

**The involvement of the electric guitar in the co-curricular music program of a Sydney high school: a case study in the structuring of pedagogic discourse**

**Saul Richardson**

A special study submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree  
Bachelor of Education (Primary) Honours

School of Teaching and Curriculum Studies

University of Sydney

1995

## Table of Contents

List of tables	5
Abstract	6

### **Chapter 1: The electric guitar and school music education 7**

1.1	Introduction	7
1.2	The electric guitar in music education	7
1.3	The sociology of music in education	10
1.4	Music curricula in New South Wales	13
1.5	Including popular music in the curriculum	16
1.6	Theoretical orientation	18

### **Chapter 2: Bernstein and the structuring of pedagogic discourse 19**

2.1	Introduction	19
2.2	Curriculum	19
2.3	Classification and frame	20
2.4	Pedagogic discourse	22
2.5	Text: privileged and privileging	24
2.6	Visible and invisible pedagogies: social class and pedagogic practice	24
2.7	Mary Douglas: sacred and profane knowledge	26
2.8	Boundaries and music	27
2.9	Pedagogic discourse and music education	28

### **Chapter 3: Methodology and study design 30**

3.1	Rationale	30
3.2	The case	32
3.3	Data gathering procedures	33
3.4	Data analysis procedures	36

### **Chapter 4: Results 38**

4.1	Case description	38
4.2	Data	39
4.2-1	The number of students playing guitar	40

4.2-2	The extent of the guitar's involvement	41
4.2-3	The manner of the guitars involvement	46
4.3	Summary	50
<b>Chapter 5: Discussion and conclusions</b>		<b>52</b>
5.1	The number of students playing guitar	52
5.2	The extent of the guitar's involvement	52
5.3	The manner of the guitar's involvement	56
5.4	The findings in the light of Bernstein's theory	58
5.5	Implications of this study	65
5.6	Conclusions	68

**Appendices 70**

Appendix A: Data gathering instruments	71
Teacher-interview schedule	71
Student-interview questions	72
Questionnaire	73
Observation schedule	74

**Appendix B: Complete transcripts of teacher interviews**

Interview #1	75
Interview #2	83

**Appendix C: Explanation of nomenclature 85**

Sources data	85
Types of guitar	86

**Bibliography 87**

General bibliography	87
Methodology	96

## List of tables

Table 4.1 The number of students at the school playing guitar

Table 4.2 Involvement in official ensembles by instrument

Table 4.3 Involvement of private instrumental students in official ensembles by instrument

Table 4.4 Student-organised ensembles at the school

Table 4.5 Types of part provided for each instrument across all official ensembles

Table 5.1 The number of students playing each instrument involved in instrumental lessons or ensembles

## **Abstract**

---

In this study the extent and manner of the involvement of the electric guitar in performance in the co-curricular music program of a Sydney high school were investigated using a case study approach. The number of students playing and learning the guitar at the school were also surveyed. The study revealed that the electric guitar was involved in the case to a limited extent only and that the manner of its involvement was such that students playing the instrument were excluded from access to socially powerful genres of music. The processes by which this exclusion occurred were located in the structuring of the music curriculum of the school and are described using the framework of Bernstein's theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse.

---

## **Chapter 1: The electric guitar and school music education**

### **1.1 Introduction**

This study examines the extent and manner of the involvement of the electric guitar in school music education in the light of Bernstein's theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse. This chapter reviews relevant background literature and introduces various key issues which are implicit in the topic, and Chapter two introduces Bernstein's theory. Chapter three explains the methodology and design of the case study which was conducted in order to investigate the issue in the context of the co-curricular music program of a Sydney high school. Chapter four reports the data gathered by the study. In chapter five, these data are discussed and are analysed within the descriptive framework of Bernstein's theory, some implications of the findings are suggested and conclusions drawn.

In this chapter, the issues surrounding the involvement of the guitar and, more specifically, the electric guitar in school music education are introduced. First, previous research and theoretical literature on the popularity of learning and playing the guitar among children and adolescents, the extent of the guitar's involvement in school music education, and the manner of its involvement are reviewed. Second, the sociology of music in education is introduced and a major recent theory, that of Shepherd and Vulliamy (1983, for instance), reviewed. How this might be relevant to guitar education is also discussed. Following this is a review of the most recent New South Wales Board of Studies music syllabus documents and the ways in which the course structures they prescribe might affect students playing the electric guitar. Finally, the debate on how or whether popular music should be included in school music curricula is introduced and three main schools of thought are identified and discussed.

### **1.2 The electric guitar in music education**

The guitar, and particularly the electric guitar (see appendix C), is frequently claimed to be one of the most popular musical instruments to play or learn among older children and adolescents

(Bartel, 1990; Stimpson, 1985; Zvengrowski, 1980). Despite this, studies done in Britain and the United States suggest that the electric guitar is largely excluded from the formal school music curriculum, and where it is included the usage tends to be inadequate or inappropriate (Bartel, 1990; Stimpson & Bumett, 1988; Stimpson, 1985).

The extent and manner of the guitar's involvement in English music education were investigated by Stimpson (1985). He found that despite the guitar being among the most popular instruments, in surveys of what instruments children would like to learn and in terms of numbers actually playing it, it was generally excluded from formal school music education. It was rarely offered for tuition by Local Education Authorities, received comparatively little funding, and was offered for study at tertiary level only infrequently. This was particularly apparent in teacher-education courses. The electric guitar was rarer still, at all levels. Whilst Stimpson found that 66.67% of the Local Education Authorities he surveyed provided some guitar tuition, only 24% of these offered electric guitar, in combination with classical and folk guitar. Thus, in those authorities offering electric guitar, funding was always shared with the other types of guitar. No authority offered only electric guitar, whereas 31% offered classical guitar exclusively.

When the guitar is included in school music programs, the manner of its usage tends frequently to be inappropriate, according to Stimpson (1985) and Stimpson and Burnett (1988). The general image of the guitar, and hence of the electric guitar, has been that of an instrument ideally suited to accompanying other musical instruments or singing (Stimpson & Burnett, 1988). This image, they suggest, has prevented the full potential of the guitar from being recognised. The general role of the guitar in school music, they found, was to accompany other musical activities by playing chords. These chords are not notated as music, but are instead presented as symbols for the player to interpret. Stimpson and Burnett point out that this stereotypical role is often perpetuated by publishers of educational music who, while providing fully notated parts for the traditional melodic instruments, provide only chord-charts for guitar.

In 1978, the American String Teachers' Association (ASTA) and the Guitar Accessories Manufacturers' Association (GAMA) conducted a survey of guitar use in 2,500 American secondary



schools (ASTA-GAMA, 1979). This revealed that, whilst some guitar instruction in schools was not uncommon, only 2% offered guitar as part of a chorus or band. This suggests a severe lack of performance opportunities for guitarists of any kind, let alone electric guitarists.

A form of performing ensemble which often does include electric guitar, albeit only one per group, is the stage band (an educational version of the jazz big band). Locally there is a moderately successful stage band movement, its popularity suggested by its inclusion in a number of music festivals and eisteddfods in the Sydney area (City of Sydney Cultural Council, 1995; Warringah Eisteddfod, 1995; Yamaha Music Festival, 1995). However, the parts played by the electric guitar in stage band arrangements consist almost always of un-notated chord charts. It is very rare for the guitar to be given a notated melodic part, and when it is it tends only to be in advanced-level arrangements written for professional groups. The reason for this convention probably stems from the traditional role of the guitar in such ensembles as an accompanying instrument. It seems, though, that the exclusive use of chord charts for guitarists in beginning ensembles is unlikely to assist in their developing musical literacy. It is also technically far more demanding for the beginning student to play chords than it is to play single-note melodies (Stimpson & Burnett, 1988). This suggests that the traditional predominance of chord charts for guitar in school stage band music is educationally inappropriate. Similarly, rock bands, the only other form of ensemble which routinely includes electric guitars, can be criticised on the same grounds: when parts are written for the guitar, they tend nearly always to be in the form of un-notated chord charts only.

Even where guitars are included in performing ensembles, then, as Stimpson and Burnett (1988) point out, their role tends to be limited to playing from un-notated chord-charts. The figures from the ASTA-GAMA (1979) survey, as well as the more recent discussion of Stimpson (1985) and Stimpson and Burnett (1988), suggest that electric guitarists are denied the opportunities for performance of melodic material which are routine for those children who play one of the traditional band or orchestral instruments.

Playing melodic music written by the best composers, both solo and in ensemble, is a crucial aspect of developing musicianship at the highest level, (Bartel, 1990). The electric guitar is a melodic

instrument, and yet the literature discussed above strongly suggests that it is rarely used as such. The reason for this is not necessarily because of any shortage of repertoire (Stimpson & Burnett, 1988); nor is it impossible to include electric guitars in performing ensembles (Stimpson, 1988a, 1988c; Stimpson & Burnett, 1988; Bartel, 1990). Stimpson and Burnett (1988) and Burnett (1988) describe a wide range of methods for realising the melodic potential of the electric guitar, including incorporating it into traditional performing ensembles. Bartel (1990) describes a multifaceted approach to guitar education which includes solo and ensemble performance across a range of musical styles, settings and genres. Caluda (1986) makes it clear that a large guitar ensemble can easily be set up, and that it is not particularly difficult to find music which can be adapted or arranged for such an ensemble. It will be suggested here that the reasons for the apparent exclusion of the electric guitar from school music performance curricula and its frequent misuse by music educators can usefully be explained by examining the ways in which a number of sociological issues manifest themselves in music education. This can help reveal the processes and structures through which power relations external to education express themselves through music pedagogy.

### **1.3 The sociology of music in education**

In music education, as in the wider musical community, there are distinctions drawn between different kinds of music. Such distinctions frequently manifest themselves in the form of a hierarchy of alleged aesthetic and intellectual worth. Some music is accorded a high status, whilst other musics are accorded lower status. Traditionally, in music education, the music considered to be of greatest intellectual and aesthetic value is western (or European) art music. This is frequently referred to as 'classical' or 'serious' music. Conversely, 'popular' musics tend to have a lower aesthetic and intellectual status.

The term 'popular music' can refer to a wide range of musical styles and traditions, from British music-hall, through the 'light classical' of the contemporary musical, to jazz and rock. In this discussion the term will be used to describe the music which has arisen from the Afro-American tradition in the twentieth century (Shepherd, 1979 & 1983). This includes the genres of jazz, blues, rock, and pop. It is the music of this tradition which has been most vigorously denigrated and excluded from school music curricula in the past (Shepherd, 1979: 14-20; Shepherd & Vulliamy, 1983; Swanwick, 1984: 50 ff.; Cutietta, 1991; Pembroke, 1991).

One recent attempt to explain the exclusion of popular music from the traditional school curriculum, through an examination of the sociology of music in education, has been that of Shepherd and Vulliamy. John Shepherd (1979), later with Graham Vulliamy (1983), argues that the standard system of western music notation and theory (which he calls 'functional tonality') mirrors the social structure of modern industrial- capitalist society. Functional tonality, according to Shepherd and Vulliamy, tends to emphasise abstraction and distance between the performer and the musical product. It also operates, traditionally, according to a stringent set of harmonic rules in which musical sounds revolve around a single key-note, and all music begins with a basic three-chord framework which builds outwardly as it increases in complexity. Within this harmonic framework there is a clear hierarchy of musical notes, with all notes effectively subservient to the key-note. Their role is simply to contribute to the sequence of tension creation and tension release which characterises western art music.

Shepherd (1983, 28-29) contends that musical notes in the system of functional tonality, which are subject to the central controlling power of the key note, are analogous to workers in capitalist society who 'are seen as impersonal sources of labour to be placed at will in a pre-determined economic system' (p. 29). He extends this by adding that

'alienation of self by a central and remote controlling power is expressed musically through the key-note's alienation of the individual notes of the harmonic-rhythmic framework. (1983, 29).

