1993). Music and spatial task performance. *Nature*, 365, 611.
- Rauscher, F.H., Shaw G.L., Levine, L.J., Wright, E.L., Dennis, W.R. & Newcombe, R. (1997). Music training causes long-term enhancement of pre-school children's spatial-temporal reasoning abilities. *Neurological Research*, 19, 1-8.
- Rauscher, F. H., & Zupan, M.A. (2000). Classroom keyboard instruction improves kindergarten children's spatial-temporal performance: A field experiment. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*, 15(2), 215-228.
- Reid, J. (2009). Shower singing and other essentials. In C. Sinclair, N. Jeanneret, J. O'Toole (Eds.), *Education in the arts: Teaching and learning in the contemporary curriculum*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Reid, K., Flowers, P. & Larkin, M. (2005). Exploring lived experience. *The Psychologist*, 18(1), 20-23.
- Rix, J., Hall, K., Nind, M., Sheehy, K. & Wearmouth, J. (2009). What pedagogical approaches can effectively include children with special educational needs in mainstream classrooms? A systematic literature review. *Support for Learning*, 24(2), 86-94.
- Robb, S.L., Burns, D.S. & Carpenter, J.S. (2011). Reporting guidelines for music-based interventions. *Music and Medicine* 3, 271. doi: 10.1177/1943862111420539
- Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research. A resource for social scientists and practitioner-researchers*. (2nd ed.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Russo, N., Hornickel, J., Nicol, T., Zecker, S. & Kraus, N. (2010). Biological changes in auditory function following training in children with autism spectrum disorders. *Behavioural and Brain Functions*, 6, 60.
- Russo, N., Nicol, T., Zecker, S., Hayes, E. & Kraus, N. (2005). Auditory training improves neural timing in the human brainstem. *Behavioural Brain Research*, 156, 95-103.
- Saarikallio, S. (2012). Cross-Cultural Approaches to Music and Health. In R. MacDonald, G. Kreutz, & L. Mitchell (Eds.), *Music, Health and Wellbeing*. (pp. 476-492). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Salamon, G. & Perkins, D.N. (1989). Rocky roads to transfer: Rethinking mechanisms

- of a neglected phenomenon. *Educational Psychologist*, 24, 113-142.
- Sawyer, R.K. (2003). Emergence in creativity and development. In R.K Sawyer, V. John-Steiner, S. Moran, R.J. Sternberg, D. Feldman, J. Nakamura & M. Csikszentmihalyi (Eds.), *Creativity and Development* (pp.12-60). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schellenberg, E.G. (2004). Music lessons enhance IQ. *Psychological Science*, 15(8).
- Schellenberg, E.G. (2006). Long-term positive associations between music lessons and IQ. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98, 457-468.
- Schellenberg, E.G. (2008). By-products of music lessons: Commentary on Tierney, Bergeson and Pisoni (2008). *Empirical Musicology Review*, 3, 205-207.
- Schellenberg, E.G. (2009). Musikunterricht, geistige Fähigkeiten und Sozialkompetenzen: Schlussfolgerungen und Unklarheiten [Music lessons, intellectual abilities, and social skills: Conclusions and confusions] In Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung (Ed.), *Pauken mit Trompeten? Lassen sich Lernstrategien, Lernmotivation und soziale Kompetenzen durch Musikunterricht fördern? [Drilling with trumpets? Is it possible to enhance learning strategies, learning motivation and social competence with music lessons?]* (pp. 114-124). Bonn/Berlin: Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung.
- Schellenberg, E.G. (2011a). Examining the association between music lessons and intelligence. *British Journal of Psychology*, 102, 283-302.
- Schellenberg, E.G. (2011b). Music lessons, emotional intelligence, and IQ. *Music Perception*, 29, 185-194.
- Schellenberg, E.G. (2011c). Music lessons and intelligence: Reply to commentaries. *British Journal of Psychology*, 102, 309-312.
- Schellenberg, E.G. & Hallam, S. (2005). Music listening and cognitive abilities in 10 and 11 year olds: The Blur effect. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1060, 202-209.
- Schellenberg, E.G. & Mankarious, M. (2012). Music training and emotion comprehension in childhood. *Emotion*, 12, 887-891.

- Schellenberg, E.G., & Moreno, S. (2010). Music lessons, pitch processing, and g. *Psychology of Music*, 38, 209-221.
- Schellenberg, E.G., Nakata, T., Hunter, P.G. & Tamoto, S. (2007). Exposure to music and cognitive performance: Tests of children and adults. *Psychology of Music*, 35, 5-19.
- Schellenberg, E.G. & Peretz, I. (2008). Music, language, and cognition: unresolved issues. *Trends Cogn. Sci. (Regul. Ed.)* 12, 45–46.
- Schellenberg, E.G., & Weiss, M.W. (2013). Music and cognitive abilities. In D. Deutsch (Ed.), *The psychology of music* (3rd ed.) (pp. 499-550). Amsterdam: Elsevier.
- Schellenberg, E.G. & Winner, E. (2011). Music training and non-musical abilities: Introduction. *Music Perception*, 29, 129-132.
- Schön, D., Boyer, M., Moreno, S., Besson, M., Peretz, I. & Kolinsky, R. (2008). Songs as an aid for language acquisition, *Cognition*, 106(2), 975-983.
- Schön, D., Magne, C. & Besson, M. (2004). The music of speech: Music training facilitates pitch processing in both music and language. *Psychophysiology*, 41, 341-349.
- Slater, J. Tierney, A. Kraus N. (2013). At-Risk Elementary School Children with One Year of Classroom Music Instruction Are Better at Keeping a Beat. *PLoS ONE* 8(10): e77250. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0077250
- Sloboda, J.A. (2001). Emotion, functionality and the everyday experience of music: Where does music education fit? *Music Education Research*, 3(2), 243-253.
- Sloboda, J.A. & Howe, M.J.A. (1992). Transitions in the early musical careers of able young musicians: Choosing instruments and teachers. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 4(4), 283-294.
- Smith, J.A., Flowers, P. & Larkin, M. (2009). *Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis: Theory, method and research*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Smith, J., Jarman, M. & Osborn, N. (1999). Doing interpretive phenomenological analysis. In M. Murray & K. Chamberlain (Eds.), *Qualitative health psychology*. London: Sage.
- Snowling, M.J. & Hulme, C. (2011). Evidence-based interventions for reading and

