

Chapter 1

Introduction

The aims and rationale of this book

- Michael: Just play it once, just play it once.
- Ross: I'll go (plays guitar riff).
- Michael: You don't need to play that, so when I go (starts to play) if you be silent (guitar plays) and then you go silent for (bass plays).
- Ross: I know! So I'll just go (guitar plays).
- Billy: Are we going to have to do chords?
- Ross: Yeah, what we doing after that bit?
- Michael: Work out the first bit first. If we get the first bit done, so at least we can perform, and then (inaudible). 'Cause we're still not sure what Ross is doing.
All start attempting to play/improvise on their instruments.
CD comes on. They play along with the CD.
- Billy: It's too loud.
- Michael: So when I go (plays guitar) you be silent, 'cause it's quite hard.
- Ross: Come on, shall we just start again, shall we just listen to it?
- Billy: We're only doing the first one though aren't we?
CD comes on again.
- Michael: Drums don't come in yet.
- Ross: You play five, you don't need to do that.

(Broadacres High School, concealed field recording)

The above extract is from a 'fly-on-the-wall' recording of a group of 13- to 14-year-old pupils working together in a school practice room. They were taking part in a research and development project which introduced and evaluated new pedagogical methods in the music classroom. The project's approach derived from a study of the informal learning practices of popular musicians (Green 2002a), and represented an attempt – which might at first seem an impossible task or a contradiction in terms – to bring informal music learning practices into the formal environment of the school classroom. The project became part of a major national music education programme in England called 'Musical Futures', and the resulting teaching strategies and curriculum resources are already available for teachers' use (Green with Walmsley 2006; <www.musicalfutures.org/PractionersResources.html>). But the aim of this book is to present a more detailed and theoretical analysis of what went on during the project, how things occurred, why, and what benefits and challenges the project seemed to offer to music education.

The book considers how pedagogy in the music classroom could draw upon the world of informal popular music learning practices outside the school, in order to recognize, foster and reward a range of musical skills and knowledge that have not previously been emphasized in music education. It investigates how far it is possible

and desirable to incorporate informal music learning practices into formal music education; how the incorporation of such practices can affect young teenagers' skill and knowledge acquisition processes, and how such practices can change the ways pupils listen to, understand and appreciate music in and beyond the classroom. It raises questions about pupils' motivations towards music education, their autonomy as learners, and their capacity to work co-operatively together without instructional guidance from teachers.

In so doing, it considers how informal practices can affect teachers' approaches and perspectives in ways that we have, as music educators, often left unquestioned or taken for granted. Bringing informal learning practices into a school environment is challenging for teachers. It can appear to throw up conflicts with their existing views of professionalism, and may at times seem to run against official educational discourses, pedagogical methods and curricular requirements. But I hope to show that any conflict is more apparent than real. For informal learning practices can introduce fresh, constructive ways for music teachers to understand and approach their work, and worthwhile new perspectives on pupils' capacities and needs. Through examining such issues, the book touches on further current debates about pedagogy as well as curriculum, offering grounded examples and discussions of alternative approaches to classroom work and classroom relations, that may have relevance to a variety of curriculum subjects.

In the pupils' words quoted above, we can glimpse many of the themes that will be considered in greater depth as the book goes along. The task they were engaged in had not been broken down into a series of progressively demanding steps, but instead they were holistically approaching a piece of 'real-world', professionally produced music. They had no notation or other form of written instructions in front of them, but were using their ears to copy what they heard on a CD. Only one of them had any previous experience of instrumental tuition, yet they were all attempting to communicate instructions and ideas to each other through musical gestures and sounds; and were engaging in embryonic instrumental performance and improvisational skills. They had been given no instruction to analyse the music, yet they were beginning to listen structurally, observe entries and count repetitions. There was no teacher in the room, yet they were focused on the task. They had not been given separate or explicit roles, but were co-operating as a group, and trying to sort out what one of them should do as they worked towards a performance. Most importantly, perhaps, they had been given no guidance about how to approach the task, but they were engaging in self-directed, co-operative learning. Not only had they selected the content of the curriculum themselves – that is, the song that they were copying – but they were also responsible for organizing and structuring their own teaching and learning strategies.

Pupil motivation and take-up of music as a curriculum subject have never been high or widespread. Over the last forty years or so, music educators have made radical shifts towards raising motivation and widening participation. This has involved re-thinking the role of music as a minority subject that catered mainly for the success of children who took instrumental lessons, and that focused centrally on classical and folk music, singing and musical literacy. Music educators, along with teachers in many other subjects, have challenged the notion of education as a stable

body of knowledge and skills which are unquestioningly possessed by teachers, and which should be imparted to pupils, regardless of whether such knowledge and skills are equally useful, relevant or valid for all pupils, or whether all pupils are equally capable of absorbing them. This challenge has included closing the gap between 'high' and 'low' musical cultures, and between 'Western' and 'non-Western' musics, and has involved recognizing and valuing pupils' 'own' musical cultures by bringing them into the curriculum.¹

However, until recently one area within music education has remained relatively unaffected – that of pedagogy. For although the above changes brought in a huge range of music as new curriculum *content*, this new content was largely approached through traditional teaching *methods*. Thus a new gap opened up, particularly in the realm of popular, as well as jazz and 'world' musics. For whilst a huge range of such musics have entered the curriculum, the *processes* by which the relevant musical skills and knowledge are passed on and acquired in the world outside the school, have been left behind. These processes in most cases differ fundamentally from the processes by which skills and knowledge tend to be passed on and acquired in formal music education settings. In this sense, popular, jazz and world musics – and indeed other previous curriculum content including folk and traditional musics, and even in some ways classical music itself – have been present in the school more as a simulacrum of the real thing than the real thing itself.

Many young people who go on to become skilful and successful popular musicians report that the music education they received at school was unhelpful, or worse, detrimental. For some, instrumental lessons, even in popular music genres, also provided a negative and often short-lived experience (see, for example, Green 2002a, pp. 127–76). We can surmise that many children and young people who fail and drop out of formal music education, far from being either uninterested or unmusical, simply do not respond to the kind of instruction it offers. But until very recently, music educators have not recognized or rewarded the approaches involved in informal music learning, nor have they been particularly aware of, or interested in, the high levels of enthusiasm and commitment to music displayed by young popular or other vernacular musicians.