The system of 'functional tonality' (western art music) is dominated by the fact that it is written down, according to Wishart (1977 and 1985), Shepherd (1979 and 1983) and Shepherd and Vulliamy (1983 and 1984). The elements of this kind of music are only those which can be written down in standard notation. Furthermore, only those elements of music capable of being notated will be admissible as legitimate music. Popular music, they argue, involves a different set of musical criteria to those of western art music. Most of the elements of Afro-American music cannot be notated. Some examples of such elements are the use of improvisation, highly individualised timbres by performers, and subtle rhythmic and melodic inflections.

Because the most significant aspects of popular music cannot be notated, they cannot be admitted by functional tonality as legitimate music. The only elements of popular music remaining once the complex, un-transcribable ones have been filtered out are essentially melody and the harmonic-rhythmic framework. These remaining elements tend, according to Shepherd (1983, 34), to be comparatively simple. It is these elements that are often the basis for the denigration of popular music as simplistic, 'or 'childish' (Shepherd, 1983: 34). Thus, analysis of popular music according to the criteria of what is admissible as western art music by its system of notation reveals it as being simpler, and thus of less intellectual worth than 'serious' music.

Popular music emphasises immediacy and concreteness, whereas western art music tends to emphasise distance and abstraction. For instance, the use of a highly personalised tone colour by a jazz singer, or an improvisation, are both acts of immediacy. They are produced spontaneously by the performer. On the other hand, performance in western art music involves the reproduction of a written score, and instrumentalists are expected to play with a highly standardised sound, particularly in orchestral playing. Popular music, then, emphasises activities which, in the view of Shepherd and Vulliamy (1983) are incompatible with the notational requirements of western art music and the structure of capitalist society of which it is a microcosm.

For the reasons outlined above, Shepherd and Vulliamy argue that popular music is (or has been) largely excluded from school music programs. Their claim is that there is a hidden curriculum at work which denigrates popular music and maintains the hegemony of Western Art Music.

Many of the assumptions made by Shepherd and Vulliamy about the differences between popular and western art music are false. They dramatically overstate the freedom, particularly in improvisation, of popular music. Conversely, they overstate the rigidity of western art music. The rigidity of popular music is apparent in the fact that, for instance, in jazz music a saxophone always sounds the way we know a jazz saxophone should sound. The performer is not permitted, by convention, to differ too much from the timbral norm of the instrument in the style which they are playing. Also, within a given tradition of jazz playing, there are consistent stylistic features (such as 'swing') which individuals are not at liberty to vary. This is particularly true of big band jazz. On the

other hand, many classical concert pianists make extensive use of highly individualised rhythmic inflections.

The fact is that in both popular and western art music, certain elements can to some extent be accurately notated and reproduced. These include pitch, duration and form. Other elements, such as timbre and rhythmic inflection can never be notated. These elements, in any music, are the result of socially constructed norms and conventions. These dictate, for instance, what a classical flute or a jazz saxophone should sound like. All music can be analysed according to the same set of elements; the difference between popular and western art music lies in the way composers and performers manipulate these elements.

The socio-musicological model of Shepherd and Vulliamy, whilst addressing many important issues, seems unable to provide an adequate theoretical structure for examining the sociology of music in education. Because it relies so heavily on assumptions about music which, as has been discussed, are inaccurate, it cannot provide a satisfactory account of the ways in which social power relations are expressed through music or music pedagogy. Further, if one examines current New South Wales music syllabus documents, it becomes apparent that Shepherd and Vulliamy's account of music education cannot be satisfactorily applied to pedagogic practice in local schools.

#### **1.4 Music curricula in New South Wales**

Recent syllabus documents for secondary music in New South Wales (Board of Studies NSW, 1993a; 1993b; 1994a; 1994b) suggest that Shepherd and Vulliamy's assertion that popular music is excluded from school music curricula is either dated, or simply not applicable to local schools. These documents make it clear that popular music must be included in the curriculum, to some extent at least, throughout the secondary years. Teachers of years seven to ten are free, in the mandatory course for all students, to select what emphasis they will place on content, but are required to include a broad base of musical experiences, including popular music (Board of Studies NSW, 1994a). The additional (elective) course permits considerable scope for the inclusion of popular music (Board of studies NSW, 1994a). Also, both the 2 unit course 1 (Board of Studies NSW, 1994b) and 2/3 unit

Higher School Certificate courses (Board of Studies NSW, 1993b) allow for popular music to be included in the curriculum, although the Music AMEB courses do not.

Despite the inclusion of popular music in the most recent Board of Studies New South Wales syllabus documents for music (1993a, 1993b, 1994a, 1994b) however, there remains a clear structural bias against those students who choose to specialise in popular music, particularly those who play the electric guitar. There are three Higher School Certificate (HSC) music courses offered by the Board of Studies: 2 unit, 3 unit and 2 unit course 1. The 2/3 unit courses are intended for those students who have completed elective (additional) music in years seven to ten, and who already have a high level of knowledge about music theory and have good musical literacy. No prior experience is necessary for 2 unit course 1. Only the 2/3 unit courses are sufficient to gain entry to a university Bachelor of Music course at all Sydney universities, with the exception of the University of Western Sydney (UAC, 1994) and the newly established Bachelor of Music (Jazz Studies) at the Sydney Conservatorium of Music. In addition to the courses offered by the Board of studies, alternative Higher School Certificate courses in music are offered by the Australian Music Examinations Board (Music AMEB). These courses are offered at 2/3 unit (common) and 3 unit (additional) level and are performance-based with additional studies in aural and written skills (Board of Studies NSW, 1993a: 79-83). The assessable content of these courses is drawn from the AMEB instrumental performance and musicianship examination syllabus documents and they are generally studied externally with private tutors. The material studied must be based on material taken from the AMEB Grade five (or above) syllabus for the year eleven preliminary course (Board of Studies NSW, 1993a: 81) and Grade 6 for the HSC course (ibid.: 83). The structural bias against popular music (and, hence, the electric guitar) is clear in the Music AMEB courses. No AMEB syllabus permits any study of popular music, nor does the AMEB offer any examinations in electric guitar.

Thus, to study music at tertiary level, it is virtually essential that students complete the 2/3 unit course. These courses require the study of two mandatory topics: 'Western tonal tradition' in the preliminary course, and 'Music 1970 onwards' in the HSC course (Board of Studies NSW, 1993a: 66; Board of Studies NSW, 1993b: 28-29). The content of the first of these topics is entirely western art music. In the second, it is compulsory to study art music and one other musical form (Board of Studies NSW, 1993b: 29). It is also compulsory for all students to perform and compose music

representing the mandatory topic. In other words, to qualify for a university course in music, a student has to be able to play and read western art music. I would suggest that this performance and composition requirement represents a major obstacle to students whose major instrument is electric guitar gaining access to either the high status 2/3 unit HSC courses, or to tertiary music education.

The 2 unit course 1 does not require students to study any music other than popular, if they so choose. The performance requirement is that they should perform music representing the topics they have chosen (Board of Studies NSW, 1993a: 61-62). It is, then, easy for electric guitarists to complete this course, but it is the equivalent of a general course, and is usually insufficient for tertiary entry. An alternative tertiary entrance requirement for musicians without the necessary HSC qualifications is generally an Australian Music Examinations Board (AMEB) exam grade of seven or eight (UAC, 1994). This is distinct from the Music AMEB HSC course. However, as noted above, no exams are offered in electric guitar.

Success in the 2/3 unit HSC music courses tends to depend on students having successfully studied the additional study (elective) junior music course to School Certificate level, or at least their being familiar with its content. Like the 2/3 unit course, this includes a heavy emphasis on western art music (Board of Studies NSW, 1994a). This course is structured so that it is compulsory for all students to study the topic 'Australian Music' for which the class teacher is free to select any focus he or she chooses (Board of Studies, 1994a, 17). However, must also study one topic from each of three groups of elective topics. Of these groups, only one contains popular musics. Of the eleven elective topics, seven involve western art music and two (both in the same group) focus exclusively on popular forms (Board of Studies, 1994a: 'Contexts: additional study course, p. 17). Taking, as Bernstein (1975) suggests, the number of formal units given to a content area in a curriculum and whether a given content is optional or compulsory as a rough measure of the relative status of that content, it is apparent that western art music enjoys a far higher status in the junior elective music course than does popular music.

Clearly, then, familiarity with the tradition of western art music is virtually a prerequisite to success in the highest, most prestigious levels of school music. I would suggest that those students for whom this tradition holds little meaning could well be alienated from school music by the structure and content of the various courses. Given that students who play the electric guitar seem likely to belong to this group, then it is clear that there are structural impediments to electric guitarists gaining access to high-status musical knowledge.

It seems that, locally, popular music is not excluded from official school curricula, as Shepherd and Vulliamy (1983) have claimed. Rather, apparent in the syllabus documents is a process whereby one genre, western art music, is privileged at the expense of other genres, notably popular music. The processes by which this occurs are structural and tacit. It will be suggested later that these tacit processes of curriculum selection and design represent a realisation, through the pedagogical process, of principles of power relations and social control in the wider community. Shepherd and Vulliamy's (1983) thesis is also flawed because of its inaccurate portrayal of music and because it attempts to locate the play of sociological issues within the music itself. One consequence of this attempt has been that it has led Shepherd and Vulliamy, and others, to advocate from a comparatively weak and unsustainable position, the inclusion of popular music in school curricula.

### **1.5 Including popular music in the curriculum**

There are three schools of thought with regards to the inclusion of popular music in school curricula. The first of these, expressed most notably by Swanwick (1984a, 1984b, and 1988), is that it can be useful, but is in many cases inappropriate in the school setting. The second school, to which Shepherd and Vulliamy belong, is that it should be included, and that music educators need to recognise that the criteria by which popular musics are to be judged are different to those applicable to western art music. The third school of thought is that popular music should be included, but should be treated in the same way, and judged according to the same criteria, as western art music.

The exclusion of popular music from school curricula is often justifiable, on either aesthetic or social grounds, according to Swanwick (1984). His argument is essentially that much popular music, and rock in particular, has more to do with emotional catharsis and the expression of social identity



than it has to do with music as art (1984b and 1988). Popular music is often neglected in school music curricula, he suggests, for reasons related to 'the logistics of schools as social structures' (1984: 51), and because teachers frequently feel uncomfortable in dealing with such music. Swanwick sees no connection between these factors and tacit processes of cultural reproduction. He contends that most music teachers would not consider themselves to be agents of a dominant musical ideology, and therefore the reasons for the exclusion of popular musics must lie in the music itself (1984b).

Popular music should be judged and understood according to criteria different to those traditionally employed in the analysis of western art music, according to Shepherd and Vulliamy (1983). They argue that traditional ways of analysing, judging, and performing music (within functional tonality) effectively filter out the most important elements of popular music, thus providing its detractors with grounds for denigrating it, and helping to ensure its exclusion from school music programs. They assert that much popular music cannot and should not be notated, and that it should be treated as qualitatively different to western art music (Shepherd, 1979; Shepherd, 1983; Shepherd & Vulliamy, 1983). A similar view is expressed by other advocates of popular music (May, 1988; Cutietta, 1991; Kuzmich, 1991). It is a common claim by those who subscribe to this view that notation is not appropriate to popular music (May, 1988; Kuzmich, 1991), and that formal performing ensembles, such as those organised by schools, can only stifle the music (Cutietta, 1991). This school of thought, then, represents a position of difference with regards to popular and western art music. Popular music, so the argument goes, demands qualitatively different educational approaches to those of western art music, because of its special nature.

The third school of thought, that popular music should be included on the same terms as western art music, is represented by Stimpson (1988a, 1988b, 1988d), Burnett (1988), and Pembroke (1991). Pembroke (1991), for instance, argues that all popular music can be analysed in terms of the same musical elements as western art music. He suggests that the criteria for including popular music in the curriculum should be the same as those applied to any other musical genre. This view represents a position of no difference (between popular and art music).