- language difficulties: creating a virtuous circle. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81(1),1-23. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8279.2010.02014.x.
- Snyder, B. (2000). *Music and memory. An introduction*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Spelke, E. (2008). Effects of music instruction on developing cognitive systems at the foundations of mathematics and science. *Learning, Arts, and the Brain: The Dana Consortium Report on Arts and Cognition*, 17-50.
- Stewart, L. & Williamon, A. (2008). What are the implications of neuroscience for musical education? *Educational Research*, 50, 177-186.
- Strait, D. L. & Kraus, N. (2014). Biological impact of auditory expertise across the life span: Musicians as a model of auditory learning. *Hearing Research*, 308,109-121.
- Suzuki, S. (1969). *Nurtured by love*. Athens, OH: Senzay Publications.
- Swanwick, K. (1999). *Teaching music musically*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Tallal, P. & Gaab, N. (2006). Dynamic auditory processing, musical experience and language development. *Trends in Neuroscience*, 29, 382–390.
- Tarrant, M., North, A.C. & Hargreaves, D.J. (2002). Youth identity and music. In R. MacDonald, D. Hargreaves & D. Miell (Eds.), *Musical Identities*. (pp. 134-162). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Thompson, P., Hall, C., Jones, K. & Sefton Green, J. (2012). The signature pedagogies project : Final report. *Creativity, Culture and Education*, 2012.
- Trainor, L., Shahin, A. & Roberts L. (2003). Effects of musical training on the auditory cortex in children. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences: Neurosciences and Music*, 999, 506.
- Trehub, S. E., Bull, D. & Thorpe, L.A. (1984). Infants' perceptions of melodies: The role of melodic contour. *Child Development*, 55, 821-830.
- Trehub, S.E., Unyk, A.M., Kamensky, S.B., Hill, D.S., Trainor, L.J., Henderson, J.L. & Saraza, M. (1997). Mothers' and fathers' singing to infants. *Developmental Psychology*, 3, 500-507.
- Trevarthen, C. (2000). Musicality and the intrinsic motive pulse: Evidence from human and infant communication psychobiology. *Musicae Scientiae*, 3, 155.
- UNESCO (1994). *The Salamanca statement and framework for action on special needs education*. Paris: UNESCO.

- Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Wan, C.Y., Bazen, L., Baars, R., Libenson, A., Zipse, L., Zuk, J., Norton, A & Schlaug, G. (2011). Auditory-motor mapping training as an intervention to facilitate speech output in non-verbal children with autism: a proof of concept study. *PlosOne* 6, e25505.
- Warrier, C., Johnson, K., Hayes, E., Nicol, T. & Kraus, N. (2004). Learning impaired children exhibit timing deficits and training-related improvements in auditory cortical responses to speech in noise. *Experimental Brain Research*, 157, 431-441.
- Weiss, M.W. & Schellenberg, E.G. (2011). Augmenting cognition with music. In I. Segev & H. Markram (Eds.), *Augmenting cognition* (pp. 103-125). Lausanne, Switzerland: EPFL Press.
- Welch G., Ockelford, A. & Zimmermann, S. (2001). *Provision of music in special education (PROMISE)*. London: University of London Institute of Education/RNIB.
- White-Schwoch, T., Woodruff Carr, K., Anderson, S., Strait, D.L. & Kraus, N. (2013) Older adults benefit from music training early in life: Biological evidence for long-term training driven plasticity. *The Journal of Neuroscience*, 33(45), 17667-17674.
- Wible, B., Nicol, T. & Kraus, N. (2004). Atypical brainstem representation of onset and formant structure of speech sounds in children with language-based problems. *Biological Psychology*, 67, 299-317.
- Williamon, A. (2002). Memorising Music. In J. Rink (Ed.), *Musical performance. A guide to understanding*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Williamon, A. & Davidson, J. (2002). Exploring co-performer communication. *Musicae Scientiae*, 1(1), 53-72.
- Wilson, B. & McCrary, J. (1996). The effect of instruction on music educators' attitudes toward students with disabilities. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 44(1), 26-33.
- Winsler, A., Ducenne, L., & Koury, A. (2011). Singing one's way to self-regulation: The role of early music and movement curricula and private speech. *Early Education and Development*, 22(2), 274-304.

- Wong, P.C., Skoe, E., Russo, N.M., Dees, T. & Kraus N. (2007). Musical experience shapes human brainstem encoding of linguistic pitch patterns. *Nature Neuroscience*, 10(4), 420-422.
- Young, S. (2003). *Music with the under-fours*. London: Routledge Farmer.
- Young, S. (2005). Musical communication between adults and young children. In D. Miell, R. MacDonald & D. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Musical communication* (pp. 281-299). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Young, S. (2008). Collaboration between 3- and 4-year olds in self-initiated play on instruments. *International of Educational Research*, 47, 3-10.
- Zendel, B. R. & Alain, C. (2012). The influence of life-long musicianship on neurophysiological measures of concurrent sound segregation. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience*, 25, 503-516.
- Ziegler, J. C. & Goswami, U. (2005). Reading acquisition, developmental dyslexia and skilled reading across languages: A psycho-linguistic grain size theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(1), 3-29.
- Zillmann, D. & Gan, S. (1997). Musical taste in adolescence. In D.J. Hargreaves and A.C. North (Eds.), *The social psychology of music* (pp. 161–87). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Zimmerman, E. & Lahav, A. (2012). The multi-sensory brain and its ability to learn music. The Neurosciences and Music IV: Learning and Memory, *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1252, 179-184.

Electronic Sources:

- Arts Council (2012). *Music Education Hubs*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/funding/our-investment/funding-programmes/music-education-hubs/>
- Burland, K. (2005). *Becoming a musician: A longitudinal study investigating the career transitions of undergraduate music students*. (Unpublished PhD thesis). Retrieved from: music.leeds.ac.uk/files/2012/04/Burland-PhD.pdf
- Carpenter, H., Papps, I., Bragg, J., Dyson, A. Harris, D., Kerr, K., Todd, L. & Laing, K. (2013). *Evaluation of pupil premium: Research report*. Department for Education. Retrieved from:

http://www.epd.org.uk/content_files/files/Join%20Us/DfE%20Report%20-%20Evaluation%20of%20Pupil%20Premium%20Research%20Report%20July%202013.pdf.

Centre for Use of Research and Evidence in Education (CUREE) (2011). *Synthesis report: Sing Up, 2007-2011. Programme evaluation*. Retrieved from: <http://www.CUREE.co.uk/node/2390>

Children Act (1989). Retrieved from: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1989/41/contents>

Dickens, L. (2010). *Music is Power: Youth Music outcomes and impact. 2009-2010*. Retrieved from: <http://www.youthmusic.org.uk/assets/files/Youth%20Music%20Outcomes%20and%20Impact%202009.pdf>

Dillon, L. (2010). *Looked after children and music making. An evidence review*. Youth Music. Retrieved from: <http://www.youthmusic.org.uk/assets/files/looked%20after%20children%20evidence%20review2010.pdf>

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2003). *Every child matters*. Norwich: HMSO. Retrieved from: <https://www.education.gov.uk/consultations/downloadableDocs/EveryChildMatters.pdf>

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2004). *Music Manifesto Report No.1*. Retrieved from: <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/1-84478-533-5%20PDF1.pdf>

Department for Education and Skills (DfES) (2006). *Making every child's music matter. Music Manifesto Report No.2. A consultation for action*. Retrieved from: http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130401151715/https://www.education.gov.uk/publications/eOrderingDownload/Music_Manifesto_Report2.pdf

Department for Education (DfE) (2011a). *Special educational needs in England*. Table 11. Retrieved from: <http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s001007/index.shtml>