1 Scandinavian countries are probably among the first and most far-reaching in bringing popular music into the school curriculum. See, for example, Vakeva (2006), Stålhammar (2000, 2003), Faulkner (2003), Tagg (1998). For history, information, critical accounts and arguments concerning the entrance of popular music into the curriculum in the UK, see, for example, Swanwick (1968, 1992), Vulliamy (1977a and 1977b), Vulliamy and Lee (1976 and 1982), Green (1988, 2003); Shepherd and Vulliamy (1994), Gammon (1999), Byrne and Sheridan (2000), Lamont et al. (2003) and Odam (2004). For Australia, Malaysia, the USA, Hong Kong, Thailand and Japan respectively, see, for example, Wemyss (1999, 2004), Marsh (1995, 1999), Dunbar-Hall and Wemyss (2000), Dunbar-Hall (1996), Shah (2006), Ginocchio (2001), Humphreys (2004), Herbert and Campbell (2000), Newsom (1998), Ho (1999), Maryprasith (1999) and Koizumi (2002). For general discussions of popular music in education, see for example, Rodriguez (2004), Lines (2005a) or the special issues of the journals *Research Studies in Music Education* 13 (1999) and *International Journal of Music Education* no. 36 (2000).

In my previous book, *How Popular Musicians Learn*, I investigated popular musicians' informal learning practices, specifically with a view to what those practices could tell us as music educators. From my findings I hypothesized that such learning practices could possibly enhance motivation and increase a range of musical skills, in ways that were largely missing from pedagogy and from the school curriculum. I also considered that such practices could make music education more inclusive for pupils of all abilities and backgrounds, particularly those who have found it difficult or impossible to make their musicality shine in formal environments. In addition, I had observed that popular musicians seem to have a wide appreciation and respect for a range of musical styles going beyond the familiar, perhaps more so than other people of the same age who are not musicians. Therefore, I hypothesized that through informal ways of approaching music-learning, school pupils could also be brought to expand their appreciation of music, both in relation to what they already know and to what lies beyond it. Through this, the approaches could, I believed, help to demystify the world of music, including its commercial manifestations, making pupils more confident of their own musicality in relation to notions of musical value and musical ability, more discerning, or more 'musically critical'.

The final chapter of that book put forward a number of suggestions for adopting and adapting informal popular music learning practices within various formal music education settings, not as a substitute, but as a complement running side by side with existing approaches. The project on which the present book is based gave the opportunity to try out some of those suggestions in practice, within school classrooms.²

For the remainder of this introductory chapter I will first briefly discuss the main characteristics of informal popular music learning practices as these occur outside the school. Then I will explain in general terms how these characteristics were incorporated into the aims and strategies of the project, and will situate the project in relation to the historical context of music education in the present day. Finally I will outline the research methods used.

2 Increasing numbers of projects are, each in their different ways, currently bringing informal music learning practices into formal settings. For work in classrooms, see, for example: in Scotland, Byrne (2005) and Byrne and Sheridan (2000); in Holland, Evelein (2006); in the USA, Boespflug (2004), Emmons (2004), Jaffurs (2004), Seifried (2006) and Harwood (1998a, 1998b), and in Australia, Wemyss (1999). For work relating to instrumental music teaching in Scotland, see, for example, Cope (1998, 1999) and Cope and Smith (1997). For work in the 'non-formal' sector, also known as 'community music', see Renshaw (2005). For general discussions of informal learning within formal music education, see, for example, Folkestad (2005), O'Flynn (2006) and Westerlund (2006), and with reference to jazz at the HE level, Nielsen (2006). Information about such developments at a national level in the UK is available in Price (2005, 2006a and 2006b) and DfES (2006).

Background research: how popular musicians learn

The exact ways in which popular musicians go about acquiring their skills and knowledge vary between different sub-styles of popular music, different social and cultural contexts, and from one individual learner to another – the more so precisely because of the general lack of formal systematization involved in such learning. Increasing numbers of popular music learners nowadays are taking advantage of formal provision such as instrumental lessons on electric guitars, drums and other instruments that are almost wholly associated with popular music, and for which it would have been difficult to find a professional, formal teacher even a few decades ago. Some musicians nowadays also take national qualifications, from elementary exams right up to post-graduate degrees in popular music. There is in addition fast-growing provision through community music networks and many other organizations outside formal education, which is often referred to as ‘non-formal’ music education. However, such formal and non-formal provisions still mainly act as supplements or extensions to popular musicians’ informal practices. These informal practices continue to form the essential core of most popular musicians’ learning, and run alongside any additional formal or non-formal activities. Overall, in spite of differences between sub-styles of popular music, context, provision and individual musicians, informal popular music learning practices are undertaken, in one way or another, by nearly all popular musicians in nearly all sub-styles of popular music, in ways that can be characterized by a number of generalizable features.³

‘Enculturation’, or immersion in the music and musical practices of one’s environment, is a fundamental factor that is common to all aspects of music learning, whether formal or informal. However, enculturation plays a more prominent part in some learning practices and with relation to some styles of music than others. In the traditional music of many countries, young children are drawn into group music-making activities on a daily basis, both within the home and beyond, almost from birth. Through being included in music-making by adults and older children around them, they pick up musical skills in ways that are similar to how they pick up linguistic skills.⁴ These skills include all three of the main ways by which we engage with music: performing (whether playing or singing, even at a basic level), creating (whether composing or improvising) and listening (to ourselves and/or to others).

3 There is a growing literature on how popular musicians learn. One of the earliest and most thorough investigations was by H. Stith Bennett (1980). Also see Bayton (1997), Berkaak (1999), Björnberg (1993), Campbell (1995), Clawson (1999a, 199b), Cohen (1991), Davis (2005), Finnegan (1989), Green (2002a), Horn (1984), Kirshner (1998), Lilliestam (1996) and Negus (1999). For work in hip-hop, Jamaican dance culture and jazz respectively, which have many similarities as well as differences, see, for example, Dimitriadis (2001), Stolzoff (2000), Berliner (1994) and Monson (1996). The remainder of the current sub-section of this book is a rewritten version of Green (2004), and originates in Green (2002a).

4 For classic texts on enculturation and learning in traditional musical contexts, see Merriam (1964), Blacking (1976) and Nketia (1975). For discussions of the concept in relation to formal education, see, for example, Barrett (1996), Nettle (1983, pp. 323–5), Kwami (1989), Campbell (1998), McCarthy (1999) and Nwezi (1999).

Most folk and traditional musics of the world are learnt by enculturation and extended immersion in listening to, watching and imitating the music and the music-making practices of the surrounding community. In some folk and traditional musics, as well as in art musics of the world such as Indian classical music, and to a large extent in jazz, there are also systems of ‘apprenticeship training’ whereby young musicians are introduced, and explicitly trained or just generally helped by an individual adult or a ‘community of expertise’.⁵ In such environments, older musicians might provide specific guidance, as in a ‘master–apprentice’ or ‘guru–shishya’ relationship; or they may allow learners to ‘sit in’ with a band or join a group of older musicians, as in jazz or African drumming. Most importantly, the older musicians act as expert musical models whom learners can talk to, listen to, watch and imitate.