This study will adopt the position of no difference. That is, that all musics can be reduced to the basic elements of rhythm and timbre, and nearly always to the additional elements of pitch (or melody), beat (or tempo), dynamics, texture, harmony and form. All music involves the manipulation in various ways of these elements by composers and performers and, as such, there is no qualitative difference between popular music and western art music. Contrary to the assertions of Shepherd and Vulliamy (1983), and Kuzmich (1991), there is nothing special about popular music which justifies any radical departure from well-established methods of music education. The explanation for the denigration of popular music and its historical exclusion from school music curricula lies not in the music itself or its system of notation, but in social power relations external to the music and the structures through which they are expressed.

### **1.6 Theoretical orientation**

The processes by which school music curricula are selected and what forms of musical knowledge and texts are privileged can be usefully analysed within the framework of Basil Bernstein's sociology of education. His theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse (1990) seems particularly suited to such analysis. This theory will provide the structure within which school music education can be examined, for instance, in terms of the strength of classification of musics, the strength of boundaries between genres, and of what musical knowledge and activities are privileged, and by whom. If 'school knowledge is an organisational representation of different class languages' (Bernstein, paraphrased by Wexler, 1982: 278), then it follows that this can be related to musical knowledge, for popular music and western art music tend to be the favoured musical texts of different social classes (DiMaggio & Useem, 1982; Virden & Wishart, 1977). Bernstein's (1990) theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse will be used in this study as the descriptive means for examining the sociological issues implicit in the involvement of the electric guitar in school music education. An outline of the theory and its possible applications to the issue follows in the next chapter.

## **Chapter 2: Bernstein and the structuring of pedagogic discourse**

### **2.1 Introduction**

Basil Bernstein's (1990) theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse essentially provides a descriptive means for examining the processes by which social power relations are expressed through the formation and realisation of texts. The model is not concerned with what is expressed or what specific power relations are realised through pedagogic discourse. Rather, its chief concern is with the structures or discursive grammars which inform and facilitate such realisations (Bernstein, 1990). In the context of education Bernstein's model, which in its fullest form encompasses all social contexts at all levels, provides a means of analysing curriculum and pedagogy in such a way as to reveal and map otherwise tacit processes. For the purposes of this study, there are five key concepts which will be of particular relevance. The first of these is the notion of two contrasting curricular types, the collection type and the integrated type. The second concept is that of classification and frame, which deal with the boundaries of knowledge and practice. The third is pedagogic discourse and the pedagogic device whilst the fourth is the notion of text. The final key concept in this framework is the principle of visible and invisible pedagogies which describe a relationship between social class and pedagogic practice. In addition to these concepts, it is also relevant to consider some parallels between the sociology of Bernstein and aspects of the anthropological work of Mary Douglas and then to see how these might relate to the specific case of the sociology of music in school education. What follows is a brief outline only. A complete explanation of the theory can be found in Bernstein (1990).

### **2.2 Curriculum**

Bernstein (1975) identifies two broad types of curriculum, the collection type and the integrated type. A collection type curriculum is one in which contents, defined as how a given unit of educational time is filled, stand in closed relation to each other. That is where there exists a high degree of insulation between content areas and the boundaries are clearly defined and explicitly maintained. An integrated type curriculum, on the other hand, is one in which contents stand in open relation to each other. That is, where there is a low degree of insulation between content areas and boundaries are not maintained. It would perhaps be a valid generalisation to suggest that,

in New South Wales, state primary school curricula tend to more of the integrated type, whereas secondary school curricula tend more towards the collection type.

In a collection type curriculum the tendency is towards depth and detail of education and increasing specialisation (Bernstein, 1975). This means that as a student progresses through such a system they grow to 'know more and more about less' (p. 81). The gradual receipt of knowledge is strictly regulated by teachers, experts, and so on, and attaining 'the ultimate mystery of the subject' (p. 81) requires discipline on the part of the student. Discipline involves earning the right to knowledge, and Bernstein identifies this as a powerful form of control (p. 82). It is also a characteristic of a collection-type curriculum that knowledge takes on a sacred quality and the boundaries of a given content are closely guarded and defended by its exponents.

An integrated curriculum will tend to emphasise 'ways of knowing rather than states of knowledge' (p. 83). In such a curriculum contents are subordinated to some relational idea. The focus shifts towards general principles, and reduces or eliminates the compartmentalised view of knowledge implicit in the collection curriculum. Bernstein argues that this influences social as well as pedagogic practice, with teachers and students interacting socially through a 'shared cooperative educational task' (p. 83). Both types of curricula described above are extremes. However, it is argued that any curriculum will lie somewhere on a continuum between these two extremes.

### **2.3 Classification and frame**

In Bernstein's sociology of education, educational knowledge is seen as being realised through the interaction of three 'message systems': curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation (1975: 85). These three systems form an inseparable whole and together, describe what goes on in a given pedagogical relationship. The underlying structure of these three message systems can be analysed through the concepts of classification and frame.

Classification, in the context of educational knowledge, refers to the extent to which contents of curriculum areas are insulated from one another. It provides a relative measure of the strength of the boundaries that are maintained between contents. Where classification is strong, the boundaries between contents or subject areas are sharply defined. Where classification is weak, the boundaries between contents are weakly defined or ambiguous. Classification, then, refers essentially to 'the degree of boundary maintenance between contents' (Bernstein, 1975: 88). Classification need not refer only to educational knowledge, but can also be used as a means of describing degrees of boundary maintenance in any social field.

An important aspect of classification is that it is reflective of both 'the distribution of power and the principles of social control' which operate both at the micro level of educational knowledge and at a macro level in society in general (Bernstein, 1975: 85). Where there is strong classification, Bernstein suggests, there must in some sense be 'strong boundary maintainers' (1975: 90). Williams (1994), in an examination of literacy pedagogy, suggests that 'an analysis of implicit principles which structure the classification of categories...provides a means for describing a distribution of power between categories' (p.77). It follows that in an examination of music pedagogy the concept will carry the same descriptive potential.

Frame relates to the inner structure of a pedagogical relationship. It refers to the strength of the boundary between what is admissible as a legitimate communication or text within a pedagogical relationship and what is inadmissible. For both the transmitter and the acquirer it can be analysed at four levels: selection, organisation, pacing and timing. These describe the internal framing values of the relationship. Frame also provides a relative measure of the strength of the boundary between everyday (community) knowledge and official pedagogic knowledge, again for both types of participant in the relationship. This level of boundary describes the external framing values of a pedagogical relationship.

Classification, in Bernstein's structural theory, provides a means of analysing the structure of curriculum. Framing provides a means of analysing the structure of pedagogy. The third message

system, evaluation, which together with curriculum and pedagogy comprises the realisation of formal educational knowledge, is a function» of both classification and framing.

The concepts of classification and framing can be applied to the two broad curriculum types, collection and integrated. Speaking very generally, the collection type of curriculum will tend to be characterised by strong classification and, to varying degrees, strong framing (Bernstein, 1975). Conversely, the integrated- type of curriculum will tend to be characterised by both weak classification and weak framing, though again there can be some variation in the strength of frames in an integrated curriculum

#### **2.4 Pedagogic discourse**

At the heart of Bernstein's theory lies the notion that pedagogic texts, as they are presented in pedagogic practice, are the result of a process of selection and recontextualization. Elements of a primary field of production, such as physics or music, are selected and recontextualized to form a new discourse, one which is created especially for the purposes of education. Examples of new discourses so created might be such subjects as school physics or school music. The content, mode or order and pacing of presentation of these school subjects are not derived from any logic internal to the original discourses or from the practices of the primary producers of the discourses (such as physicists or composers) (Bernstein, 1990). Instead, the school versions of such discourses represent socially constructed 'imaginary subjects'(Bernstein, 1990: 184).

Bernstein (1990) argues that the processes of selection and recontextualization in the construction of pedagogic discourse must be informed by some rule, that they cannot simply be arbitrary. In a pedagogical relationship, some aspects of the primary field from which the subject is drawn are selected as appropriate or relevant, whilst others are rejected. People only take on selected roles in the relationship, and the whole interaction only takes place under specific circumstances. The means for describing how such selections are made is referred to as distributive rules: 'who may transmit what to whom, and under what conditions' (Bernstein, 1990: 183). The function of these rules is to define what counts as legitimate pedagogic discourse.

In addition to having inner and outer limits defined by the distributive rules, any discourse will also have some form or other. This will be shaped by the relationship between the participants in a pedagogical relationship and the context in which it takes place as well by its content. Again, the form taken by discourses cannot be arbitrary and must be informed by some principle. Such principles are referred to as 'recontextualizing rules' or as 'pedagogic discourse':

'We shall define pedagogic discourse as the rule which embeds a discourse of competence (skills of various kinds) into a discourse of social order in such a way that the latter always dominates the former' ( Bernstein, 1990: 182).

An instructional discourse is one which regulates the internal features of a competence or subject. A regulative discourse is one which regulates relations between transmitters, acquirers, competences and contexts (Bernstein, 1990). In Bernstein's model, the needs of a regulative discourse always take precedence over those of an instructional one. The processes and principles by which discourses are brought into relation with each other are described by the recontextualizing rules and by pedagogic discourse. Pedagogic discourse, in turn, represents the grammar through which social power relations are expressed.

The principles shaping production and transmission of educational knowledge, then, are described by the distributive and recontextualizing rules. The third stage of the pedagogical process, acquisition, is subject to what Bernstein (1990) describes as the 'rules of evaluation' (p. 180). These operate at the level of pedagogic practice and define how the age of students, content, context, acquisition, evaluation and transmission are brought into a special relation to suit the purposes of pedagogy.

Together, the distributive, recontextualizing and evaluative rules form the 'pedagogic device', which 'provides the intrinsic grammar of pedagogic discourse' (Bernstein, 1990: 180). In terms of educational knowledge and school curricula, the pedagogic device comprises the sets of relations through which (tacit) principles for the selection, teaching and evaluation of contents (pedagogic discourse) come into play. It also regulates when, where and by whom for both teachers and

students. The key concept here is that the selections made by way of the pedagogic device are informed by power relations, often external to the field of education. The tendency will be, according to Bernstein, for selections to be made so as to serve and protect the interests of powerful social groups, possibly at the expense of the less powerful.

### **2.5 Text: privileged and privileging**

'Text' in Bernstein's theory is a broad term which is used in both a literal and an extended sense and 'can refer to the dominant curriculum, dominant pedagogic practice, but also to any pedagogic representation, spoken, written, visual, postural, sartorial, spatial' (Bernstein 1990: 175). A text, then, in the context of music, can be a composition or performance, a way of playing, a way of teaching or learning, a musical genre, and so on. In any given social genre, some texts will be privileged or privileging whilst others will stand in contrast to these.

A privileging text is one which is compatible with, and accepted as legitimate by, the hierarchical, pacing or sequencing, and criterial rules of pedagogic discourse. Thus, which texts are privileged is determined by the rules of pedagogic discourse. A privileging text will be one which conforms to privileged practice in a given situation. In HSC 2/3 unit music, musical literacy is a privileging text, as are familiarity with western art music and proficiency in performing non-improvised music from a written score. Familiarity with popular music and the ability to learn and play music by ear are texts which stand in contrast to the official pedagogic practice in that context. In the 2 unit course 1, the pattern of privileging and privileged texts is different, with more emphasis being placed on popular musics. On the other hand, with respect to entrance into a prestigious tertiary music course, 2/3 unit music becomes a privileging text whereas 2 unit course 1 does not.

### **2.6 Visible and invisible pedagogies: social class and pedagogic practice**

Bernstein (1990) suggests that the internal grammar by which pedagogic practice acts as a cultural relay operates according to three basic rules: hierarchical rules, sequencing (and pacing) rules and criterial rules. The hierarchical rules are those rules by which actors in a pedagogical relationship learn their roles as either acquirer or transmitter. They also provide the rules by which,



according to their roles, the participants in such a relationship will behave. Rules of sequencing and pacing are those which determine the sequencing and pacing of stages in a pedagogical encounter. The third basic principle, criterial rules, enable the acquirer in a pedagogical relationship to learn what, in a given context, 'counts as a legitimate or illegitimate communication, social relation or position' (Bernstein, 1990: 66). Thus, in a classroom for example, a teacher will know how to act as a teacher (transmitter) and a student will know how to act as a student (acquirer). What order the content of the transmission comes in and at what rate as well as what elements are recognised by each participant as part of the communication are also determined by these three basic rules.