- Department for Education (DfE) (2011b). *The national strategies 1997–2011. A brief summary of the impact and effectiveness of the national strategies*. Retrieved from: <http://dera.ioe.ac.uk/17695/1/DFE-00032-2011.pdf>
- Department for Education (DfE) (2012a). *Support and aspiration: A new approach to special educational needs and disability: Progress and next steps*. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/support-and-aspiration-a-new-approach-to-special-educational-needs-and-disability-progress-and-next-steps>
- Department for Education (DfE) (2012b). *Children and Families Bill*. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/219658/Children_20and_20Families_20Bill_202013.pdf
- Department for Education (DfE) (2013). *The national curriculum in England: primary curriculum*. Retrieved from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/national-curriculum-in-england-primary-curriculum>
- Department for Education and Department for Culture, Media, and Sport (DfE, DCMS) (2011a). *The importance of music. A national plan for music education*. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/180973/DFE-00086-2011.pdf
- Department for Education and Department for Culture, Media, and Sport (DfE, DCMS) (2011b). *Music education in England. A review by Darren Henley for the department of education and the department of culture, media and sport*. Retrieved from: https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/175432/DFE-00011-2011.pdf
- Drake Music (2012). *Disabling barriers to formal music education*. Retrieved from: http://www.drakemusic.org/sites/drakemusic.org/files/DMEDConsultationExecSummary_0.pdf
- Education (Handicapped Children) Act (1970). Retrieved from: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1970/52/enacted>
- Education Act (1981). Retrieved from: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1981/60/enacted>

Education Reform Act (1988). Retrieved from:

<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukpga/1988/40/contents>

Griffiths, M. (2013). *Youth Music Network Blog*. Retrieved from

<http://network.youthmusic.org.uk/resources/blogs/matt-griffiths/latest-developments-youth-music>.

Hallam, R. (2012). *Music education grant. 2011/2012. Report based on local authority data returns*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.dickhallam.co.uk/resources/National%20Music%20Education%20Grant%202012%20final.pdf>

Hallam, R. & Hanke, M. (2012). *Music education in England: From the music manifesto to the national plan for music education – a review*. (ISME Conference 2012 Poster Presentation). Retrieved from:

<http://www.dickhallam.co.uk/resources/Music%20Education%20in%20England%2000from%20Music%20Manifesto%20to%20National%20Plan%20ISME%202012.pdf>

Hallam, S., Creech, A. & Varvarigou, M. (2011). *Evaluation of the EMI music sound foundation project rollout: Training key stage 1 primary school teachers (2010-2011)*. Retrieved from:

http://www.emimusicfoundation.com/images/uploads/Executive_Summary_IOE_2011.pdf

House of Commons (2009). *Evidence check 1: Early literacy interventions – Science and Technology Committee*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200910/cmselect/cmsctech/44/4405.htm#note12>

Ofsted (2010). *The special educational needs and disability review. A statement is not enough*. Retrieved from: <http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/news/statement-not-enough-ofsted-review-of-special-educational-needs-and-disability-0>

Ofsted (2012a). *Music in schools: sound partnerships. A short survey of music education partnership work in schools*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/music-schools-sound-partnerships>

Ofsted (2012b). *Music in schools: Wider still and wider*. Retrieved from:

<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/music-schools-wider-still-and-wider>

Ofsted (2012c). *The pupil premium: How schools are using the pupil premium funding to raise achievement for disadvantaged pupils*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/pupil-premium>.

Ofsted (2013). *School inspection handbook*. Retrieved from:
<http://www.ofsted.gov.uk/resources/school-inspection-handbook>.

Warnock Report (1978). *Special educational needs. Report of the committee of enquiry into the education of handicapped children and young people*. London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office. Retrieved from:
<http://www.educationengland.org.uk/documents/warnock/warnock1978.html>

Youth Music (2006). *Our music. Musical engagement of young people aged 7-19 in the UK*. Omnibus Survey. Retrieved from:
http://network.youthmusic.org.uk/sites/default/files/research/Our%20Music_Youth_Music_Omnibus_Survey_2006.pdf.

List of Abbreviations

ACE	Arts Council of England
AMMT	Auditory-Motor Mapping Training
ASD	Autism Spectrum Disorder
AST	Advanced Skills Teacher
BESD	Behavioural, Emotional and Social Difficulties
BKA	British Kodály Academy
BSL	British Sign Language
CAMHS	Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services
CD	Compact Disc
CPD	Continuing Professional Development
CUREE	Centre for Use of Research and Evidence in Education
DCMS	Department for Culture, Media and Sport
DCSF	Department for Children, Schools and Families
DfE	Department for Education
DfES	Department for Education and Skills
DT	Design and Technology
EAL	English as an Additional Language
EBD	Emotional and Behavioural Disorders
ERG	Existence, Relatedness and Growth
EYFS	Early Years Foundation Stage Programme
GCSE	General Certificate of Secondary Education
HLTA	Higher Level Teaching Assistant
HMI	Her Majesty's Inspector
ICT	Information and Communications Technology
IEP	Individual Education Plan
IMP	Intrinsic Motive Pulse
IPA	Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis
IPC	International Primary Curriculum

LEA	Local Education Authority
LSA	Learning Support Assistant
MGI	Musical Group Interaction
MLD	Moderate Learning Difficulties
NICU	Neonatal Intensive Care Unit
NPME	National Plan for Music Education
NQT	Newly Qualified Teacher
Ofsted	The Office for Standards in Education
OPERA	Overlap, Precision, Emotion, Repetition, and Attention
OT	Occupational Therapist
PDA	Professional Development Agreement
PGCE	Post-Graduate Certificate of Education
PTSD	Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder
QCA	Qualifications and Curriculum Authority
SAME	Shared Affective Motion Experience
SD	Standard Deviation
SEAL	Social and Emotional Aspects of Learning Strategy
SEN	Special Educational Needs
SENCo	Special Educational Needs Coordinator
SEND	Special Educational Needs and Disability
SIP	School Improvement Partner
SLCN	Speech, Language and Communication Needs
SLSR	Specific Learning Support Resource
SPSS	Statistical Product and Service Solutions
TA	Teaching Assistant
THRASS	Teaching Handwriting Reading and Spelling Skills
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
VI	Visually Impaired
VOCA	Vocal Output Communication Aids

Appendix A – Survey Schedule

Using Music to Support Children with Special Educational Needs in Mainstream Primary Schools

Your educational role:

Do you work in or support a mainstream state primary school?*

This study is investigating *mainstream state primary education*.

If you work in any of the following roles or settings please click the YES button below:

A mainstream primary school (or a mainstream infant or junior school).

An internal specialist learning support unit within a mainstream state primary school.

An external specialist learning support unit supporting mainstream state primary schools.

If you work in *both* mainstream and special schools or in both state *and* independent primary schools, please click on the YES button below, but only refer to your work in *state mainstream* primary schools in your answers. Thank you.

If you *only* work in any of the following roles or settings please click the NO button below.

A special school for children with profound, multiple and severe learning difficulties (see above)

A secondary school.