Popular musicians also tend to acquire musical skills and knowledge, first and foremost through being encultured in, and experimenting with, the music which they are familiar with, which they like, and which they hear around and about them. This involves early experimentation with an instrument or the voice, and discovering what different sounds they can make through trial and error, before stringing sounds together into embryonic musical phrases, rhythms or harmonies.

However, there are some crucial differences between how most folk and traditional musics are passed on, and how most Western popular musics are passed on – differences which it is tempting to overlook, but which are very significant for music education. They include, firstly, the fact that, unlike in most folk and traditional fields, most young popular musicians in Western or Westernized musical cultures are not regularly surrounded by an adult community of practising popular musicians who they can talk to, listen to, watch and imitate, or who initiate them into relevant skills and knowledge. Hence young popular musicians tend to engage in a significant amount of *solitary* learning. Secondly, in so far as a community of practice *is* available to young popular musicians, it tends to be a community of peers rather than ‘master-musicians’ or adults with greater skills. The significance of this is profound, as it affects the entire way in which skills and knowledge are transmitted in the popular music field, taking the onus of transmission away from an authority figure, expert or older member of the family or community, and putting it in large measure into the hands of groups of young learners themselves.

By far the overriding learning practice for most popular musicians, as is already well known and is also clear from existing studies, is to copy recordings by ear. It seems an extraordinary fact that this practice has developed in only the eighty or ninety years that have elapsed since the spread of recording technologies, across many countries of the world, through the activities of children and young people, basically in isolation from each other, outside of any networking or formal structures, and largely without adult guidance. I wish to distinguish between two extreme ways of conceiving of this practice, each situated at the opposite ends of a pole. At one extreme there is what I call ‘purposive listening’ (Green 2002a), that is, listening

5 See Lave and Wenger (1991) for elaboration of this concept. For discussions of apprenticeship learning in relation to music, see the references in note 4, and Nketia (1975), Merriam (1964, pp. 150–61) and Campbell (1991).

with the conscious purpose of adopting and adapting what is heard into one's own practices. At the opposite extreme there is 'distracted listening'. This occurs when music is heard in the background, but is not attended to in a focused way, so that it enters the mind almost entirely through unconscious enculturation. Not only purposive listening, but also distracted listening carry on beyond the early learning stages and into professional realms.

Copying recordings is almost always a solitary activity, but as already indicated, solitude is not a distinguishing mark of the popular music learner. On the contrary, group activities occurring in the absence of adult supervision or guidance are of great importance. They are characterized by two aspects. One is 'peer-directed learning'. This involves the conscious sharing of knowledge and skills, or even explicit peer teaching, through, for example, demonstration of a rhythm or chord by one group member for the benefit of another. The other aspect is 'group learning', where there is no *conscious* demonstration or teaching as such, but where learning takes place through watching and imitation during music-making, as well as talking about music during and outside of rehearsals.

Bands are formed at very early stages, even if the players have little control over their instruments and virtually no knowledge of any chord progressions, licks or songs; or even if they have no instruments to play. Often they start up a band or a series of bands within a few months of beginning to play their instrument, mostly in their mid- to later teenage years. Schools are a vital social institution to band formation, even though many bands start up without the aid of teachers. For the resources of the school, any instruments or practice spaces that it can provide, and more importantly, its ready-to-hand population of hundreds of pupils, are crucial. However, although early bands are nearly always formed with peers, age is less important than musical ability, or in other words, the fact that the band-members should all be at a roughly similar standard.

Most bands involve themselves in a range of practices including jamming and other forms of improvisation, playing covers they know and like, and making up their own music. As already indicated, conscious and unconscious peer-directed learning and group learning take place: different band members will demonstrate learnt or original musical ideas to each other, and players will engage in joint compositions that often involve every member of the band putting in their own ideas. Therefore performance, composition and improvisation abilities are acquired, not only individually, but crucially, as members of a group, through informal peer-directed learning and group learning, both conscious and unconscious. As indicated earlier, all this mainly occurs in the absence of an adult or other person who can provide leadership or bring greater musical experience to bear.

It is well known that notation plays hardly any part in the popular music world, although it is used in a few cases such as highly professional function or theatre bands, or in an occasional manner such as when a musician scribbles something down on a piece of paper (usually to be screwed up and binned as soon as the instruction is internalized). Session musicians are more likely to have constant work if they can read. But the main means of learning and passing on music is through recordings, either commercial ones or 'demos' passed between the musicians. Even when notation *is* used, it is never used on its own, but is always heavily mixed in

with purposive listening and copying. It is reasonable to suppose that less than 40 per cent of pop musicians may know how to read notation – although I am not aware of any recent research on this – mostly having been introduced to it through some amount of formal music education. However, even given this adult guidance, when operating in the informal realm the musicians none the less tend to adapt any notational skills to their own use in highly idiosyncratic ways.

Aural copying of course pays attention to a number of factors which are not readily communicated through notation. These include idiosyncratic and non-standardized timbres, rhythmic flexibility, pitch inflection and many other aspects, not least those never-to-be-defined but always recognizable qualities, groove, ‘feel’ and swing. Here again, not only conscious, focused, purposive listening and copying, but also loose imitation related to continuous, unconscious enculturation and distracted listening, are relied upon as essential parts of the learning process, and continue to be the principal means through which music is transmitted and reproduced throughout a popular musician’s career.

The concept of technique as a *conscious* aspect of controlling the instrument or voice comes late to most popular musicians, and is in many cases incorporated into their activities either immediately before or some time after becoming professional. However, having taught themselves to play their instruments or sing in their own ways, the adoption of standard techniques at a late stage comes with surprising ease.

As distinct from the executive psycho-motor *technique* involved in playing or singing, the musicians also acquire, to varying degrees, knowledge and understanding of musical *technicalities*, or ‘theory’. Such knowledge and understanding usually come haphazardly, according to whatever music is being played and enjoyed at the time. To begin with, the musicians are able to use musical elements in stylistically appropriate ways, but usually without being able to apply names to them, or to discuss them in any but vague or metaphorical terms. As listening is the prime source of learning, working out the relationships between sounds follows on from that. Thus learning about theory tends to be led by excitement about the music. As time goes by, the pieces of the jigsaw puzzle fall into place, to differing degrees depending on the individual, and can of course lead to highly sophisticated levels of theoretical knowledge and understanding. Not surprisingly, all this emphasis on listening also leads to the development of perceptive and effective aural capacities.

Some musicians practise their instruments for five or six hours a day in the early stages of learning, others practise for considerably less time, and some hardly ever practise at all. They tend to approach practice according to their mood, other commitments in life, or motivation by external factors such as joining a new band or composing a new song. Their development is in many cases marked by some periods of relatively intensive practice, interspersed with other periods without any practice at all. Most importantly, practice is something they do only so long as they enjoy it.