Within any pedagogical relationship, the regulative and discursive rules outlined above can be either explicit or implicit, to varying degrees. Bernstein uses this distinction to construct two contrasting modalities of pedagogic practice: visible and invisible pedagogies. A visible pedagogy is one in which the regulative and discursive rules are made explicit and are clear to both transmitter and acquirer. An invisible pedagogy, on the other hand, is one in which these rules are implicit and are clear only to the transmitter. A fundamental difference between these two modes of pedagogic practice is that the visible tends to emphasise performance in relation to explicitly stated criteria, whereas the invisible tends to focus more on 'procedures internal to the acquirer (cognitive, linguistic, affective, motivational)' (Bernstein, 1990: 71). It is likely that a visible pedagogy will place students (in the context of a school) in direct competition with each other, within a given cohort and that students will be expected to be able to perform certain tasks at predetermined ages or stages in their educational careers.

In a visible pedagogy it is vital that students be able to meet the requirements set for each age or stage. Their progression through the educational process depends on this, as does their long-term success. Students who fail to meet these requirements can be dealt with in two ways:

'Either a repair system will have to be introduced to cope with the children who have failed to meet sequencing requirements or the pacing rules will have to be relaxed so that the child is given more time to meet the requirements of the sequencing rules.' (Bernstein, 1990: 74).

Bernstein notes that either one of these strategies will result in a stratification of acquirers (ibid.). This point is significant because, Bernstein argues, the children most likely to fail to meet the discursive requirements of a visible pedagogy are those from the lower working class and various minority backgrounds. That is, students for whom the pedagogic practice of the school does not mirror and reinforce the pedagogic practice of their home and community. A full account of this principle is not possible here, but is available in Bernstein (1990: Ch. 2).

## **2.7 Mary Douglas: sacred and profane knowledge**

The Bernsteinian concepts of classification and frame draw heavily on, and in a number of ways parallel, the structuralist anthropology of Mary Douglas (Bernstein, 1975; Atkinson, 1985). Douglas (1966), in examining the notion of pollution and taboo across a diverse range of cultures, proposes that 'dirt' is 'matter out of place' (p.35). She argues that 'dirtiness' is not a property of objects but rather a quality which things take on when they are in the wrong place according to some arbitrary classificatory system. According to Douglas 'dirt is the by-product of a systematic ordering and classification of matter, in so far as ordering involves rejecting inappropriate elements' (1966: 35). Any notion of pollution, then, implies 'a set of ordered relations and a contravention of that order' (ibid., 35). Clearly Douglas, like Bernstein, is concerned with describing boundaries and strengths of boundary within a classificatory system.

It is, perhaps, possible to extend this link between Bernstein and Douglas somewhat further. In addition to 'dirt' and 'pollution', Douglas (1966) deals with such religious notions as the 'sacred', the 'profane' and 'holiness'. She views holiness as being 'exemplified by completeness' (1966: 53), and argues that 'holiness requires that different classes of things shall not be confused' (ibid.). It seems probable that, implicit in such a notion of categories, there must be some principle by which things are classified. The classificatory divisions of such a system must be informed by some rule and Bernstein's (1990) notion of the pedagogic device would seem to provide a descriptive means for understanding such principles. What, using Douglas's terminology, is deemed to be a pure category must be negotiated by pedagogic discourse, and the set of principles comprising such a discourse represents a manifestation of the play of power in the social world external to it. Hence categories of things, such as areas of knowledge, and their classification will reflect the dominant power relations of the culture which defines them.

The curricular elements selected and recontextualised by official pedagogic practice at a school could be seen as analogous to Douglas's (1966) pure categories, in which the 'pure' is that which conforms to the criteria for some class of things. The impure, following the same model, would be that which does not conform to a recognised category. As discussed above, recognition as a category must depend on some principle or criteria, and using Bernstein's (1990) model, such criteria will be shaped by the pedagogic device -the 'distributive, recontextualising, and evaluative rules for specialising forms of consciousness' (Bernstein, 1990: 181). In other words, the pedagogic device is the set of principles whereby the criteria for what constitutes a legitimate category or content area are formed. The relevance of Douglas's anthropological account of the creation of legitimate categories to this study is explained in section 2.8 below.

## **2.8 Boundaries and music**

In the case of music and school music in particular, the criteria for what constitutes different musics referred to by Vulliamy and Shepherd are the criteria by which pure musical categories are classified. Musics which do not conform to the class 'music' as defined by these criteria, in being rejected become analogous to the 'impure' or 'profane' in Douglas (1966). Popular forms of music which place emphasis on elements inadmissible by the traditional criteria of western art music are, in effect, polluting. Indeed, this is remarkably similar to the language used by critics of popular music to denigrate it (see, for instance, Shepherd, 1979 and Rainbow, 1989). These criteria, then, are used to distinguish the pure from the debased and, based on these criteria, strong classification is maintained between western art music ('serious music') and other musics (most notably popular). This classification manifests itself in the strong dichotomy commonly recognised between 'popular' culture and 'serious' culture.

In addition to criteria internal to music itself, a number of social criteria have also been used by musicologists and, presumably, educators, to define the boundaries of 'serious' music and to maintain its identity as a pure category (Vulliamy, 1977). Vulliamy (1977) and Shepherd (1979) give an example of this, citing Routh (1972), who gives the following as social criteria for defining 'serious' music:

1. Serious music is not written for commercial gain.
2. Serious music is to be listened to, and no other activity is to occur during its performance.
3. The composer of serious music will have 'a creative, unique purpose'.
4. Serious music demands an 'active [intellectual] response on the part of the listener', bringing to bear his or her full intelligence.
5. The composer of serious music will possess and use both 'vision and technique'.

(Routh, 1972. Quoted in Vulliamy, 1977: 182)

Routh makes it quite explicit that these criteria exclude 'non-art music, such as pop music' from being considered as art and that to do so is 'an illogical affectation' (ibid.).

## 2.9 Pedagogic discourse and music education

In the context of music and music education, it should be possible to use Bernstein's descriptive framework to analyse the tacit processes by which power relations are expressed through curriculum selection. In the field of music it is clear, for instance, that different genres historically have been associated with different social groups. Western art music has been, and remains, the musical text of the middle class. Popular music, on the other hand, developed as the musical text of the working class. The review of current New South Wales music syllabus documents in section 1.3 (above) revealed a clear structural bias against popular musics, whereas western art music clearly was privileged. The reason for this cannot not lie in the music itself, for there are no logical grounds for such discrimination, despite the assertions of such critics as Routh (1972, in Vulliamy, 1977). Nor can the reason lie in the significance of the music, for the popular genre includes the most significant musical forms of the twentieth century. Rather, the denigration of popular music and the privileging of western art music in the syllabus documents represents the play of social power, for it is the musical text of the socially powerful which is privileged.

The picture which emerges from the range of literature discussed above is that the genre of popular music, whilst not always excluded from school curricula, has historically been denigrated whereas the genre of western art music has been privileged in music education. If we take the

electric guitar as being subject to the same issues as those affecting popular music in general, then the theoretical framework of the structuring of pedagogic discourse seems to offer a means whereby some of the deficiencies in guitar education which have been documented overseas might be explained. Overseas studies (such as Stimpson, 1985) show that despite being one of the most popular musical instruments played and learned by older children and adolescents, electric guitar is infrequently used in school music education and, when it is included in performance curricula it tends to be used in ways which do not represent sound educational practice. Such issues have never been addressed locally, so it will be a major aim of this study to investigate three questions. Firstly, how many older children and adolescents play the various types of guitar? Secondly, to what extent is the guitar involved in the music curricula of schools? Thirdly, what is the manner of the guitar's involvement in school music curricula? It will also be an aim of this study to use the guitar as a case example of the structuring of pedagogic discourse in music education.

## Chapter 3: Methodology and study design

### 3.1 Rationale

It was suggested in the previous section that, in order to address the issues of the extent and manner of the electric guitar's involvement in school music curricula, three key questions need to be answered:

1. how many school students play the various types of guitar?;
2. to what extent is the guitar involved in school performance curricula?; and
3. what do guitarists do when they are involved in such curricula?

In addition to these questions, this study aims to use the guitar in education as a case example of the structuring of pedagogic discourse. This chapter describes the design of the study which was carried out in order to answer the three research questions listed above. First, a rationale is presented for the methodological approach adopted. Second, the range of data gathering procedures used in the study is explained. The chapter concludes with a description of the ways in which data were analysed for the final report.

Of the three research questions the first two, involving number and frequency, clearly entail some sort of quantitative investigation. The third question, however, entails description and interpretation of practices and so lends itself to a qualitative methodology. This being the case, it is clear that any study which aims to deal with all three of the above questions taken together will need to combine both quantitative and qualitative research strategies. A research method which meets ideally these criteria is the case study (Yin, 1994; Stenhouse, 1985).

A case study method was chosen as the most appropriate to this investigation. In addition to being naturally conducive to a combination of data gathering approaches, a case study is also well suited to the nature and stage;of development of this inquiry. None of the three questions listed above about the involvement of the guitar in school music education has previously been studied

locally. Because of this, the current investigation is driven entirely by the overseas literature, local anecdotal evidence, personal experience, and the sociological theory of Bernstein. This can only be, in effect, an exploratory study which may establish a need for further, more extensive work. However, at this stage it seems most appropriate to use a small-scale but detailed inquiry. Whilst the case study has, traditionally, been seen as primarily an exploratory precursor to more broad-based quantitative research (Yin, 1994; Sarantakos, 1993), this view has recently been rejected (Stake, 1994; Yin, 1994) and is not what makes it appropriate to this investigation. Rather, it is the depth and fine detail of data made available by a case study, and its ability to illustrate actual practices in their natural context (Sarantakos, 1994; Yin, 1994; Krueger, 1987) which best justify such an approach here. In addition to this, case study research can also provide a strong basis for theorising and theoretical generalisation which, considering the absence of previous local research into the questions raised by this study, makes its use here still more appropriate.

The choice of a case study method is also appropriate given the nature of the theoretical framework within which this study is located. The theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse, when considered at the level of the school, deals with tacit processes of curriculum selection. Students and teachers in a school situation will, most likely, be unaware of such processes or of their own role in them. One of the benefits of a case study in such a context is that it 'offers from an outsiders standpoint explanations that emphasise causal or structural patterns of which participants in the case are unaware' (Stenhouse, 1985: 645-646). A key purpose of case study research in schools, according to Krueger (1987), is to gain an understanding of patterns of conduct and institutional structures which shape the everyday practice of those involved. Such a purpose is also highly relevant to this inquiry.

Case study methods have previously been used in England and Canada to investigate the sociology of musical knowledge in school curricula. Graham Vulliamy (1977) conducted a study in the music department of a London secondary comprehensive school, where he used interviews and non-participant observation to discover what musics were considered as legitimate by its teachers. John Shepherd (Shepherd & Vulliamy, 1983) used similar data gathering techniques in a study of the same issue in a secondary school in Ontario. While the data presented in the accounts of both of these studies seem to be highly selective and, largely for reasons discussed in chapter 1 above, the

authors' interpretation of them seems debatable, it is clear that the use of case studies to investigate the sociology of music in education is precedented and appropriate to the field.

Initially, it was intended that this project would involve a contrastive study of music education practice in two sites using a multi-site case study methodology (Yin, 1994; Stenhouse, 1985). The two sites selected were to have been located in contrasting socio-economic areas and populations: largely working class in one site and entirely middle class in the other. The rationale for this was that it was anticipated that popular and western art music would be given different treatments and a different status in each school, but that similar generalisations would nevertheless be possible about each site using the framework of Bernstein's theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse. Also, use of two socially contrasting sites was intended to help counter economic reasons for the presence or absence of the electric guitar, particularly at the working class site.