An independent school.

A short stay school or pupil referral unit.

A private instrumental teacher or a private tutor working in your own practice.

Yes

No

Your educational role:

Which of these job titles best describes your role(s)? (please select all that apply).*

Head Teacher

Deputy Head/Assistant Head

- SEN Coordinator (SENCo)
 - Key Stage Coordinator
 - Music Subject Leader
 - Class teacher
 - Learning Support teacher
 - Visiting Learning Support teacher
 - Learning Support Assistant (LSA)
 - Higher Level Teaching Assistant (HLTA)
 - Teaching Assistant (TA)
 - A peripatetic music teacher or community musician working in mainstream state primary schools.
 - Other
-

Your educational role:

Where do you work? (please select all that apply).*

	State primary, infant or junior school	In-school primary learning support unit	External primary learning support unit	Other
--	---	--	---	--------------

You selected an alternative work setting. Please give details.*

If you work in *multiple* roles, please choose just *one* of your roles listed below to comment upon for the remainder of this survey.

If you only work in *one* role, please click on your role below and continue with the survey.*

If you only work in *one* setting, *do not* answer this question. Please move on to the next question.

However, if you work in *more than one* setting, please choose *one* of the following settings to comment upon for the remainder of this survey. N.B. If you work in multiple roles *and* multiple settings, please choose the setting below that corresponds to the role you chose in the previous question.

- State primary school
- In-school primary learning support unit
- External primary learning support unit
- Other: _____

How long have you been working in your teaching/ support/ chosen role?*

- Less than a year
- 1-3 years
- 4-7 years
- 8-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 15-20 years
- Over 20 years

How long have you been working in your teaching/ support/ chosen role?*

- Less than a year
- 1-3 years
- 4-7 years
- 8-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 15-20 years
- Over 20 years

Which local authority do you work in?*

**Which of these statements best describes your teaching/support/chosen role?
(please select all that apply).***

- I do not have a teaching or support role
 - I teach in class with in-class support
 - I teach in class without in-class support
 - I teach/support in a small group in class
 - I teach/support in a small group outside the main class
 - I provide one-to-one support in class
 - I provide one-to-one support outside the main class
 - Other
-

Your educational role:

What year groups do you teach or support? (please select all that apply).*

- Reception
- Year 1
- Year 2
- Year 3
- Year 4
- Year 5
- Year 6

Do you have *responsibility* for the education of children with SEN (with or without a Statement of SEN?).*

- Yes
- No

What type of responsibility do you have for children with SEN? (please select all that apply).*

- Day to day in-class responsibility
- SENCo responsibility
- Visiting teacher responsibility
- Overall school responsibility (E.g.Head Teacher)
- Other

Do you *teach or support* children with SEN (with or without a Statement SEN?)*

- Yes
- No

How many children with SEN (with or without Statements of SEN) in total do you teach or support?*

- 1-3
- 4-6
- 5-7
- 8-10
- more than 10

What type of special educational needs do the children you teach or support have? (please select all that apply).

*

- Profound and Multiple Learning Difficulties (PMLD)
- Severe Learning Difficulties (SLD)
- Moderate Learning Difficulties (MLD)
- Specific Learning Difficulties (SpLD)
- Behavioural and Social and Emotional Difficulty (BESD)
- Speech and Language Communication Needs (SLCN)
- Autistic Spectrum Disorder (ASD)

- Visual Impairment (VI)
 - Hearing Impairment (HI)
 - Multi-Sensory Impairment (MSI)
 - Physical Disability (PD)
 - Other
 - Not sure
-

Your educational role:

Do you have *responsibility* for the education of children with SEN (with or without a Statement of SEN?)*

- Yes
- No

What type of responsibility do you have for children with SEN? (*please select all that apply*)*

- SENCo responsibility
 - Visiting teacher responsibility
 - Overall school responsibility (E.g. Head Teacher)
 - Other
-

Your use of music in your teaching or support role:

Do you use music in your *own* teaching, support or chosen role?*

N.B.: The definition of 'music' here should be widely interpreted. It could include the use of recorded music for listening, singing or dancing to, or as a backdrop to other activities; or involve active music-making, singing, composition, recording or performance as individual, class or school activities.

- Yes
- No

On average, how often do you use music in your teaching, support or chosen role?*

- Daily

- Several times a week
- Once a week
- Monthly
- Half termly
- Termly
- Once a year

What year groups do you use music with? (please select all that apply).*

- Reception
- Year 1
- Year 2
- Year 3
- Year 4
- Year 5
- Year 6

For what purpose do you use music for in your own teaching, support or chosen role? (please select all that apply).*

- For musical learning as part of the Primary National Curriculum
- To support literacy work
- To develop phonological awareness (starting sounds of words, rhyming ability and awareness)
- To support numeracy work
- To develop attentive behaviour
- To support social development
- To support Individual Education Plans (IEPs)
- As a specific learning support intervention/activity
- As a creative context to explore other learning or cross-curricular topics
- To support creative learning
- To provide a calming environment for non-musical learning

- To provide a meaningful or enjoyable context for non-musical learning
- Other
- Individual Instrumental lessons
- Wider Opportunities group instrumental lessons

Thinking about your *own* practice, which of the following *musical opportunities / activities* do you provide in your teaching, support or chosen role? (please select all that apply).*

- Children sing in music lessons
- Children make music with percussion instruments
- Children perform on their own instruments in class
- Children make musical instruments (e.g. out of recycled materials)
- Children compose their own music
- Children can record their performances or their compositions
- Children can publish their musical work (e.g. online via school or a music education website)
- Children listen to music as a focussed listening activity as part of their music lesson
- Children listen to music as a focussed listening activity as part of non-music lessons
- Children can choose to present their learning or homework in a musical format
- We play clapping games to sung or spoken words
- We sing as a class as part of our daily class routine
- We sing the register
- We sing or use music to signal a change in activity
- We sing or use music as a warm up to a lesson
- We sing or use music when we come in from playtime
- Recorded music is used as a backdrop to other class work
- We have a song of the week
- We listen to music or sing to encourage good behaviour
- We sing occasionally as a class
- We sing as a class in assembly

- Children take turns to be the musical leader for the session
- Other types of musical leadership roles for the children to champion or organise music activities to the rest of the class
- Class talent show
- Special class music days/weeks
- Other

Which of the following *musical resources* do you use in your teaching, support or chosen role? (*please select all that apply*).*

- Multi-sensory resources
- Notation-based resources
- A musical learning programme e.g Dalcroze
- A published musical resource e.g. Music Express
- An online music teaching resource e.g Sing Up website
- I have devised my own musical learning programme
- Your own CDs/MP3 tracks
- Pupils' CDs/MP3 tracks
- Backing tracks
- Composing and recording software e.g. Sibelius, Garage Band or e-Jay
- Your own musical instrument
- Pupils' own or school loaned musical instruments
- Hand-held percussion instruments
- Body
- Voice/Singing
- Keyboards
- Steel band
- Recorders
- Other

In what ways do you *deliver* the musical activities in your teaching, support or chosen role? (please select all that apply).*

- Teacher-led delivery
- Peer-directed learning
- Self-directed learning
- Individual tasks
- Pairs
- Small groups
- Friendship groups
- Whole class/ whole group learning
- Improvisation
- Playing by ear
- Multi-sensory methods
- Notation based methods
- Across key stages
- Whole school learning
- With colleagues as part of a learning support programme
- With colleagues as part of a cross-curricular programme
- With colleagues as part of an arts programme
- With visiting community musicians
- With visiting peripatetic music instrumental teachers
- Other

On a scale of 1 to 5, please rate how *confident* you feel to use music in your own teaching, support or chosen role?