Along with these learning practices go attitudes towards musical value and musical ability that tend to emphasize expressive qualities such as ‘feel’, ‘sensitivity’, ‘spirit’ or other similar attributes over and above complexity or technical ability. Popular musicians also place high value on friendship amongst themselves, tolerance, shared taste, and commitment. I am not suggesting that all young popular musicians are exceptionally well-balanced individuals who never have arguments;

but that co-operation, sensitivity to others, commitment and responsibility are explicitly highly *valued* by the musicians. Furthermore, this emphasis on friendship and commitment concerns not only the social relationships that surround the band practice or performance, but are necessary conditions of two further aspects. One is that, since the music being played is arrived at through choice and group negotiation, all the productive activities of the band are reliant on a consensus of taste, and/or the willingness to tolerate the potentially differing tastes of others, as well as the ability to co-operate and the responsibility of arriving at rehearsals and gigs at the correct place and time, bringing the correct equipment. Without such co-operation (especially in the absence of incentives such as fame and money, but even *with* such incentives), a band will eventually disintegrate. A second aspect is that friendship, co-operation and the ability to be sensitive to other people also affect the precise nature and ‘feel’ of the music being produced, in ways that relate to musical communication in performance, and particularly to group composition and improvisation.

Playing popular music in a band tends to raise the self-esteem and the perceived peer group status of the participants. The values surrounding their music and the musicians in their group are intimately tied up with deeply felt issues of personal identity. Finally, one thing that all popular musicians unfailingly report is the extremely high levels of enjoyment that accompany their music-making and music-learning activities. As I mentioned earlier, in the informal realm there is no imperative to practice unless they feel like practising, no teacher or parent telling them they must do it, no homework, no tests or exams, no coursework. Not only do popular musicians love what they are doing, but also from such a starting point many of them go on to develop a deep passion for music and a thirst for listening, often seeking out and becoming familiar with a wide range of different styles, including classical music.

The underlying principles of the project

With all the above in mind, I devised a pedagogical project which aimed to investigate whether it would be possible and beneficial to bring at least some aspects of informal popular music learning practices into the realms of the school classroom.⁶ The first step was to locate some defining characteristics of informal popular music learning practices, and to consider how they differ from formal educational approaches. Drawing from the research described above, I formed these characteristics into five fundamental principles, which were placed at the heart of the project.

6 As indicated in the Acknowledgements, the early stages of the project were indebted to funding from the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation. Its further development was possible thanks to the Paul Hamlyn Foundation’s ‘Musical Futures’ project, in which it formed a partnership with the Hertfordshire Music Service. We also had support from the UK Department for Education and Skills Innovation Unit. A large number of other institutions and individuals were involved in many different ways as the project proceeded, many of whom are named in the Acknowledgements. The teachers’ resource that arose from the project is available in Green with Walmsley (2006), and can be downloaded from <www.musicalfutures.org/PractionersResources.html>, Section 2. Information about the ‘Musical Futures’ project as a whole is available on <www.musicalfutures.org>.

Perhaps the prime factor is that informal learning always starts with music which the learners choose for themselves. Therefore, it tends to be music which they already know and understand, like, enjoy and identify with. This is distinct from most formal educational settings, in which the main idea is to introduce learners to music that they do *not* already know, and which is usually selected by the teacher.

Secondly, the main method of skill-acquisition in the informal realm involves copying recordings by ear. This is very different to learning through notation, or some other form of written or verbal instructions and exercises lying beyond the music itself. Although teachers in the music classroom employ a wide variety of approaches, aural copying from a recording has rarely, if ever, been amongst them, at least until very recently.

Thirdly, informal learning takes place alone as well as alongside friends, through self-directed learning, peer-directed learning and group learning. This involves the conscious and unconscious acquisition and exchange of skills and knowledge by listening, watching, imitating and talking. Unlike the pupil-teacher relationship in formal education, there is little or no adult supervision and guidance. Along with this, friendship and identification with a social group such as a particular sub-culture or other markers of social identity form an important part in the choice of music to be played. These factors are also central to negotiation over music-making and music-learning practices amongst the members of the band.

Fourthly, skills and knowledge in the informal realm, not surprisingly given the above, tend to be assimilated in haphazard, idiosyncratic and holistic ways, starting with 'whole', 'real-world' pieces of music. By contrast, in the formal realm learners tend to follow a planned progression from simple to complex, often involving specially composed music, exercises, a curriculum or a graded syllabus, under the direction of a teacher.

Finally, informal approaches usually involve a deep integration of listening, performing, improvising and composing throughout the learning process, with an emphasis on personal creativity. This is distinct from the greater differentiation of skills that tends to mark the formal realm, and its emphasis, very often, on reproduction more than on creativity.

At the same time as acknowledging differences between the informal and the formal realms in relation to learning strategies, it is important to recognize that there are also deep and remarkable similarities in many of the attitudes and values which are shared by popular musicians and formal educators alike. These include placing a high value on 'feel' over and above technique; demanding and valuing group co-operation in order for music-making to work; being aware of the huge amount of enjoyment that is to be had from music-making; believing that making music can raise self-esteem, and appreciating and respecting a wide range of music, often going into realms far removed from the familiar.

As will be explained in more detail in the next chapter, the project involved the development of classroom activities which drew as much as possible on the above fundamental characteristics of informal music learning.

The project in historical perspective

The music appreciation movement of the twentieth century

The music appreciation movement of the twentieth century is often associated with an image of school pupils seated in neat rows, passively listening to gramophone recordings of high-quality classical music.⁷ In this sense, ‘music appreciation’ seems on the surface to have little in common with the approach of the project. For, as will be seen, the latter involves active music-making, and at least to begin with, allowing pupils to bring in their own choice of music rather than designating ‘good’ music for them to study. However, there are many respects in which the aims and outcomes of the music appreciation movement are shared by those of the project. These particularly include the notion that pupils’ listening skills can and should be enhanced by education – although the means to this enhancement might be different – and that pupils should develop a critical appreciation and discernment in relation to a wide range of music. I will discuss this issue further, and attempt to substantiate these claims, in Chapter 4.

The creative music movement of the 1960s and 1970s

At first sight it could be assumed that the project strategies have a lot in common with what became known as the ‘creative music movement’ of the late 1960s and 1970s, which was itself a part of the broader notions of ‘progressive education’ and ‘child-centred education’ that were influential at that time.⁸ The most obvious similarities include the fact that both the creative music approach and the project, as will be seen, involve pupils working together to create music in small groups. However digging a little deeper, there are significant differences.