The music department at the working class school consisted of only one teacher who, although willing to be involved in the study, was extremely busy. Early in the data gathering phase of the study at this school, it became apparent that it would have to be abandoned, the teacher being too busy and his department too under-resourced to cope with the demands which would have been placed on him by participating in the study. The research continued, slightly modified and in greater detail, at the second school, where no such problems were encountered.

### **3.2 The case**

The 'case' in this study was the co-curricular music program of each of the schools. For the purposes of this study, 'co-curricular' will be defined as involving all musical performance, particularly in musical ensembles, which is organised by the school music department as part of its official program. Thus, this study was mainly concerned with bands, orchestras, choirs, and so on which were organised and run by the school.



It was in this context that the issues of the extent and manner of involvement of the guitar and the number of students playing it were investigated. The focus was mainly on official curriculum, outside of normal classroom teaching, though some consideration was also given to the use of the guitar in unofficial (student organised) ensembles and in practical classroom music-making. Likewise, some attention was paid to the related issue of the role of popular music, as opposed to western art music, in each of the above contexts.

### **3.3 Data gathering procedures**

The case study was conducted using a range of data collection techniques. Data were gathered through formal interviews, informal interviews, a questionnaire, non-participant observation, and documentary analysis. The informal interviews, the questionnaire and the non-participant observation procedures were all pre-tested in the music department of a government boys' high school located in the northern suburbs of Sydney.

Two types of interview were used, formal and informal. Two formal interviews were conducted with one full-time music teacher at the school. These were semi-structured (Sarantakos, 1993) and in depth. The first interview was the longer and more detailed of the two, with the second serving as a follow-up in which further issues could be raised or points from the initial interview clarified. The teacher-interviews dealt with a range of issues, each relating to one or more of the research questions. The main questions were designed in advance and are listed in appendix A-1. All of these questions were addressed, but not necessarily according to a set interview schedule, and in no specific order. However, each main item was posed formally and a specific response required. In addition to the formal, scheduled questions described in appendix A-1, there were also various probes and follow-ups. These can be found in the transcriptions in appendix B. Both interviews were, with the permission of the teacher, tape-recorded and later transcribed in full. The complete transcripts are included in appendix B.

Informal, semi-structured interviews (Sarantakos, 1993) were conducted with student key informants at the school. One student from each year seven class and one student from each of

years eight to twelve were to be questioned. However, it was only possible to arrange a meeting with four out of the six year seven classes. Ideally, the student key-informants were to have been guitarists who were identified with the help of the music staff. In fact, all but one of the students did play the guitar. These students were asked to provide information about their peers, and it was assumed that the older students would be more familiar with their whole year than the year sevens. These informal interviews addressed the following questions:

1. How many guitarists are there (in each year) at the school?
2. What styles of guitar do students at the school play?
3. Are the students who play guitar involved in any non school-organised musical groups, either at school or outside of it?

These informal interviews were intended to determine the number of students at each site who play the guitar, without having to survey the entire school population first-hand. Contact with these students was made twice at a prearranged time, and the interviews were conducted in one group of nine. The first meeting with the students established what information was needed of them, and the second was to provide the data. The exact questions asked of the student key-informants are given in appendix A-2. The interviews with the students were not tape-recorded, but the data were manually recorded and quantified (where relevant) for the final report. Any apparently significant comments made by the students were noted verbatim. This data gathering procedure was pre- tested at a second school with a similar location and student population and was found to be effective.

A brief self-completion questionnaire was administered to students involved in the official performing ensembles (see appendix A-3). The purpose of the questionnaire was to help determine how many instrumentalists were involved in each school-organised ensemble, what instruments they played both in ensembles and elsewhere, how many guitarists were involved in such ensembles on guitar or some other instrument, and whether the respondents were involved in any musical ensembles not organised by the school.

This questionnaire was administered and completed during ensemble rehearsals. It was completed under supervision and was designed to take into account any students who played in more than one ensemble. The results were quantified for the final report. The questionnaire was pre- tested at the test site described above. Based on this testing, the questionnaire instrument was revised.

Observation was also used to gather data. The observation was non-participant (Cohen & Manion, 1989) and semi-structured (Sarantakos, 1993). It was carried out according to a schedule (see appendix A-4), but one which allowed some scope for additional unstructured observation where needed. The context for the observation was a rehearsal of each of the instrumental ensembles at the school. The observation focused on the number of students involved in the school-organised ensembles on each instrument, what music was played by each instrument.

School records were used to gather data such as the number of students involved in the co-curricular program, the number taking lessons on each instrument with the school, and so on. Where appropriate and possible, photocopies of relevant documents were made and analysed away from the case study site.

A number of questions were covered by more than one data gathering method. This was so as to increase the reliability of the data through triangulation (Cohen & Manion, 1989), and also to allow different perspectives to become apparent. An example of this may be the popularity of the electric guitar among students. The data include perceptions of its popularity from the perspective of students and that of a teacher. The bulk of the data gathering has focused on the actual practices of teachers and students at the school. This is consistent with a view of curriculum as the (educational) experiences of students at school (Pinar, 1975), and as what is there to be experienced. Note that here the term 'curriculum' is distinct from its more specialised use in Bernstein's terminology, and is used to describe a much broader system which encompasses Bernstein's three message systems: curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation.

### **3.4 Data analysis procedures.**

The data gathered by the various procedures described in the previous section were both quantitative and qualitative in nature. To reflect this, the data were analysed using a variety of approaches. Quantitative data were simply quantified and reported whilst qualitative data were reported in full and analysed in terms of content and, where appropriate, were also quantified. Once all the data were organised by these methods, they were analysed using a pattern-matching logic (Yin, 1994) and by placing them within the descriptive framework of Bernstein's (1990) theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse.

The data relating to the number of students at the study school who played the guitar and those reporting the extent of the guitar's involvement in the case have been quantified and presented in tabular form in the following chapter. These data have not been subjected to any statistical analysis beyond conversion into percentage form, to facilitate comparison, where appropriate. The nature of the research questions and the data they generated did not demand finely detailed comparisons or tests of significance. Nor was it a purpose of this study to generalise beyond the single case except at the level of theory (Yin, 1994).

The data describing the manner in which the guitar was involved in the co-curricular music program of the school were qualitative in nature. Data derived from the teacher-interviews and relating to this issue were analysed in terms of content. The relevant information has been extracted from the interview transcriptions and grouped with other data which report on the same aspect of the issue. Thus, all data describing the manner of the guitar's involvement in classroom performance have been grouped together, as have all those which report the ways in which guitars were used in Higher School Certificate performances by students.

In order to classify the role played by and the types of musical part provided for each instrument in the school-organised ensembles, descriptive categories were derived from the data themselves (reported in table 4.5 in the following chapter). Every instance observed of an instrument playing a part from any of the four categories was recorded and the findings presented in tabular form.

All of the data, taken together, were analysed using a pattern- matching logic (Yin, 1994). For each of the three research questions, it was possible to predict from the literature reviewed in chapter one what patterns would be likely to be apparent in the data. For instance, Bartel (1990), Stimpson (1985) and Zvengrowski (1980) suggest that the guitar is one of the most popular musical

instruments among children and young adolescents to play or learn. This predicted pattern was compared with the actual pattern revealed in the data gathered by this study. The degree to which the patterns could be matched is discussed in the final chapter.

Finally, all of the data gathered have been analysed within the descriptive framework of Bernstein's (1990) theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse. The concepts of classification and framing, outlined in the previous chapter, were used to describe the characteristics of the three message systems curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation in the case. Also, in the final chapter, the main components of the pedagogic device which shaped the guitar's involvement in the co-curricular music program of the study school were identified.

Thus, the data presented in the following chapter are analysed and grouped at an organisational level only, in order to facilitate easy reference and clear comparison. Analysis at the level of pattern-matching and theory does not occur until the final chapter, chapter five.

## Chapter 4: Results

In this chapter, the data gathered by the procedures described in chapter three are reported. First, general descriptive data and background about the case are given. Second, the data relating to each of the three research questions are reported, starting with the number of students playing each type of guitar at the school, followed by the extent of the guitar's involvement in the case and, finally, the manner in which the guitar was used in the co-curricular music program of the study school. The chapter concludes with a brief summary of the findings answering each of these questions in general terms.

### 4.1 Case description

The setting for the case study was a large non-government school in the northern suburbs of Sydney. The school had an enrolment of 1600 students from years three to twelve and was divided, physically and administratively, into a junior school (years three to six) and a senior school (years seven to twelve). From years three to ten the school is for boys only, but is co-educational in years eleven and twelve. The case in this study involved only the co-curricular music program of the senior school.

The music department was housed in a large, recently built, dedicated building located well away from other classrooms and administrative areas but close to the junior school which shared the same facilities. The 'music centre', as it was known, was a two-storey building which included a rehearsal room for large ensembles, many smaller rehearsal and instrumental practice rooms, a small performance space, a sixteen-track recording studio and storage areas as well as classrooms, staff offices and a large staff common room. There was a piano in most rooms, a full set of orchestral percussion equipment permanently set up in the large rehearsal room, and class sets of electronic keyboards and music computer equipment in two of the classrooms which were organised as keyboard laboratories.

The music staff consisted of four full-time teachers and fourteen peripatetic instrumental and ensemble teachers. Private instrumental lessons were conducted all day, both inside and outside of class time. Departmental records show that, at the time of this study, there were 246 secondary students receiving instrumental lessons through the music centre, a number of them receiving instruction in two or more instruments, and an additional 25 students taking private

coaching in musicianship. Junior school students also received private instrumental instruction at the centre and every student in year three studied violin for which lessons were conducted in groups.

The senior school music program was preceded by a program in the junior school in which every student studied music in class with a specialist teacher and learnt violin in year three. In addition to this, the junior school also had its own co-curricular program with seven ensembles in all. The ensembles consisted of two concert bands, two choirs, an orchestra, a string group (chamber orchestra) and a recorder ensemble. All of these groups rehearsed in the music centre.

The case under investigation in the present study, as mentioned above, was the formal co-curricular music program of the senior school. This referred to the musical ensembles and performance-based activities organised by the school outside of normal classroom teaching. In this case the seventeen ensembles involved were as follows:

- 3 concert bands
- 2 choirs
- 2 guitar ensembles
- 2 string groups
- 2 orchestras
- chamber orchestra
- stage band
- brass ensemble
- clarinet ensemble
- percussion ensemble
- saxophone ensemble

#### **4.2 Data**

The following sections show the data gathered by the various procedures described in the previous chapter. They are organised according to which of the three research questions they relate to. The first data relate to the number of students at the school who played the guitar. The next group of data report the extent to which the guitar was used in the case and the third group of data describe the manner in which the guitar was used. The sources of the data are cited as exactly as possible throughout this and the following chapter. Where data have been drawn from the teacher interviews they are referenced according from which interview in the sequence they are derived: teacher interview number one (TI#1) or number two (TI#2). These are always followed by a paragraph reference containing the paragraph number and identifying the source of the data ('T'

standing for the teacher and 'S' for the interviewer). Complete transcriptions of the two teacher-interviews are included in appendix B. Observations are referenced by giving details which relate to a specific completed schedule in the case study data base. For instance, Monday guitar ensemble is coded as 'Observations : GM'. A full summary of all nomenclature used is included in appendix C.

#### 4.2-1 The number of students playing guitar

The number of students at the school who played guitar was determined through existing school records, through the student key- informants and the questionnaire. The records used as a source were, first, the list of students receiving private instrumental instruction through the music\_ centre and, second, the list of students involved in each school-organised ensemble. School records showed that a total of 246 senior school students received private instrumental lessons through the music centre on a total of 18 different instruments. Of these, 28 (or 11.3%) were guitarists. The student key-informants surveyed other students in their year group to find how many considered themselves as playing the guitar and recorded their names. The questionnaire yielded names of students who played the guitar as a main or other instrument. The names were cross-checked to ensure that each was counted once only. The results of the procedures described above are shown in table 4.1.