(1 = not at all confident, 5 = very confident)*

- 1 2 3 4 5

How important are the following factors in supporting or encouraging you to use music in your role? (Please rate their importance to you using the rating scale below).*

	Unimportant	Neither important or unimportant	Important	Very important
Academic research findings	()	()	()	()
Music training	()	()	()	()
Music resources	()	()	()	()
Funding	()	()	()	()
Time in the timetable	()	()	()	()
Physical space	()	()	()	()
Collaboration with music coordinators	()	()	()	()
Collaboration with colleagues already using music in their role	()	()	()	()

Collaboration with community musicians/peripatetic instrumental music teachers	()	()	()	()
Support from the Head Teacher and/or Senior Leadership Team	()	()	()	()
Support from parents	()	()	()	()

Are there any other factors that *encourage* you to use music in your teaching, support or chosen role?*

() Yes

() No

Please give details.*

Are there any factors that *discourage* you from using music in your teaching, support or chosen role?*

() Yes

() No

Please give details.*

How important are the following factors in your decision not to use music in your role? (Please rate their importance to you using the rating scale below).*

	Unimportant	Neither important or unimportant	Important	Very important
Music is taught by a music specialist in my school	()	()	()	()
Music is taught by the class teacher in my school	()	()	()	()
I do not feel confident to use music in my teaching/support work	()	()	()	()

I am not musically qualified	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I am not sure how to use music in my teaching/support work	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
There is not much support for music in my school	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

Are there any other factors that *discourage* you from using music in your teaching, support or chosen role?*

Yes

No

Please give details.*

Which of the following factors would *encourage* you to use music in your role in the future? (Please answer by rating their importance to you, using the rating scale below).*

	Unimportant	Neither important or unimportant	Important	Very important
More music training	()	()	()	()
More awareness/ knowledge of academic research findings	()	()	()	()
More music resources	()	()	()	()
More funding	()	()	()	()
More time in the timetable	()	()	()	()
Physical space	()	()	()	()
Collaboration with	()	()	()	()

music coordinators				
Collaboration with colleagues already using music in their role	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Collaboration with community musicians/ peripatetic instrumental music teachers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Support from the Head Teacher and/or Senior Management Team	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Support from parents	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Are there any other factors that might *encourage* you to use music in your teaching, support or chosen role?*

Yes

No

Please give details.*

The use of music in your school:

Has your school/chosen school been given any of the following specialist awards or status, or does it take part in any national music initiatives listed below? (*please select all that apply*).*

- Sing Up Platinum Award
- Sing Up Gold Award
- Sing Up Silver Award
- Sing Up (member but no award)
- Wider Opportunities
- Arts Mark Gold Award
- Arts Mark Silver Award
- Arts Mark Bronze Award
- Inclusion Mark
- A School of Creativity
- A Change School
- An Enquiry School
- Academy status
- Not sure
- None of the above

In what ways does your school use music? (*please select all that apply*).*

- For musical learning as part of the Primary National Curriculum
- To support literacy work

- To support numeracy work
- To develop attentive behaviour
- To support social development
- To support Individual Education Plans (IEPs)
- As a specific learning support intervention/activity
- As a creative context to explore other learning or cross-curricular topics
- To support creative learning
- To provide a calming environment for non-musical learning
- To provide a meaningful or enjoyable context for non-musical learning
- Not sure
- Other

**Does your school provide or encourage any of the following *musical opportunities*?
(please select all that apply).***

- Children make music with percussion instruments
- Children perform on their own instruments
- Children compose their own music
- Children can record their performances or their compositions
- Children can publish their musical work (e.g. online via school or a music education website)
- Children listen to music as a focussed listening activity as part of their music lesson
- Children listen to music as a focussed listening activity as part of non-music lessons
- Children play clapping games to sung or spoken words
- Music is used to signal a change in activity
- Music is used as a warm up to a lesson or activity
- We sing or use music when we come in from playtime
- Recorded music is used as a backdrop to other class work
- Music or singing is used to encourage good behaviour
- Children sing in music lessons
- Singing in assembly

- Singing in the playground
- We have a school song of the week
- School talent show
- School musical productions
- School choir
- School orchestra
- Other school music groups
- Musical leadership opportunities e.g. Singing ambassadors, music monitors, house music captains etc.
- Special music days/music weeks
- House music competitions
- Not sure
- Other

What type of *musical resources* does your school use? (*please select all that apply*).*

- Multi-sensory music resources
- Notation-based music resources
- A musical learning programme e.g Dalcroze
- A published musical resource e.g. Music Express
- An online music teaching resource e.g Sing Up website
- Teacher's CDs/MP3 tracks
- Pupils' CDs/MP3 tracks
- Backing tracks
- Composing and recording software e.g. Sibelius/Garage Band or e-Jay
- Teacher's own instruments
- Pupils' own or school loaned instruments
- Hand-held percussion instruments
- Voice
- Body
- Keyboards

- Steel Band
- Recorders
- Not sure
- Other

Does your school *deliver* its musical activities in any of the following ways? (*please select all that apply*).*

- Teacher-led delivery
- Peer-directed learning
- Self-directed learning
- Friendship groups
- Whole class learning
- Across Key Stages
- Whole school learning
- With colleagues as part of a specific learning support programme
- With colleagues as part of a cross-curricular programme
- With colleagues as part of an arts programme
- With visiting community musicians
- With visiting peripatetic instrumental teachers
- Through improvisation
- Playing by ear
- Multi-sensory methods
- Notation based methods
- Not sure
- Other

Using music as a specific resource to support children with SEN:

In your opinion, do children with SEN have equal access to the available opportunities for music in your school?*

'Access' may be defined here in two ways:

- 1) As having equal opportunity to attend all music lessons, special workshops, instrumental lessons, productions etc.
- 2) As having equal access to music-making opportunities within the music classroom or musical setting itself. This might be achieved through differentiation by task or by outcome or by using multi-sensory or specialist pedagogy, materials and resources.

Yes

No

Not sure

Please describe the ways you or your school ensure equal access to musical learning opportunities for children with SEN?*

In your opinion what are the factors that may prevent a child with SEN from gaining full access to musical opportunities?*

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Do you think it is important that children with SEN have equal access to music?*

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Are you aware of any research evidence that suggests that music might be a valuable resource in supporting the learning of children with SEN?*

- Yes
- No

Please describe briefly what research about music you have found that you feel might be useful to you in your work with children with SEN.*

On a scale of 1 to 5, please rate how *likely* you would be to consider using music as a *specific learning support resource* for children with SEN in your own teaching or support role or school (for respondents in non-teaching/support roles)? (1= *highly unlikely*, 5 = *highly likely*).*

A *specific learning support resource* might take the form of a musical intervention programme or be identified as a specific resource to support an Individual Education Plan.