One of the main differences concerns the notion of ‘child-centredness’. Drawing from the wider educational context of the time, the creative music movement was explicitly child-centred, in that it placed the responsibility for learning in the hands of the child, with the possibility of open-ended learning outcomes, rather than making each step the responsibility of the teacher and geared towards pre-specified learning objectives. However, there was a crucial aspect in which it fell short of being child-centred. For rather than starting with music that pupils were familiar with and enjoyed, it introduced them, through compositional stimuli and

7 For discussions of the music appreciation movement, see, for example, Martin (1995, pp. 230ff.), Rainbow with Cox (1989/2006, pp. 276ff.), Scholes (1972, p. 48) and Simpson (1976). The project’s relationship with the concept of ‘music appreciation’ is considered more fully in Chapter 4.

8 The adoption of creative music-making as a part of education dates back to before that time, as in the work of Carl Orff. It became influential through new channels during the 1960s in the work of, for example, Dennis (1970), Paynter and Aston (1970), Paynter (1982), Schafer (1967) and Self (1967). The notion of child-centred education can be traced as far back as Rousseau (1762), and has been much discussed within education studies generally. For a helpful recent overview of this concept and its historical role within educational theory and practice, see Moore (2000).

other means, to musical styles that they would be unlikely ever to come across in the world outside the school. This mainly focused not so much on the mainstream of classical music as on atonal or other modernist twentieth-century music of many varieties. The distance of this music from pupils' existing musical tastes, knowledge and skills made it difficult for pupils to connect their learning with their lives outside the school.

Another difference was that the creative music movement implicitly centred on a theoretical understanding of the nature of composition and pupil creativity, derived from the world of 'serious' or classical music. It did not, in the main, base its approaches on real-world composing practices, and did not involve pupils at the outset in copying an already-existing, familiar piece of music. Such copying may have been regarded then – and now – as 'slavish' and lacking in creativity. Also, in the creative music movement, teachers gave quite precise stimuli for pupils to build their compositions around, so that the compositional tasks were relatively structured. The project, however, does not give any compositional stimuli, but expects pupils to spontaneously carry over what they learn through copying tasks into compositional creativity as time goes by. The stimuli are therefore implicit, and once again, involve what is already familiar.

Overall, whilst there are both similarities and differences between the creative music movement and the project, the teachers in the project were in agreement that the differences overrode the similarities.

The popular music and 'world music' movements of the 1970s and on

The project also has many aspects in common with the early entrance of popular music into the curriculum in the UK and many other countries during the 1970s and 1980s. Popular music entered the curriculum partly in response to criticisms, such as those described above, that the creative music movement was not pupil-centred enough because it overlooked the very music that pupils already knew and were familiar with. In response to that criticism, a number of educationalists and teachers sought to reflect their pupils' musical tastes and identities by including popular music in their curricula (see notes 1 and 2).

However, it is pragmatically, economically and also ideologically very challenging for curriculum content, especially on a national level, to keep genuinely up-to-date with pupils' 'own' music. For one thing, pupils' ideas of what counts as 'popular' music change with alarming rapidity. Partly in response to this problem, and partly for reasons to do with the ways in which music is valued in the society at large, popular music in the curriculum, and particularly in national exam syllabi, has tended to centre mainly on 'classic' songs and bands. These include a range of music from early blues to bands such as The Beatles and Queen. Such music is perceived either to offer some authentic, rather than commercial, expression of its time and place; transcendent, universal qualities, and/or sufficient formal and harmonic complexity to warrant study. The inclusion of 'classic' popular music has in this way tended to reproduce traditional, accepted notions of musical value, and with those, of what counts as musical ability. But such music is often, from pupils'

perspectives, as far removed from their lives and identities as mainstream classical music or twentieth-century atonal music.

The entrance of world music into education took place in a number of countries mainly during the 1990s.⁹ That development has raised a huge number of important issues that are relevant to the project. These include the difficulties of incorporating music from one culture into another; the challenges of adopting, within formal education, music which is transmitted outside formal education; the lack of fit between the cultural assumptions that surround music and musical practices in different cultures; and many more. Unfortunately it is not possible to enter into such problems in this book, although many of the issues that I will be discussing can be directly or indirectly related to current debates in the literature on world music and cultural diversity in music education. But one issue that can be noted here, is that the introduction of world music in schools is also subject to the same tendencies as those identified in the paragraph above. Firstly, educators' particular choices of world music can reflect similar ideological values to their choices of popular music, that is, music which is considered to be an authentic, traditional, rather than commercial, expression of its time and place, and to have universal, transcendent qualities, and in some cases sufficient complexity. Secondly, by its very nature, world music in the curriculum tends to involve musical styles which are largely unfamiliar to most pupils.

Thus, although the newer music curriculum appears to challenge the previously more narrow selection of music from a mainly white, middle-class culture, the *values* which accompany it do not necessarily do so; and the musical identities of most pupils continue in many cases to be distanced. The social-class and cultural patterns of musical success and failure which are entailed therefore remain to a large extent unchallenged. (This position is argued more substantially in Green, 1988, 1999a, 1999b, 2003a and 2003b.)

Current trends and the aims of the project

In order to more thoroughly or accurately reflect pupils' musical identities, it seems appropriate to give pupils some autonomy to select curriculum content for themselves: that is, to choose the music they work on in class. An immediate objection to this is that it will 'pander', 'dumb down' and generally fail in the main educational endeavour, of leading learners beyond what they already know and can do into further, deeper and better realms. However, I hope to show that there are benefits to allowing such choice. One is that pupil-selection of curriculum content breaks down the reproductive effects of many previous music curricula, which by ignoring the musical identities and tastes of vast numbers of pupils prevented many of them from demonstrating or even discovering their musical abilities. Such pupils tended to be labelled, for *cultural* rather than musical reasons, as 'unmusical' or 'uninterested' in music (Green 1988, 1999a, 1999b, 2003a and 2003b). Another benefit is that starting from pupil-selected curriculum content can form the basis, not

⁹ See, for example, Campbell (1991), Campbell et al. (2006), Lundquist and Szego (1998), Volk (1998) and T. Wiggins (1996).

only for leading pupils out into unfamiliar territory, but also for making them more aware in relation to what they *do* already know and *can* already do. Just because they identify with and listen to certain music outside the school of course does not mean that they have a critical understanding of it. Rather than making that assumption, I will argue that we need to invoke a notion of ‘critical musicality’ as an educational aim, and address it to pupils’ *own* music as much as to any other.¹⁰

More importantly, pupil-selection of curriculum content is only one side of bringing informal learning practices into the school. The more radical and far-reaching side concerns pupil autonomy in relation to learning *strategies*. Rather than approaching popular music through recognized, formal teaching or pedagogic strategies, in seeking to reflect the informal learning practices of popular musicians the project gave pupils autonomy to *direct their own learning*. Such autonomy presents a significant challenge to previous patterns, including fundamental issues such as how success and failure are constructed and measured. It will form a central issue to be addressed in many subsequent parts of this book.