**Table 4.1**

#### **Number of students at the school playing guitar**

involvement:	Number:
involved in ensembles on guitar:	18
Involved in ensembles on an instrument other than guitar:	11
Not involved in ensembles:	26
Total number of guitarists:	55

Table 4.1 shows the numbers of student guitarists at the school involved in school-organised ensembles as guitarists, those involved in school-organised ensembles on an instrument other than guitar and those not involved in any school-organised ensembles. It also gives the total number of students at the school identified by this study as playing guitar.



Of the 55 guitarists identified, it was possible to determine the style of guitar played by 45 students. Of these, 40.5 (or 90%) played either electric or plectrum-style guitar and 4.5 (or 10%) played classical guitar (one student specialized in both equally). The source of these data was a combination of the interviews with student key-informants and Observations of ensembles in rehearsal.

The figure of 55 guitarists in the senior school is supported in the observation of the teacher (T1) interviewed. His perception was that there were 'maybe fifty or sixty across the different years - who play it [guitar] at a reasonable level' (TI#1: 002T). However, although this number may be accurate, it is likely that not every guitarist in the school was accounted for. The reason for this was that three of the six year seven students failed to return their survey, as did the year twelve student. This suggests that the number of students playing guitar at the school may be more than the 55 identified by this study. Thus, while the data gathering methods used were not necessarily comprehensive, the number of guitarists arrived at must be either correct or, at worst, an underestimate.

The number of students playing guitar at the school, then, was at least 55. Of these, 41 students played the electric or plectrum guitar. Data reporting the extent of the guitar's involvement in the case, the second of the three research questions, are described in the following section

#### **4.2-2 The extent of the guitar's involvement**

The extent of the guitar's involvement in the co-curricular music program of the school was measured in three different contexts. The first of these was in the official, school-organised ensembles. In this context, a picture of the guitar's involvement was developed through observations, records of ensemble membership and the teacher interview. The second context was the guitar's involvement in unofficial (student-organised) ensembles, and involved data derived from the student key-informants, the questionnaire and the teacher interviews. The final context, on the periphery of the case under investigation but still relevant to this study, was the involvement of the guitar in practical musical performance in class. This was investigated through the teacher interview alone.

In the school-organised ensembles there were 17 guitars used, involving 16 students in 3 ensembles. These were the two guitar ensembles, which together included 16 guitars, and the stage

band, which included one guitar. One student played guitar in both a guitar ensemble and the stage band. The numbers of each instrument involved in all the ensembles, the number of ensembles in which each was included, the number of ensembles available to each instrument and the number of students involved in ensembles on each instrument are shown in table 4.2.

**Table 4.2**

***Involvement in official ensembles by instrument***

Instrument:	Number involved:	Number of ensembles:	Ensembles available:	Students involved:
Voice	49	2	2	49
Violin	46	5	5	30
Saxophone	45	5	5	32
Trumpet	36	6	7	24
Clarinet	29	6	6	24
Percussion	29	6	8	22
Flute	22	5	5	16
'Cello	19	5	5	10
Trombone	19	7	7	13
Guitar	17	3	3	16
Viola	9	5	5	4
French horn	7	3	6	5
Euphonium*	6	4	6	5
Piano/keyboard	6	4	6	6
Tuba	6	5	6	3
Electric bass	4	4	6	2
Bassoon	3	2	5	3
Oboe	3	2	5	2
Double bass	1	1	7	1
Drum kit	1	1	1	1

\*including tenor horn & baritone

Source: School records, questionnaire, observations.

Table 4.2 illustrates the extent of involvement in school-organised ensembles of each instrument used (including voice). It also shows the potential for involvement of each instrument. The first column shows the number of positions occupied by each instrument at the time of the study. The second column gives the number of official ensembles in which each instrument was involved. The third column gives the number of school-organised ensembles which had places available for each instrument. The fourth column shows the actual number of students involved on each instrument, taking into account those involved more than once.

Membership of school-organised ensembles was open to all students, provided an vacancy existed for their instrument. An exception to this was the stage band. Students could only join the stage band if they were already involved in a large ensemble (concert band or orchestra) or one of the guitar ensembles (Ti#2: 020T; 022T). The reason for this was that stage band was considered to be 'an extension group' to the large ensembles which were seen as the basis of the school's music program (Ti#2: 022T).

There was a total of 246 senior school students receiving private instrumental lessons through the music centre. A number of students took lessons on more than one instrument, so that there were 270 private lessons conducted each week for students in years seven to ten. Most, but not all, of these students were involved in official, school-organised ensembles. The extent to which private students of each instrument learning through the school were involved in official ensembles is shown in table 4.3.

Other performance opportunities open to guitarists in the school's co-curricular program included musicals (TI#1: 089T) and student-organised groups which were able to perform at a voluntary weekly informal lunchtime concert when they wanted to in the music centre (TI#1: 079T). The musicals, held annually, included a guitarist when the score required it (TI#1: 091T).

The official ensembles in which guitarists were involved (guitar ensembles and stage band) rehearsed for thirty minutes each week in the music centre. Of the ensembles not involving guitars, the chamber orchestra, string quartets, clarinet and percussion ensembles also rehearsed for thirty minutes per week. The remaining ensembles each rehearsed for one hour per week (school records). The guitar ensembles and stage band did not perform any more or less than the other school ensembles (TI#2: 006T). Performance venues for the ensembles involving guitars included 'eisteddfods, . . .Friday lunchtime concerts, ...school concerts, ...assemblies' and at workshops combined with another school (TI #2: 002T; 004T).

Table 4.3 shows the number of private lessons conducted weekly at the school on each instrument in which tuition was offered. They are ordered from the instrument with the highest number of lessons (piano) to that with the lowest (double bass). Also shown is the number of students receiving private tuition on each instrument who were involved in school-organised ensembles. The rate at which these students were involved in ensembles is given by expressing the number involved as a percentage of the total number receiving private lessons.

Table 4.3

***Involvement of private instrumental students in official ensembles by instrument***

Instrument:	Lessons per week:	Number of private students involved in ensembles:	Rate of participation in ensembles (%)
Piano	42	21	50
Saxophone	41	25	60.9
Guitar	28	16	57.1
Clarinet	25	19	76
Trumpet	23	19	82.6
Percussion	22	15	68.1
Flute	19	11	61.1
Voice	19	10	52.6
Violin	10	9	90
Trombone	8	7	87.5
'Cello	6	4	66.6
Euphonium*	6	5	83.3
Oboe	6	4	66.6
Jazz piano	6	3	50
French horn	3	2	66.6
Tuba	3	3	100
Viola	2	2	100
Double bass	1	1	100

\*Including baritone & tenor horn

Source: Term 3 instrumental lesson list; ensemble enrolments

The guitar was also involved in unofficial, student-organised ensembles. The existence of such groups was determined through the questionnaire, the student interviews and the teacher interviews. The exact number of student-organised ensembles was unclear. This was because only students involved in ensembles and guitarists were surveyed as to this, leaving out a large section of the schools' student population. However, as was the case with the number of guitarists in the school, the data gathered during the study must represent either the correct number of unofficial ensembles in the school or, at worst, an underestimate. According to the teacher interviewed, there were also some ensembles organised by year twelve students which have not been counted here (TI#1: 079T).

Through the questionnaire and the student interviews, it was found that there were at least 7 unofficial, student-organised ensembles. Electric and/or acoustic plectrum guitar was involved in all seven of these ensembles. They are listed in table 4.4 below:

**Table 4.4**

***Student-organised ensembles at the school***

Year group of students involved	Ensemble description:
11	Jazz/funk band
11	Punk (rock) band
11	Rock band
11	Techno/rock band
10	Rock/pop group
9	Rock band
8	rock/pop group

Source: Survey by student key-informants; questionnaire, item 1

Table 4.4 gives the style of music played by and the format of each of the unofficial, student-organised ensembles identified by this study. The description of each ensemble is as it was given by the students involved. They are arranged according to the year group from which the majority of members were drawn.

The student-organised ensembles were supported by the school in so far as they were permitted to perform at the weekly informal conceit, some of them were occasionally invited to perform at school concerts and functions, and they were allowed to use the music centre facilities for rehearsal (TI#1: 079T). These ensembles received no allocated regular rehearsal time or allocated staff to tutor them (ibid.).

Guitars were involved in musical performance in class as well as in the co-curricular program of the school. Although not the main focus of this study, data on this involvement were gathered by means of the teacher interviews. Guitar was used in the classroom during practical performance activities by those students who played the instrument and were able to cope with the part involved (TI#2: 008T; 014T; 016T). If a piece of music did not call for guitar, a guitarist might be asked to play electric bass instead (TI#2: 008). In the elective music classes, from years nine to twelve, there were

a total of 8 students specializing in guitar, plus an additional 5 who played guitar while specializing in other instruments (TI#1: 020T).

This concludes the data reporting the extent of the guitar's involvement in the co-curricular music program of the school. In the following section, data describing the manner of the guitar's involvement in the case are given.

#### **4.2-3 The manner of the guitar's involvement**

Data on the manner in which the guitar was used at the school were gathered through observation, the teacher interviews, the interviews with student key-informants and the questionnaire. Of these, the first two were the primary sources. All of the data concerning this question were qualitative, though some have been quantified here. Wherever this is the case, the principles by which the conversion has been effected are made explicit.

In the rehearsal of guitar ensemble #1, 5 students were in attendance out of a possible 7. Present were 1 electric guitar, 1 nylon-string acoustic guitar played with a plectrum, 1 classical guitar played with the fingers, 1 steel-string acoustic guitar played with a plectrum and one electric bass. Two pieces were rehearsed. The first of these was a flamenco-influenced piece based around an E Phrygian mode and arranged in a western art music style. The second piece was in a rock/pop style. Both were set for electric bass, melody and rhythm guitars. The flamenco-influenced piece was arranged into three melodic guitar parts, playing in harmony, one guitar playing chordal accompaniment and electric bass playing a line similar to those of the melody guitars. The second piece was arranged for electric bass, melody guitars playing in unison or in octaves and rhythm guitar playing a chordal accompaniment. The bass player played the first piece from memory and the second from a notated melodic part. The student playing the steel-string acoustic guitar played the first piece without music and played from chord symbols in the second. The other guitarists all played from notated parts in both pieces. One of these students had fret numbers written above every note in the first piece. The director of the group counted pieces in and out them off and made suggestions between playings. There was no formal conducting, and he and the students spoke informally to one another. Some students swore freely throughout the rehearsal both to each other and to the director. At one stage, students voiced objections when the director proposed playing a new piece of music in a jazz style. The director observed that the students were only interested in playing music in a rock style. (Observations: GM).

In the rehearsal of guitar ensemble #2 observed for this study, 7 students were present out of an enrolment of 11. There was 1 electric guitar, 4 nylon-string acoustic guitars played with plectrums, 1 classical guitar played with the fingers and 1 electric bass. Three pieces were rehearsed. They were all in a rock/pop style and were arranged for bass, rhythm guitar and melody guitars. The melody guitars were in unison for two of the pieces and divided into melody and ostinato accompaniment for the third piece. The bassist played from a notated melodic part in 'every piece. Four of the six guitarists played from both notated melodic parts and chord symbols during the course of the rehearsal. One of the remaining guitarists played only from chord symbols and the other used no music but played both chords and melody. The director of the group counted tunes in, cut them off at the end and made suggestions between playings. There was no formal conducting and conversation between students and the director was informal (observations: GT).

In the rehearsal of the stage band observed, 18 out of 20 members were present. There were 4 saxophones, 8 trumpets, 3 trombones, an electric guitar, electric bass and drum kit. The band played three pieces, one in a swing jazz style and two in a rock style. All instruments played entirely from notated melodic parts in every piece except for the electric guitar and drum kit. The guitar played from chord symbols and the drummer played from percussion notation. The director counted pieces in and cut them off and made suggestions between playings. There was no formal conducting and no eye contact between director and students during playing. The director negotiated tempos with the students and several times sang examples of stylistically correct swing articulations as models for the musicians. There were places in two of the arrangements for improvisation, but none was attempted. Students played written solos (observations: SB).