- 1 2 3 4 5

On a scale of 1 to 5, please rate how *confident* you feel to use music as a *specific learning support resource* for children with SEN in your own teaching or support role, or school (for respondents in non-teaching/support roles)? (1 = *not at all confident*, 5 = *very confident*)*

- 1 2 3 4 5

Do you use music as a *specific learning support resource* to support children with SEN in your teaching or support role? (E.g. in support of Individual Education Plans, or as a specific musical intervention programme).*

- Yes
 No
 No but I would like to.

Please describe how you use music as a specific resource to support the learning of children with SEN in your teaching or support role.*

Does music offer any opportunities/benefits for these children in your view?*

Yes

No

Please describe what you perceive these opportunities/benefits to be.*

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Does music present any challenges for children with SEN?*

Yes

No

Not sure

Please describe what these challenges are in your opinion.*

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Do *you* face any challenges as a teacher or support worker when using music with children with SEN, either personally or professionally?*

Yes

No

Please describe the sorts of challenges you face in using music in this context.*

Are there any benefits that *you* feel you gain from using music to support children with SEN, either personally or professionally?*

Yes

No

Not sure

Please describe what you perceive these benefits to be.*

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Do you or your school receive any support to use music as a specific resource for children with SEN?

E.g. professional support (training, information, research evidence, Local Authority resources, County Music Service, professional organisations), resources (financial, space, time, materials) and personal support (Head or Senior Management team, SENCo).*

Yes

No

Please describe the nature of the support you receive.*

What do you think are the main reasons for this lack of support?*

Even though you use music to support children with SEN, are there any factors that *discourage* you from using music to support children with SEN in your teaching, support or chosen role?*

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Please describe the factors that *discourage* you from using music in this context.*

In summing up this section, what do you feel are the most important factors that *encourage* you to use music to support children with SEN?*

Does anyone else in your school use music as a *specific learning support resource* for children with SEN?*

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

Please give brief details of the ways in which colleagues in your school are using music to support children with SEN.*

Are there any factors that *discourage* you from using music to support children with SEN in your teaching, support or chosen role?*

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Please describe the factors that *discourage* you from using music in this context.*

Which of the factors you have described is the most important in discouraging you from using music in this context?*

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Is there anything that would *encourage* you to consider using music to support children with SEN in your teaching, support or chosen role?

(E.g. more research evidence, more resources, time, training, collaborative opportunity).*

Yes

No

Not sure

Please describe the factors that might *encourage* you to use music in your role to support children with SEN.*

Which of the factors you have described would be the most important in encouraging you to use music in your role to support children with SEN?*

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Does your *school* use music as a specific learning support resource? (E.g. in support of Individual Education Plans, or as a specific music intervention programme)*

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Please give details of how your school uses music as a specific learning support resource.*

In your opinion, what do you think are the reasons your school does not use music as a specific learning support resource?*

Are there any factors that *discourage* you from using music to support children with SEN in your teaching, support or chosen role?*

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Please describe the factors that *discourage* you from using music in this context.*

Which of the factors you have described is the most important in discouraging you from using music in this context?*

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Is there anything that would *encourage* you to consider using music to support children with SEN in your teaching, support or chosen role?

E.g. more research evidence, more resources, time, training, collaborative opportunity.*

Yes

No

Not sure

Please describe the factors that might *encourage* you to use music in your role to support children with SEN.*

Which of the factors you have described would be the most important in encouraging you to use music in your role to support children with SEN?*

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Does your *school* use music as a specific learning support resource? (E.g. in support of Individual Education Plans, or as a specific intervention programme)*

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Please give details of how your school uses music as a specific learning support resource.*

In your opinion, what do you think are the reasons your school does not use music as a specific learning support resource?*

Please give reasons for your answer.*

Do you have opportunities to collaborate with any of the following colleagues in meeting the needs of the children with SEN in your care? (*please select all that apply*).*

- Class Teachers
- In-school Music Coordinator
- SENCo
- Key Stage Coordinator
- Senior Management Team
- Visiting Peripatetic Instrumental Teacher
- Visiting Community Musician
- Visiting Learning Support Teacher
- None of the above
- Not applicable

Please give brief details of any *musical* collaboration.

Your musical background:

Have you participated in any of the following musical experiences either as a child or an adult? (please select all that apply).*

- Taught yourself to play an instrument
- Written your own songs/music
- Played music by ear (without notation)
- Busking
- Performed in a pop band or similar music group, or with friends
- Performed in a school or community orchestra
- Sung in a school or community choir
- Performed in school or community musical productions
- None of the above

Have you had any of the following forms of musical training either as a child or an adult? (please select all that apply).*

- Private instrumental or singing lessons
- Instrumental or singing lessons in class (e.g. recorder)
- Singing lessons in a church choir/choir school
- Learnt to play an instrument in a community band e.g. Brass Band or Salvation Army Band or similar
- Attended a junior conservatoire programme
- Studied music at a university/conservatoire
- Learnt to read music in school music lessons
- I have not had any formal music training

How long did your most concentrated period of musical training last for?*

- Less than 6 months
- 1 year
- 2 years
- 3 years
- 4 years
- 5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- More than 20 years

Broadly speaking, how long ago did this period of concentrated training take place?*

- In the last year
- 2- 5 years ago
- 6-10 years ago
- 11-15 years ago
- 16-20 years ago
- More than 20 years ago

Do you have any of the following music qualifications? (*please select all that apply*).*

- Instrumental examinations Grades 1-5
- Instrumental examinations Grades 6-8
- Theory exams 1-5
- Theory exams 6-8
- Performance/Directing/Teaching Diploma or higher or equivalent
- GCSE Music
- AS Music
- AS Music Technology

- A2 Music
- A2 Music Technology
- O Level Music
- A Level Music (pre AS/A2 level)
- CT ABRSM
- Music Teaching in Professional Practice (Mtp)
- Bachelor of Music degree
- Bachelor of Education with Music degree
- Joint Honours degree including Music
- Postgraduate Diploma in Performance
- MA in Music
- PhD in Music
- I do not have any formal music qualifications
- Other

Did you receive any musical training as part of your initial teacher training?*

- Yes
- No
- Not sure
- Not applicable

What did this musical training consist of?*

How much time was allocated to musical training in your initial teaching training programme?*

How long ago did this initial teacher training take place?*

- In the last year
- 2-3 years ago
- 3-4 years ago
- 5-10 years ago
- 10+ years ago

Have you received any musical training as part of any subsequent professional/staff training? E.g. Continuing Professional Development (CPD), INSET, SEN training?*

- Yes
- No

What did this musical training consist of, and who organised and funded it?*

How recently did this training take place?*

- In the last 3 months
- In the last 6 months
- In the last year
- 2-3 years ago
- 3-4 years ago
- 5+ years ago

Are you currently involved in any music-making activities or groups?*

Yes

No

Please give details of the type and frequency of any current musical involvement.*

Do you currently do any of the following musical activities?*

I go to live concerts/festivals

I listen to recorded music

I listen to music to relax

I listen to music when exercising

I like dancing to music

I like singing along to music

I like having music on in the background when I am doing other things

None of the above

Have your own musical experiences or training had any effect (positive or negative) on your use of music in your own teaching, support or chosen role, or your attitude towards its use in school (for those respondents in non-teaching/support roles)?*

Yes

No

In what ways have your musical experiences or training affected your use of music in your teaching, support or chosen role, or your attitude towards the use of music in school?*

Final thoughts

Please use the space below to provide any other comments you may like to make, concerning your experiences or views about the use of music to support children with SEN in mainstream primary education.