Research methods

The empirical part of the project took place from 2002 to 2006, and involved altogether 21 secondary schools, 32 classroom teachers and over 1,500 pupils. General information about each school and its particular involvement is given in Appendix A.

We collected quantitative and qualitative data from all the project schools, but focused in detail on seven classes of 13- to 14-year-olds, one in each of seven schools, which I shall refer to as ‘main-study’ schools.¹¹ Three of the main-study schools were located in London, and four in Hertfordshire, a county just north of London. The

10 This notion is linked to those of ‘critical literacy’ and ‘critical pedagogy’, which run through the education, as well as music-education literature in a variety of guises. Within education these terms are principally associated with the work of Paulo Freire (1972, 1974). Recent helpful discussions are available in, for example, Bentley (1998), Buckingham (2005), Edwards and Kelly (1998), Goodson (1998), Hartley (2006), Kincheloe and Steinberg (1998), Kress (2006), McFarlane (2006), Moore (1999, 2000), Somekh (2006) and Young (2006). In music education, for sentiments and values that also resonate with these notions in various implicit or explicit ways, see, for example, Abrahams (2005a, 2005b), Allsup (2004), Bowman (2005), Boyce-Tillman (2000), Campbell (1998), Campbell et al. (2006), Elliott (1995), Glover (2001), Jorgensen (1997, 2003), Koopman (2005), Lines (2005b), Odam (1995), Regelski (2005), Ross (1998), Small (1977), Ståhlhammar (2006a and 2006b), Westerlund (2002), J. Wiggins (2001), T. Wiggins (2006), Wright (2007), Woodford (2005) and many more.

11 I have elsewhere referred to three of these as ‘pilot schools’ (for example, Green with Walmsley 2006, Green 2005a and 2005b). However, since they undertook exactly the same strategies as the other main-study schools for the first two stages of the project, and since the first stage forms the main focus of this book, it makes more sense to refer to them as main-study schools in the present context. The only sense in which they were pilots was that they were the first schools to try out the strategies, and they completed only two stages of the project. Another school, which I shall refer to as a ‘pilot’ school, was the very first to try out the strategies, but I did not conduct interviews with pupils there.

data-collection methods included the following: unstructured participant observation of pupils working together in small groups within class music lessons; observations of whole-class lessons or sessions within lessons; audio recordings of group work; audio and video recordings of performances and other whole-class activities; tape-recorded semi-structured interviews with pupils and teachers at regular intervals, and tape-recorded teacher team meetings. In addition, a number of conversations took place in corridors and over cups of coffee in busy staffrooms, which were in many cases recorded and transcribed or written up in field notes. The detailed findings from those seven classes, and the approximately 200 pupils and 11 teachers involved with them, form the main focus of this book.

A pilot school in London undertook the first one out of seven stages of the project, during the final term of the academic year 2001–2002. The three main-study London schools then undertook the first two stages only, during the academic year of 2003–2004. At that time, I was the sole researcher, observing one lesson per class per school per week of the project, and conducting all the interviews with pupils and teachers, the initial induction, and a final teacher team meeting. I was extremely fortunate to be joined by Abigail D'Amore (née Walmsley) and others when the project became part of the national Paul Hamlyn Foundation's 'Musical Futures' venture for the following two years. Abigail became the Research Officer and Project Manager, and during 2004–2005 she and I together or individually observed almost all the remaining lessons in the further four main-study schools that are discussed in detail in this book. These schools undertook all seven stages of the project, lasting almost one academic year.

During the following year Abigail oversaw and co-ordinated all the practical work in 17 schools. These included the four main-study schools from the previous year, which repeated the project, developing and incorporating it into their curricula in their own ways. It also included 13 schools new to the project, which I shall refer to as 'extension schools'.

Three of these were specialist institutions. One was for children with 'moderate learning difficulties', known in the UK as an MLD school, and the other two were for children with 'emotional and behavioural difficulties', known as EBD schools. The project had not been designed for such contexts, and I am unable to give them any special attention here, although I was thrilled that the teachers involved were not only interested in trying out the strategies, but stayed on board for the entire year and beyond. A dedicated study would be needed to evaluate the suitability of the project for such schools, and also the ways in which the teachers adapted it to the needs of their pupils. However, the findings from those three schools are included amongst those from all the others, and where appropriate, findings from the two EBD schools are identified separately. I have also included a brief note at the end of Chapter 6, concerning how the work was progressing, at the time of writing, in those and other schools for children with special educational needs. It should also be mentioned that there were a small number of pupils with special educational needs in most of the mainstream classes in which we worked.

In that year of the project we no longer conducted observations and interviews, but used the following data-collection methods instead. One was an anonymous quantitative questionnaire to teachers in all 15 schools which were still involved at

the very end of the project. Two schools had stopped the project, since one Head of Music was on maternity leave and the other had moved away. We received responses from 17 teachers across all 15 of the remaining schools. This included one Head of Music from each school, plus an extra classroom teacher from two of the schools. We also used qualitative and quantitative anonymous pupil questionnaires, transcribed teacher meetings at the end of each term, and open-ended teacher feedback forms. Abigail visited the schools as often as possible, observed lessons on an informal basis, and kept in constant contact with the teachers by phone and email. The findings from the seven main-study schools have been cross-checked with the findings from these extension schools, and were presented, discussed and agreed in the extension school teacher meetings. As the book goes along I will occasionally refer to the findings from the extension schools and the results of the anonymous questionnaire, mainly in footnotes. At the time of writing, a number of schools in the UK have taken up the project strategies, but it remains to be seen to what extent their experiences will match those of the schools discussed here.¹²

There are many disadvantages to this kind of research. For one thing, there was bound to be a 'halo effect', especially in the four main-study Hertfordshire schools, where the teachers and pupils were particularly aware of participating in a nationally recognized project. In addition, the teachers were part of a small team working intensively together and having regular meetings. This in itself would be likely to make them feel more positive, involved and enthusiastic about their work than usual, regardless of what the project actually entailed. To some extent such problems were held in check by the findings from the extension schools. For although their teachers had an induction session and a meeting once a term, they worked at a greater distance from the researchers, had fewer meetings, and were generally more 'out on a limb'. In addition, the pupils in those schools were not so aware of participating in a national project, and had few, if any, visits from a researcher. Reference to other weaknesses and disadvantages, as well as strengths, of the qualitative approach is woven into the discussion below.