In all of the other large-ensemble rehearsals observed, every instrument played from a notated melodic part in every piece played, with the exception of percussionists playing untuned percussion instruments, who played from percussion notation. The music played by all the remaining ensembles was in a western art style and involved no improvisation. All directors conducted formally and made suggestions between playings. There was no negotiation of any aspect of the music and the relationship between the directors and students was friendly but formal. Students addressed conductors either as 'Sir' or 'Miss', or 'Mr\_' and 'Mrs\_\_'. The types of part played by each instrument across all ensembles are illustrated in table 4.5.

Table 4.5 illustrates, for comparison, the types of musical part which were provided for each instrument across all of the school-organised instrumental ensembles. The four categories, notated melodic part, no music, chord symbols and percussion notation, represent the full range observed.

Percussion notation was only given to those students playing untuned percussion instruments.  
 Melodic percussionists were provided with notated melodic parts.

**Table 4.5**

***Types of part provided for each instrument across all official ensembles***

Instrument:	Types of part provided:			
	Notated melodic part	No music	Chord symbols	Percussion notation
Bassoon	✓			
'Cello	✓			
Clarinet	✓			
Double bass	✓			
Electric bass	✓	✓		
Euphonium*	✓			
Flute	✓			
French horn	✓			
Guitar	✓	✓	✓	
Oboe	✓			
Percussion	✓			✓
Saxophone	✓			
Trombone	✓			
Trumpet	✓			
Tuba	✓			
Viola	✓			
Violin	✓			

\*Including baritone & tenor horn

NOTE: ✓ = type of part observed

Source: Observation; analysis of current ensemble repertoire

The typology of different parts played from by each instrument presented in table 4.5 above was arrived at by observing each instrument in rehearsal and analysing music which was not played at the observed rehearsal but nonetheless formed part of the current repertoire of each ensemble. The repertoire was available for study in music folders which contained the parts for each



instrument. Four distinct types of part were apparent: all instruments were given fully notated melodic parts; slightly more than one third of music for guitars was in the form of chord symbols; occasionally guitarists and, on one occasion, an electric bassist used no music; and untuned percussion players read from percussion notation. 6 pieces were played in the 3 rehearsals which involved guitars. These were played by 10 guitarists and involved a total of 24 separate parts. Of these, 11 (or 45.8%) were notated melodic parts, 10 (or 41.6%) consisted of chord symbols and 3 (or 12.5%) involved no written music. Of the 8 pieces played which involved electric bass, 1 (or 12.5%) involved no written music and 7 (or 87.5%) involved notated melodic parts (observations).

Data on how the guitar was used in classroom performance activities were collected through the teacher interviews. When playing from published arrangements of classroom ensemble music, the role most commonly played by guitars was chordal accompaniment for other instruments. The written guitar parts, most of the time, were in the form of chord symbols (TI#2: 008T). Sometimes a guitarist would be able to play a melodic part 'if there's a suitable melody line' (ibid) or, if that was not possible they might be asked to play electric bass (ibid). The parts for all other instruments were always fully notated (TI#2: 010T). The teacher felt that this was not an appropriate or effective use of the guitar, musically or educationally (TI#2: 012T). In his experience, the music reading skills of guitarists tended to be significantly less than those of other instrumentalists (TI#1: 066T; 068T; TI#2: 014T; 016T; 018T), a situation which he felt was due to the infrequency with which they were required to read music (TI#2: 016T) and the way in which popular styles of guitar are often taught, emphasising playing by ear (TI#1: 068T; 072T). In many cases, the guitarists who were able to read music were those who also played another instrument (TI#1: 072T; TI#2: 014T). He felt that the extensive use of chord symbols for guitar parts in arrangements of classroom music reflected 'a lack of skill on the part of the arrangers (TI#2: 012T). He also believed that, at the school, 'a lot of the kids who aren't doing music who play guitar aren't doing it because they can't read music' (TI#1: 068T).

In Higher School Certificate (HSC) music courses, guitarists played both classical and popular styles (TI#1: 012T; 016T; 020T; 030T; 036T). At the time of the interview, there was one student sitting for the 3-unit music course who played in both a classical and a jazz style, but was majoring in composition for his third unit (TI#1: 016T). In year twelve there were two guitarists enrolled in the 2-unit related course, one of whom played classical guitar whilst the other specialized in jazz and rock but could also play classical guitar (TI#1: 020T). There was no 2-unit 1 class in year twelve, and in year eleven there were two guitarists who played in a rock/pop style in 2-unit 1. There were no guitarists involved in 2-unit related in year eleven (ibid).

Students who played electric or popular styles of guitar in 2-unit course 1 were 'capable of getting the same mark as any other 2 unit 1 student' (TI#1: 024T). In the 2-unit related course, the teacher felt that guitarists were at a disadvantage unless they were able to play classical guitar with a 'very refined technique' (ibid). He had never had a student who played guitar achieve better than 'above average' (T I#1: 028T) marks in the 2-unit related or 3-unit courses. Students who played only electric guitar for the 2-unit related or 3-unit courses scored below average marks in their HSC performances (T I#1 : 032T). In the past seven years, no students at the school had attempted the 2-unit related or 3-unit courses on electric guitar alone (TI#1: 036T). The teacher felt that it was much easier for guitarists to sit for the 2-unit course 1 than the 'related course because they 'can play standard rock repertoire'(ibid.). In the 'related course playing rock was 'not really acceptable' (ibid.) because popular musics are not included in the syllabus (T I#1: 038T) and, despite content topics having open-ended titles such as 'Australian music 1970 onwards' (TI#1: 043\$), 'the syllabus is looking for more an art style than a popular or rock style' (TI#1: 044T). He believed that there was some freedom for teachers and students in the most recent syllabus document, but:

'I think there's possibility for change, but I think, again, it would still make it harder for a guitarist if they weren't able to play in other twentieth century styles and other, Classical and Romantic and Baroque styles to fill their other topic areas' performance. I'm not saying that a rock performance couldn't be incorporated in the 2 unit, in their twentieth century or, sorry, 1970 onwards Australian topic, but it just makes it harder for them' (TI#1: 046T).

In the teachers perception, there is a problem for non-classical guitarists involved in the 2-unit related and 3-unit HSC music courses in that there is a stylistically limited repertoire from which they can draw material for performance (TI#1: 046T; 050T). He felt that it would be possible for an electric guitarist to play works transcribed for other instruments in any western art music style (TI#1: 064T). He could not recall ever having seen a student electric guitarist playing such a transcription for an HSC performance (TI#1: 062T). The effectiveness of using the electric guitar in this manner would depend on 'the effectiveness of the transcriptions and the ability of the player and 'whether they have the inclination to do it'(TI#1: 064T).

#### 4.3 Summary

This concludes the data describing the manner in which the guitar was used in the co-curricular music program of the study school. In summary, the data reported above show that at least 55 students at the school played the guitar, that the guitar was involved in 3 of the 17 school-

organised ensembles (stage band and guitar ensembles 1 and 2) and that guitar was used in these ensembles to provide chordal accompaniment, in the case of the stage band, or a combination of chordal accompaniment and melodic playing in the guitar ensembles. Guitarists variously played from notated melodic parts, chord symbols or used no written music. These findings are discussed in the following chapter, both with reference to each of the three research questions and in the light of Bernstein's theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse.

## Chapter 5: Discussion and conclusions

In this chapter, the findings of the study are summarised and discussed with reference to each of the three research questions: the number of students at the school who play the guitar, the extent to which the guitar was involved in the case and the manner in which the guitar was used. The discussion demonstrates the ways in which the patterns revealed by the data described in the previous chapter match the patterns that would be predicted by the literature reviewed in chapter one. Following these summaries, the relationship between the patterns evident in the data and Bernstein's theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse are made explicit. Finally, some implications of the study's findings for the practice of music education are discussed and conclusions drawn.

### 5.1 The number of students playing guitar

The number of student guitarists in the school identified by this study was 55 (table 4.1). If this figure is compared, as a rough measure, with the numbers of students playing other instruments in ensembles (table 4.2) then it is apparent that the number of students playing guitar at the school is about the same, if not greater than the numbers playing other instruments. If the number of students learning each instrument through the school but not involved in ensembles is added to the number playing each instrument in ensembles, then the 55 guitarists identified by this study outnumber all other instrumentalists in the study school except voice. Even if, for a more direct comparison, only those guitarists either learning through the school or involved in ensembles are considered, then the guitar is still the fifth most common instrument and only slightly less common than violin and clarinet, as shown in table 5.1 below. Also, the number of students enrolled in private guitar tuition through the school was the third highest of all the instruments taught.

Table 5.1 shows the number of students at the study school who were involved in either private instrumental lessons at the school or in school-organised ensembles. Students involved both in lessons and ensembles have only been counted once. Thus, the total number of students involved in the official co-curricular music program of the school on each instrument are shown. These data are derived from those reported in chapter 4 above and show clearly that guitar was one of the most commonly played or studied of all the instruments involved in the case.

This informal comparison suggests that the claim of Bartel (1990), Stimpson (1985) and Zvengrowski (1980), that the guitar is one of the most popular musical instruments to play or learn among older children and adolescents could also be justified in this case. Given that of the guitarists surveyed for this study, 90% played electric or plectrum-style guitar, it could also be suggested that the above claim could more specifically be applied to these types of guitar. That is, in this case, electric and plectrum-style guitar was one of the most popular instruments to play or learn among the students. As regards the first question posed by this research, then, that of the number of students at the school playing guitar, the current findings seem to match the pattern suggested by the overseas literature reviewed in chapter 1. This is significant because it indicates that the issues arising from the extent and manner of the guitar's involvement in co-curricular music at the school affected a considerable number of student musicians.

**Table 5.1**

*The number of students playing each instrument involved in instrumental lessons or ensembles*

<b>instrument:</b>	<b>Number of students receiving instrumental lessons or involved in ensembles:</b>
Voice	58
Saxophone	48
Violin	31
Clarinet	30
Guitar	29
Percussion	29
Trumpet	28
Piano	27
Flute	24
Trombone	14
'cello	12
Euphonium*	6
French horn	6
Oboe	4
Viola	4
Bassoon	3
Tuba	3
Electric bass	2
Double bass	1
Drum kit	1
<b>Total:</b>	<b>360</b>

\*including baritone & tenor horn  
Source: School records

## 5.2 The extent of the guitar's involvement

The extent of involvement of the guitar in the co-curricular music program of the school was less than that of other instruments. This was apparent in the number of school-organised (official) ensembles open to guitarists, the number of guitarists involved in such ensembles, the rate of participation in official ensembles by guitarists and the general range of performance opportunities available to guitarists. This is also suggested by the data on the involvement of the guitar in performance through elective music classes.

There were three school-organised ensembles open to guitarists, the stage band (with only one position available) and the two guitar ensembles. All of the traditional band and orchestral instruments, on the other hand, had at least five ensembles open to them. Instruments which are traditionally included in both orchestra and concert band, such as trumpet and trombone had as many as seven ensembles open to them. Clearly, then, there were fewer opportunities for guitarists to become involved in official ensembles, because of the limited range open to them, than for students playing traditional band and orchestral instruments. This was, perhaps, a reflection of the formal emphasis of the school's music program on concert band and orchestra (TI#2: 023T).

Guitar was the tenth most common instrument involved in official ensembles, whereas it was the third most common instrument studied privately through the school and was one of the five most common instruments played by students involved in the formal co-curricular music program of the school, including private lessons. These findings seem to match those of Stimpson (1985), who found that guitar had the third highest number of candidates for Associated Board examinations in England from 1981 to 1983 and that, when children were surveyed as to which musical instrument they would like to learn, the guitar was consistently one of the most popular. Despite its relative popularity as an instrumental subject both in previous research and at the study school, however, only 57.1% of the students receiving private tuition in guitar through the school were involved in official ensembles. This rate of participation was lower than that of students playing any of the traditional band or orchestral instruments.