Thank You!

Appendix B - Telephone Interview Discussion Guide

Main questions

How is music used to support children with SEN in mainstream primary schools?

What are the key attitudes and issues that affect practice?

Investigative questions

How? - purpose, resources, delivery, ways of working, training/support, specific or non-specific use of music to support learning support objectives.

Why? - motivating/affecting factors - teachers' own musical interest, experience, knowledge, National Curriculum requirements, children/parental interest, school vision, internal/external support, alternative forms of learning, expression and assessment.

What are the key issues in using music as a learning support resource? - challenges and opportunities for SEN children, teachers, schools.

What are the outcomes? - for SEN children, for teachers/support workers, school.

How can music contribute to the drive towards early intervention? - existing support structures

What role can the Pupil Premium funding make to enable this to happen?

Interview Structure

A: CONTEXT AND WARM UP - teacher role, SEN responsibility, existing SEN provision in school, challenges for teachers and children.

B: ATTITUDES TO MUSIC - school, parents, SEN children's experience of music in school and everyday life.

C: TEACHER'S MUSICAL LEARNING EXPERIENCE, TRAINING, ATTITUDES AND USE OF MUSIC IN TEACHING AND /OR AS A SPECIFIC LEARNING SUPPORT RESOURCE

Teachers' musical learning experience, teacher training, musical confidence, effects on practice.

Use of music in own teaching, affecting factors.

Use of music as a specific learning support resource or more general ad hoc use, affecting factors.

D: WIDER POLICY CONTEXT

Early intervention strategies in school, local authority or govt policy.

Pupil premium - funding for musical training, resources etc.

How can music fit into existing SEN and school working structures and practices.

Government emphasis on teacher freedom - opportunities and challenges for music.

TELEPHONE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this telephone interview, which I am also conducting with other survey participants. I know I have received your written consent to participate in this interview, but would you mind confirming for the purposes of this recording that you are happy for me to record this interview? Thank you. Your comments will be kept confidential and reported anonymously.

As I mentioned in my email, the purpose of this interview is to find out more detail about your attitudes towards the use of music to support children with special educational needs (or SEN) in mainstream primary education, and how this affects your own practice. The interview will follow similar lines to the survey but in more depth. Forgive me if I cover questions you feel you have already answered in the survey, but because of the way the survey was set up to preserve anonymity, I have no way of knowing from the survey who has answered what! So please bear with me!

I want to start by asking a few quick general questions about your role (s), work setting and involvement with children with SEN which will provide the context for the interview; and then I want to move on to ask you some more specific questions about your current practice and your views on the role of music in supporting children with SEN. The interview should take about 45 minutes (and you can withdraw at any time without giving a reason.) and will be transcribed for analysis. OK? [Address issue of multiple or past roles as appropriate]

SURVEY FEEDBACK

But before I do, I wanted to ask you if completing the survey had raised any issues or areas of interest that you might like to raise in this interview? Did you spend quite a lot of time on specific areas of the survey compared to others?

OK + linking comment into the next section dependent on answers given.

E.g. That's very interesting perhaps we can look at that as we go through the interview/
at the end of the interview/ or in the part where I will be asking you about x

PART ONE: INDIVIDUAL AND SCHOOL CONTEXT

INDIVIDUAL ROLE AND INTERACTION WITH SEN CHILDREN

Q.1. I wonder if could we start by thinking about your school? Could you tell me a little about your school?

Prompts/follow up questions

Rural/urban

large/small school

Voluntary aided?

intake - mixed, high EAL, white

special awards

any particular issues or targets for improvement

school vision

Q.2 And what about your own role? Can you tell me a little about your work?

Prompts/follow up questions

What roles do you have as part of your daily work?

How long have you been in your role (s)?

How long have you been a teacher or support worker?

What year groups do you teach/support?

DON'T FOCUS ON ONE ROLE BUT CONSIDER THE REMAINDER OF THE INTERVIEW IN THE DIFFERENT ROLES MENTIONED - NOTE THE ROLES DOWN AND REFER TO THEM.

Q.3. How many children with SEN do you teach?

Q.4. What type of needs do these children have?

Q.5. Broadly, can you describe how this affects their learning experience in school?

SCHOOL PROVISION FOR SEN CHILDREN

Q.6. How does your school normally support these children?

Prompts/follow ups

School vision/ethos

School Action

School Action Plus

Statement of SEN,

Planning,

Training,

Ways of working - whole school, across key stages, cross-curricular.

Q.7. And what are you expected to do in your own role to support children with SEN?

Prompts/follow ups

Planning,

Ways of working - whole school, across key stages, cross-curricular.

Q.8. What support do you receive to do this?

Prompts/follow ups

Training

TAs/ other in-class support

SENCO support

Collaboration across key stages or within year group

External training or visiting support

Professional networks

Internet support

Q.9. What do you think are the main challenges facing children with SEN in mainstream schools in your experience? Why?

Q.10. How do you try to meet those challenges?

Prompts/follow ups

Own practice,

Planning - integration of action points from IEPs, School Action or Action Plus registers

Resources,

Collaboration across key stages or year groups, with specialists, cross-curricular

Deployment of TA or specialist support

Q.11. How does this affect you professionally and personally?

Prompts/follow ups

Managing expectations

Personal challenges

Opportunities for development, creativity

PART TWO: MUSICAL EXPERIENCES, TRAINING AND USE OF MUSIC IN TEACHING GENERALLY AND AS A SPECIFIC RESOURCE FOR CHILDREN WITH SEN

That's very interesting. Thank you for providing all that information. It provides a useful backdrop for the second part of this interview. I now want to move on to look at how music is viewed, used and experienced in your school, particularly for children with SEN. Then I would be interested to hear about your own views, experiences and use of music in your practice and the ways in which music might be able to support the non-musical learning of children with SEN. So let's start by thinking about the children with SEN in your school.

MUSICAL EXPERIENCES OF CHILDREN WITH SEN

Q.12. Do you think music plays an important part in the everyday lives of the children you teach/support with SEN?

Prompts/follow ups

At school or home

In what ways?