Interviews and meetings

In the seven main-study schools the pupils were interviewed in small groups, corresponding as much as possible with the groups they had been working in during class time. The teachers were interviewed individually, and also gave their views in group discussions during meetings. All the interviews, and some of the discussions, were audio-recorded and transcribed. Other formal and informal discussions were recorded in field notes. The interviews were semi-structured. Each one involved around five questions which were put in the same way to all respondents (or as nearly the same way as possible, according to the context of the preceding conversation). They were all open questions such as: 'Can you tell me what you enjoyed most, and what you enjoyed least about the project?'. We were careful to avoid putting

12 Although the main research phase of 'Musical Futures' project has come to an end, the Paul Hamlyn Foundation is monitoring its take-up and effects in schools nationally, and providing some support for teachers. Details are available on <www.musicalfutures.org>.

in our own suggestions or asking leading questions. Thus all substantive ideas and concepts came from the respondents themselves. In follow-up questions we tried to probe meanings, but again to avoid making suggestions.

There are obvious disadvantages to interviewing people as part of research, and particularly when the interviewers have previously been working alongside them as participant observers. Both pupils and teachers may have wanted to avoid saying negative things in case of upsetting the interviewers. They may also have felt pressure from peers and others to appear supportive rather than critical. The teachers were often quite anxious about the project at the start, and may not have articulated their anxieties quite as forcefully in an interview or a meeting as they may have done privately to each other or to their friends and family. In addition, some pupils in one of the London schools spoke very little English; others in many of the schools seemed unable to express themselves, for uncertain reasons perhaps including shyness, peer-pressure or lack of confidence; and even those who were willing to speak at length could not always put their views or feelings into words in the way an older person might.

One particularly helpful check on such problems, was to compare the interview responses with the anonymous, quantitative questionnaire results. Indeed, positive evaluations usually came over slightly more strongly in interviews and meetings than they did in the tick-box results. For example, whereas in a meeting the teachers explicitly declared themselves unanimous on a point, it may be that when they filled in their questionnaire tick-boxes at the end of the project, only 12 or 13 out of the 17 responses were unanimous on that point. In such cases I always make this clear in a footnote. Another check was that there were indeed occasions when teachers expressed doubts in meetings, and in which one or two pupils disagreed with others in the group, often entailing some discussion in which divergent or negative opinions were put forward openly. The areas that involved doubts or divergence particularly included teachers' concerns about standards and classroom management, and pupils' views about listening and classical music. This suggests that the high levels of consensus that tended to be reached around most other topics were at least in some ways relatively authentic. Besides, all human beings form their views and responses to things as a part of a group; there is no such thing as total individuality. Therefore if the group influenced views, then that was a significant influence and can be expected to happen if similar circumstances prevail elsewhere.

However, rather than being seen as a 'nuisance', some qualitative aspects of the research process became part of our recommendations. By taking time out to talk to pupils, or asking them to write down their views, we and their teachers were granted fascinating and often unexpected insights, not only into their opinions about teaching and learning strategies, but into how perceptive, analytical and constructive young teenagers can be if given the opportunity to show it. More importantly perhaps, there is evidence to suggest that pupils are more likely to perceive themselves as valued and valuable, and teachers are more likely to understand and respond to pupils' needs constructively, if such conversations are built into the educational

environment as a matter of course.¹³ The fact that teachers also may have benefited from discussing their work and meeting each other is, for similar reasons, integral rather than extraneous to the process of doing this kind of research. Overall, a tick in a box is hard to interpret meaningfully. The deeper explanations that teachers and pupils gave of their views during interviews and discussions provide far more valuable insights.

Observations

Our weekly observations of pupils working in small groups, and of whole-class sessions, were unstructured and participatory. We occasionally made notes during the observation, but on the whole this was done after the lesson. Observation of this kind naturally has many disadvantages, particularly since pupils are unlikely to behave in exactly the same way when we were in the room as they did when they were alone. One check on this, which has perhaps provided some of the best insights and may have been our most revealing research tool, was a digital MiniDisc recorder. We used only one MD-recorder per class (not per group), per lesson. Recordings from it were transcribed the same day or very soon afterwards. On some occasions, and sometimes for periods lasting up to an hour, pupils did not notice that the MD-recorder was in the room (although they later gave permission for the recording to be used in research). Those recordings are particularly illuminating. On most occasions pupils *did* know the recorder was there, but they seemed to become accustomed to its presence very quickly, and it is fair to suggest that its overall effect on their behaviour appears to have been fairly minimal. (There were occasions when the transcriber was almost deafened by a pupil picking up the microphone and shouting loudly into it at close range; not always involving the politest of language!)

During observations we attempted to retain the normal classroom environment as much as possible, although there were times when this cannot be said to have been achieved. One reason, in the four main-study Hertfordshire schools, was that across the year, a film crew was present during three or four lessons and some interviews for each class. However, I hope that the obvious disadvantages of this are counterbalanced by the value of the resulting film itself, which is available on the website.¹⁴ It graphically illustrates some audio and visual aspects of the project that would not otherwise be captured, including footage of the pupils at work, audio examples of pupils' products, and clips of pupils and teachers talking about their experiences.

13 The literature on 'pupil voice' provides a rich support to this claim. See, for example, Fielding (2004) or the journal *Theory in Practice, Special Issue: Learning from Student Voices* (1995), vol. 34, no. 2, including articles by Dahl (1995), Johnston and Nicholls (1995), Lincoln (1995) and Oldfather (1995). In music education, see, for example, Jackson (2005) and Jorgensen (1997).

14 The film can be downloaded, with the other resources, from <www.musicalfutures.org/PractitionersResources.html>, Section 2: Classroom Resources for Informal Learning. It was produced by MMT Openplay, filmed and edited by Nick Sutton.

Another difficulty in retaining normal conditions was that in the four main-study Hertfordshire schools, the Music Service had provided an instrumental teacher to help the classroom teacher. This related to the development of policies and practice concerning provision, whose effects cannot be considered here. The presence of one or two researchers, and occasionally other visitors in each classroom of course altered the normal situation as well. I have carefully compared the findings from the schools affected by this, with those in which no additional people, or only one additional person, was present, and can conclude that there appears to have been no significant effect on findings overall. Having said that, it is undeniable that additional adults in a classroom, making a film, helping, or observing, is obviously bound to have an effect, and there is no way of measuring the extent of this with precision.

More so than the interviews, the observations were not just a part of the research process, but had been put in place from the start, as a central building block of the project strategies, relating not only to the researchers', but the teachers' roles. This is an issue that I will address in the following chapter, and many other parts of the book.

Transcription

It must be mentioned how difficult it was to transcribe the tape-recordings of pupils working in groups, and also how chaotic everything sounds. It was impossible to hear every word that was said during group work, mainly because of the additional noise of instruments and music being played simultaneously within one group, let alone disturbance from neighbouring groups. Therefore the observation and group-work transcriptions are presented as sketches rather than blow-by-blow accounts. Missing passages can be ascertained by consulting the given timings, and some passages are presented as loose *descriptions* of what went on, rather than *transcriptions*. I have used square brackets for any insertions that were added after original field notes or transcriptions were made, but many of them also contain parentheses that were put in at the time for various reasons.

The interview transcriptions are complete, except for the usual convention of using ellipses to indicate missing text, but they do not include every 'um', 'er' or minor interjection of the interviewer, nor statements in which the interviewer simply repeated what an interviewee just said. I have inserted a dash at the end of a word to indicate when a speaker was interrupted, or simply stopped talking in mid-sentence, as people often do. The layout of transcriptions makes clear the difference between what was a conversation between a group of people, such as in a group interview, and what was a comment by an individual that has been isolated from its context. This is done by leaving a space between different interviews or comments. The pupils often used musical or quasi-musical terms in colloquial ways that might not be familiar to some adults. There is a discussion of their uses of musical vocabulary in Chapter 4, (pp. 68–71).

In most of the pupil interviews each speaker is named, but in transcriptions of group work or similar settings this was not always possible. Throughout the book (apart from the Acknowledgements), all names of schools and persons have been substituted with fictitious ones. In giving pseudonyms to the pupils and teachers I

have attempted to retain cultural overtones as accurately as possible, for example by replacing names that are associated with a particular culture, nation or religion with another name that is also associated with those things.

Interpreting and reporting results

In qualitative research of this kind it is virtually impossible to give completely accurate descriptions of participants' actions and views. For one thing, during interviews and meetings pupils and teachers were engaged in discussion, and between such events they continued to be involved in further music-teaching and learning activities. They sometimes changed their minds, or unwittingly contradicted themselves in different parts of an interview or meeting, or between one interview and another; and they expressed themselves in complex ways. Therefore, in describing the findings I have often had to make generalizations such as 'a small minority of pupils suggested that ...', rather than giving actual numbers. Wherever possible, such statements are backed up and illustrated by representative examples of the actual words that were said. I have at all times tried to make it as clear as possible where statements illustrate general views, and where they were idiosyncratic. Again, the anonymous quantitative data provides a more objective, if less rich, alternative check on my interpretations, and this is given mainly in footnotes.

The quantity of data we collected was quite overwhelming, including not only over 800 pages of transcriptions and field notes, but over 100 audio recordings, most of which lasted more than an hour. Overall, because of the amount of data, as well as the variety of research tools used, rather than attempting to give any further blow-by-blow account of it all here, I have instead tried to make clear what was done and how it was done as I go along. I have of course attempted to be as systematic, thorough and objective in my analyses and presentation of all data as is humanly possible, but ultimately I am presenting here one person's qualitative analysis of a huge range of material, and the analysis is bound to be susceptible to some bias and error, for which I can only apologize in advance.

This was a practice-based research and development project, which took the views and assumptions of participants at face value. Its reliability and validity rest to a large extent, not only on the thoroughness of the researchers, but on the sincerity and perceptivity of the pupils, and the professional judgement of the teachers involved. They were all essential participant-researchers. The pupils' contribution was immeasurable, unpredictable and, to me at least, fascinating. But it is, in particular, the considered opinions of the teachers, based in most cases on extensive experience and previous knowledge of their pupils in that same environment, which provide the bedrock of any claims that I will make. Their incredible skill, dedication, enthusiasm and above all willingness to take a risk in trying out new ways of working lie at the heart of this book.

The beginning, and the ends, of the project

The first lesson of the project began with a class discussion, in which pupils were asked how they thought popular musicians go about the business of acquiring their musical skills and knowledge. While pupils suggested all sorts of ideas, many of which were accurate, we did not come across a single pupil in any of the 21 schools who showed awareness of, or who described, informal popular music learning practices with any precision. Answers included:

- They practise.
- They get lessons.
- They just play what they feel and stuff.
- I dunno. I think that some people, like Christina Aguilera, they do it 'cause, they, like, what happened in their life, and then afterwards they just start singing, 'cause, the way they think it is, yeah, to show how it, it's not, I dunno.
- Sometimes it comes naturally.
- They probably like have a talent and then they go to someone that can help them bring it out, like.
- Some of them teach them by themselves, like, you get, you know when you get the books, and you get all the notes in it, you, some people teach themselves ...
- They get a guitar, and they go up to their bedroom.

I find it interesting and provocative that the pupils seemed to lack awareness of, or seemed unable to describe, popular musicians' informal approaches in more concrete ways, especially the idea of aural copying from a recording. At the same time they seemed unaware of the workings of the music industry in relation to the production of stars, either as highly trained performing commodities, sex-symbols or skilled musicians. As mentioned earlier, in jazz, folk and traditional musics, as well as in many non-Western popular and classical musics, it is often the case that older musicians induct younger ones into an adult 'community of expertise'. But young popular musicians in Western, mainstream styles, by comparison, have been very much left to their own devices. Therefore, large numbers of children in many countries and musical cultures have been unlikely ever to discover the simplicity and availability of informal music learning practices at all. The above findings, gleaned from over 1,500 pupils in 21 schools, would seem to confirm this. Whilst, as I will argue later, there is something almost natural about informal music learning practices, our society has for decades or even centuries, alienated us from them by removing them from the realm of everyday life, as well as from that of formal music education, so that we are now in a position of having to teach them back to ourselves!

The main benefit that I hope this study offers is an illustration of young people's responses to informal learning practices that have been adapted for the music classroom. Despite being fundamentally as old as the hills, these learning practices have been taken up in new ways, by only a minority of young people, outside schooling, following the invention of sound recording technology during

the last century. They are learning practices, moreover, that young people can use in their own time, without the need for elaborate, expensive resources or specialist tuition. Most importantly, according to our findings, they are learning practices that can awaken many pupils' awareness of their own musicality, particularly those who might not otherwise be reached by music education, put the potential for musical development and participation into their own hands, open their ears, and enhance their appreciation and understanding of music, not only in relation to what they already know, but also taking them beyond the known as more critically aware and open-minded listeners.

Alongside that, I hope to offer an alternative pedagogy for music, not as a substitute for, but as a complement running alongside existing approaches. In the end, all 17 of the Hertfordshire teachers in the final questionnaire agreed that using informal approaches in the classroom had 'changed their approaches to teaching for the better'. If there is any strength in the approach, I think it must lie in the fact that the strategies were developed by learners, through learning, rather than by teachers through teaching. They derive, not from a theory of learning drawn from an experimental or formal educational situation, or from an analysis of a musical outcome, but from observation and analysis of real-life learning practices by musicians in the world outside formal education. In this book I wish to explore the pupils' skill and knowledge-acquisition, responses to and views of the project, setting them alongside the changing perspectives of teachers, in such a way as to foster ideas and discussion about ways in which we can take classroom music education forward. I do not know whether teachers in other subjects would find the approaches too musically specific to be of any interest; but there are indications of many possible echoes.