Musical identity

Friendship groups

Social inclusion/belonging

Self expression

Creativity

Q.13. How would you describe the musical learning experiences of children with SEN in your school?

Prompts/follow ups

Access to musical opportunities - same as their peers/different, positive/negative

Participation opportunities: Class music, instrumental lessons, Wider Opportunities, Sing Up, school productions.

Accessibility of musical teaching and resources - same/different - How do you know?

Q.14. And how do they respond to the musical opportunities provided in your school?

Prompts/follow ups

What do they get excited about?

What do they get out of it?

What do they find hard/easy musically?

How does it affect their experience of school?

ATTITUDES TO MUSIC IN SCHOOL

Q.15. How is music viewed in your school?

Prompts/follow ups

Head and SMT, teachers, parents, governors

What would change negative attitudes towards music?

Q.16. How do the parents of children with SEN view music in your school?

Q.17. What is the effect of music on school life?

TEACHER'S USE OF MUSIC IN OWN TEACHING

Q.18. How do you use music in your normal teaching/support work, if at all?

YES Prompts/follow ups

Why? What motivates you to use music? Own experience/research knowledge/children's views/behaviour/ requests/ opportunities it offers.

Did you decide to do this yourself or are you required to do this as part of a school plan or policy.

How? Frequency? Purpose?

Are you typical in your school or amongst your teaching colleagues in your use of music?

What pressures do you face in using music? Children, Head teacher, SMT, colleagues, parents, governors.

NO Prompts/follow ups

Why not? Do you find anything difficult or challenging?

Would you be willing to use music in your teaching?

What would help you to use music in your teaching?

Do your colleagues use music in their teaching? How do they use it?

Q.19. What musical support do you receive?

In-school or external?

Music subject leader, community musicians, music service?

Collaborative, cross-curricular, shared teaching, lesson observation, participating in music lessons alongside children e.g. Widening Opportunities

Q.20. How does this compare to the support you receive to help you with your SEN provision or for other subjects?

Q.21. How do SEN children respond when non-musical learning is presented musically?

Is this different to when you present learning without using music?

Q.22. Can music play a role in supporting the non-musical learning of children with SEN?

Prompts/follow ups

How?

Why?

Why not?

Q.23. Is music considered a valuable learning resource in school?

Prompts/follow ups

In your school?

Generally in education?

Why?

Can you give some examples?

Q.24. On a personal level, in what ways might you use music in your lesson planning, if at all?

Prompts/follow ups

As a specific resource to help achieve a specific learning objective for the class or an individual child?

E.g. To help you support identified objectives as part of their individual education plan or action plan? For example, singing nursery rhymes to help learn about rhyming syllables?

Or to help develop listening and watching skills by playing musical instruments together in a group?

YES - SPECIFIC USE FOLLOW UPS

What do you do?

Why do you do this? What results do you see?

How far in advance do you plan your use of music?

Do you plan your use of music with anyone else?

Is your use of music considered by your school as a valid part of your planning and assessment work? Or is this something you have done by yourself or with the help and support of others?

How is your specific use of music to target non-musical learning valued by children, parents and colleagues?

LESS SPECIFIC USE-FOLLOW UPS

How would you use music in this instance?

Have you ever considered using it as a planned resource to support children with SEN?

What prevents you from doing so?

What would help you use music in your planning?

If you did use music as a specific resource how would you use it?

How would it be viewed in school, by parents and children?

NO SPECIFIC USE- FOLLOW UPS

Why? What prevents you from doing so?

What would help you use music in your planning?

If you did use music as a specific resource how would you use it?

How would it be viewed in school, by parents and children?

Turning to your own experience of music now.....

TEACHER'S MUSICAL EXPERIENCE/TRAINING/ CONFIDENCE

Q.25. On a personal level, does music play an important part in your everyday life?

Prompts/follow ups

How?

Is it important to you? Why?

Q.26. How would you describe your own musical learning experience?

Prompts/follow ups

Level, frequency/quantity and content of Musical training - private tuition, school, university, teacher training, CPD

Positive and negative aspects

Musical identity

Career choices

Q.27. How well did the musical content of your initial teacher training prepare you for teaching music in the classroom?

Prompts/follow ups

Why? What was good/bad?

How long ago did you train?

How much musical training did you receive?

What did it consist of?

What do you wish you had?

Q.28. In what ways have your own musical experiences affected your attitude towards or your confidence to use music in your teaching?

Prompts/follow ups

How?

Why?

Has your musical training been of any use to you as a teaching resource or do you see it as something separate - a hobby or something you did years ago as a child?

Low confidence - What would help you boost your musical confidence? Do you think your colleagues have similar feelings about using music in their teaching?

High confidence - Would you like more musical training or support? Do you think you are typical in your school? What would help colleagues who are less confident to use music in their teaching than you?

WIDER CONTEXT

Q.29. In your opinion, in what ways might music have a role to play in early intervention strategies?

Prompts/follow ups

How?

Why?

Government policies - pupil premium, every child a reader, early identification on entry to school

Q.30. How could music be fitted into the existing ways of working and support structures for children with SEN in your school?

Prompts/follow ups

What would you need to achieve this?

Q.31. In your opinion, would the Pupil Premium be useful in helping to provide funding for musical training, resources or expertise as part of early intervention strategies in your school?

Prompts/follow ups

How?

Why?

Q.32. So in conclusion, what place do you think music has in supporting the individual learning needs of children with SEN?

Prompts/follow ups

What needs to happen/change?

What existing skills, knowledge, and experience could you draw on as individuals, in school or externally?

Given the current emphasis on giving teachers more freedom to design their own teaching do you think this provides an opportunity or challenge for a wider role for music in the curriculum?

Q33. Is there anything else you feel I have missed out that is important to you and would like to mention?

WRAPPING UP

Thank you very much for your time today. You have given me a lot of valuable information. I might need to come back to you to clarify or check answers, would you be happy for me to do that? YES/NO

Thinking ahead, to the next stage, as I mentioned in my email, I am hoping to observe some examples of practice in the classroom. I may not be able to observe everyone but it would be very useful to know in advance if you would be happy to participate in this. YES/NO

THANK YOU.

Appendix C – List of Participants

A001	Peripatetic teacher – bespoke literacy support project
A002	Deputy Head
A003	In-school music specialist
A004	Class teacher/ peripatetic teacher
A005	National Programme Manager – bespoke singing project
A006	External Learning Support specialist
A007	Head of Speech, Language & Communication Needs (SLCN) mainstream unit
A008	Excluded
A009	Class teacher/ music subject leader
A010	SEND music specialist – working in mainstream and special schools
A011	Project Facilitator – bespoke singing project
A012	Head of a deaf and hearing impaired mainstream unit
A013	SEND music specialist – CD resource
A014	Head teacher
A015	Excluded
A016	Excluded
A017	Inclusion manager
A018	Excluded
A019	Vocal leader – bespoke singing project
MS001a	Head of Arts Service
MS001b	Head of Music Service
MS001c	SEND music specialist
MS002a	Music Service Manager
MS002b	Music Service Manager
MS003	Head of Music Service