The general range of performance opportunities open to guitarists was markedly limited in comparison to those of all other instruments (excluding voice). Of the sixteen guitarists involved in official ensembles, fifteen were involved exclusively in guitar ensemble. Only one guitarist was involved in an ensemble of mixed instruments, and the use of the guitar was limited to those

ensembles which played music drawn from the popular genre. This was not by choice on the part of the students who played guitar, but rather a necessity imposed on them by the structuring of the curriculum. The stage band had only one place available for a guitarist and guitars were not included in any other mixed ensemble. The exclusion of guitarists from traditional performing ensembles in schools has previously been described by Stimpson and Burnett (1988) and Burnett (1988).

It is clear from the data that, despite its being a relatively popular instrument among the students to play and learn, the extent of the guitar's involvement in the co-curricular music program of the school comparatively limited, particularly, it may be said, for a program as large and well-resourced as the one studied. The guitar was only involved as a fringe activity in a program which explicitly emphasised concert band and orchestra as its basis. This clearly matches the pattern which would be predicted by the literature reviewed in chapter one (Bartel, 1990; Stimpson & Burnett, 1988; Stimpson, 1985; ASTA-GAMA, 1979). That is, that guitar tends to be included in school music curricula to a very limited extent. The pattern, which could be predicted from Shepherd and Vulliamy's (1983) assertion that popular music is excluded from school music curricula, however, is not matched by the data.

The data on the involvement of the guitar in elective music classes reveal a similar pattern. While not the focus of this study, these data are relevant in that elective (year nine to twelve) music classes do involve an element of performance. No data were gathered concerning the number of guitarists involved in elective music compared to students playing other instruments. However, they show that guitarists were involved in all classes except the year eleven 2 unit related class. Of the students involved in the HSC courses, there was a difference in the styles of guitar involved in each course. The students enrolled in the 2/3 unit courses played classical guitar, whereas those enrolled in 2 unit course 1 played in a popular style. Thus, in the high-prestige 2/3 unit courses the classical guitar was involved whereas the electric and plectrum guitar were not. The reverse was true of the less prestigious 2 unit course 1.

Guitar was not always involved in performances of classroom music, and sometimes guitarists were asked to play electric bass instead of their own instrument. This suggests that arrangements of classroom music do not always include parts for guitar and that the teacher sometimes selected such music for his classes to perform. This was despite the fact that there were students in all but one of the classes who played guitar. One interpretation of this might be that the prestige and importance of the instrument was less than that of other instruments in the eyes of

both the teacher and producers of educational music. If it were considered important, guitar would be included in arrangements as a matter of course.

The extent of the guitar's involvement in classroom music was limited to some extent by the level of musical literacy required by the elective courses. The teacher interviewed made it clear that many guitarists not doing elective music were not doing it because they could not read music (TI#1: 068T). This is an instance of a structural requirement which, in effect, excluded guitarists from studying elective music. It seems, then, that the guitar was involved in classroom performance, but that its involvement was limited by the structuring of the elective music courses, the poor musical literacy of many student guitarists and the selection of curriculum materials made by the class teacher. The extent of the guitar's involvement seems also to have been limited by the ways in which it was used, the manner of its involvement, which is discussed in the following section.

### **5.3 The manner of the guitar's involvement**

The data show that the guitar was used in a limited number of ways in the school's co-curricular music program. The guitar, as noted above, was used only in those ensembles which performed popular musics. It was not used to perform any western art music. The one piece in the repertoire of guitar ensemble #1 arranged in the manner of art music was written in a flamenco style, a form of folk music which places great emphasis on improvisation and is not a variety of western art music (Gammond, 1983; Katz, 1980). The number of art music ensembles run by the school, the music played by each ensemble and the fact that the stated basis of the music program was the large art music ensembles indicate that western art music, in this case, was a privileged text. The fact that the school organised no rock bands and only ran three ensembles which specialised in popular music, considered alongside the fact that stage band was deemed to be an 'extension' group only, for which membership of a large art music ensemble was a prerequisite, indicates that music of the popular genre was not, in this case, a privileged text. It is clear, then, that the guitar was only involved unprivileged musical activities within the school's co-curricular music program. Structural restrictions, such as limiting membership of the large art music ensembles to traditional band and orchestral instruments, worked in combination with curriculum selections made for the guitar ensembles to ensure that the guitar could only be involved in less privileged forms of music.

Within the school-organised ensembles, the guitar tended to be used in non-literate ways. For instance, a great deal of the musical parts provided for guitarists consisted exclusively of chord



symbols. Guitar was the only instrument for which non-standard forms of notation were routine. The guitar ensembles were the only ensembles in which it was considered acceptable for students to use no music at all, but to play by ear instead. Several guitarists were observed not using any music during rehearsals and the one instance of an electric bassist playing from memory was in guitar ensemble. All other instruments, with the exception of untuned percussion, were provided exclusively with fully notated melodic parts. Given the predominance in the ensembles of standard notation and the importance of musical literacy in elective and HSC music courses, it is clear that it was a privileged text. By virtue of the types of part provided for guitar, many guitarists were routinely denied full access to this privileging text.

Within classroom performance too, guitar tended to be used in ways which do not promote the development of musical literacy, a consequence freely acknowledged by the teacher interviewed (T1#2: 012T; 016T). Producers of educational music excluded guitarists from the privileging text of musical literacy by only providing chord symbols for guitarists to play from in arrangements of classroom music, if a guitar part was included at all. The teacher also contributed to the same process of exclusion by not adapting arrangements to promote more educationally sound forms of involvement for guitar, so that guitars were used to play melodic parts only, for instance.

Within the unofficial, student-organised ensembles, guitar was used extensively. All seven of the unofficial ensembles played music the popular genre and six played rock music. Electric guitar is fundamental to the style of music played by rock bands but tends, in this context, to be used in an even more limited way than in the official school ensembles. That is, in rock bands guitarists rarely use written music and, when they do, it tends to be in the form of chord symbols and not standard notation. The number of unofficial ensembles seems to suggest, first, a good deal of interest in small rock and jazz ensembles on the part of students at the school and, second, that this need was not being met by the school's formal co-curricular program. However, the manner of the guitar's involvement in such ensembles tends, again, to restrict guitarists access to high-prestige musical knowledge and the privileging text of musical literacy. Thus, the limiting ways in which guitar was involved in the official co-curricular program of the school seem to have been replicated in the unofficial program.

That the guitar would tend to be used in educationally inappropriate ways within school music curricula was a pattern which could be predicted from the literature reviewed in chapter one (Stimpson, 1985; Stimpson & Burnett, 1988). Such a pattern is evident in the data summarised above. It seems, therefore, that the pattern predicted from overseas literature matches the pattern

apparent in the data gathered in this study. The manner of the guitar's involvement in the co-curricular music program of the school emphasised educationally inappropriate activities which restricted the opportunities available to guitarists to develop facility in controlling and familiarity with such privileging texts as musical literacy and performance of western art music.

Given that in each of the three research questions addressed by this study the patterns which would be predicted from the relevant overseas literature seem to have been matched by the current data it would, perhaps, be reasonable to suggest that the extent and manner of the guitar's involvement in the present case was much the same as that found in previous studies conducted overseas. Contrary to what would be predicted by the socio-musicological theory of Shepherd & Vulliamy (1983, for instance), popular music was not excluded from the co-curricular program of the school. Likewise, there was never any suggestion by the teacher interviewed that popular musics were inferior to western art music, which would also be predicted by the theory of Shepherd and Vulliamy (1983). Rather, the obstacles to guitarists gaining access to privileging musical texts and the exclusion of popular musics to the periphery of the co-curricular program of the music department seem to have been structural ones realised through the selection of curricula for and organisation of ensembles. It is relevant, then, to ask what tacit processes might be operating in curriculum selection in this case, and by what means are they realised? In the following section, the theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse is used as a framework for a deeper analysis of the findings discussed above.

#### **5.4 The findings in the light of Bernstein's theory**

Curriculum in the case described in this study can be analysed using the concept of classification. One of the most striking features of the co-curricular music program of the school was the extent to which popular music and western art music were insulated from one another. Ensembles played either popular music or western art music; there was no mixing of genres within any ensemble. Translated into Bernstein's terminology, there was strong classification of musical genres, for the boundaries between them were sharply defined. For students specialising in guitar, this classification was intensified by the structuring of the ensemble program such that they were prevented from participating (on guitar) in ensembles which performed western art music.

The classification of musical genres was strengthened still further by the fact that the stage band was, in effect, pushed to the periphery of the ensemble program. The only way a student could

join the stage band was to also be involved in one of the large art music ensembles (with the exception of guitarists). This condition, not applicable to any other ensemble, introduced an extra degree of demarcation between the large ensembles and the stage band. The rule both identified the stage as a special, qualitatively different ensemble to all the others and sharpened the division between it and the art music ensembles.

At the micro level of educational knowledge, in this case, the strong classification evident in the data between popular and art music, describes a distribution of power between the two genres. If, as Bernstein (1975) suggests, we take the number of units of time given to a particular content within a curriculum and whether it is compulsory or otherwise as an informal measure of the relative status of that content, then it is clear that in this case the content with the highest status was western art music. Fourteen of the seventeen school-organised ensembles were devoted to western art music, whereas three were devoted to popular music. The rule making membership of a large ensemble a prerequisite to joining the stage band further indicates the lower status of that ensemble. In this case, then, western art music was a powerful content (or privileged text) and popular music was a weak content.

The strong classification between the two genres suggests that there must, in some sense, be 'strong boundary maintainers' (Bernstein, 1975: 90). At the micro level of educational knowledge the strong boundary maintainer in this case was western art music. It is the needs and interests of western art music which are served by the emphasis placed on its performance in the ensembles and by the number and range of ensembles devoted to it. Agents of this boundary-maintenance included the teachers who structured the ensemble program, the conductors of each ensemble, the arrangers and publishers of the music played by the ensembles and the parents of students who accepted the program structure.

At the macro level of society in general, it is reasonably clear that the music privileged in this case is the musical text of the middle classes. This is not to say that western art music is exclusively a middle class text or that popular music is used only by the working class (Frith, 1978). In fact, the current use of musical texts by people of various social backgrounds is, perhaps, of less relevance here than the history of western art music. What is important is that, historically, western art music evolved as a text of the socially powerful. Conversely, popular music evolved as a text of those with little social power (Virden & Wishart, 1977). It is this historical distribution of social power which was reflected in the structuring of and curriculum selection for the co-curricular music program of the school. Western art music was privileged above popular music, a distribution of power which reflects

the greater degree of social power wielded by the middle and upper classes than by the working class. Part of the realisation of this distribution of power was the strong classification whereby the purity of western art music as a distinct category was protected by insulating it completely from popular music. The relatively higher status enjoyed by western art music in this case represents another realisation of the same distribution of power.

The strong classification of musical genres in this case had the effect of isolating students whose main or only instrument was guitar from the rest of the students involved in school-organised ensembles. It was only possible for one guitarist to be involved in an ensemble of mixed instruments, the stage band. This aside, guitarists were restricted to the guitar ensembles. This was not the case for any other instrument. The effect of this must have been to limit the range and number of musical experiences open to student guitarists. Because guitarists were confined to ensembles playing popular music and popular music was so strongly insulated from art music in the ensemble program, they were, effectively, excluded from the privileging text of western art music.

A similar pattern of classification and streaming of electric guitarists is apparent at the level of tertiary music education too. For instance, the electric guitar is offered as a major study in the Sydney Conservatorium of Music's Bachelor of Music (jazz studies) but not in the Bachelor of Music (strings) (UAC, 1995). The reverse is true for the classical guitar.

Those students who specialised in classical guitar would certainly have had access to the privileging text through their private instrumental lessons and maybe also in musical involvements outside the school. However, as the data show, such students were few. The great of students playing guitar at the school specialised in electric or plectrum guitar, and it is likely that these students would have had little or no formal access to the privileging text whatsoever. The exclusion of electric and plectrum guitarists from the privileging\_ text may offer an explanation for the inability of such students to achieve highly in HSC 2/3 unit music described by the teacher interviewed. It could also explain the preference of such guitarists for the 2 unit 1 course and the view of the teacher that it was the most appropriate course for them to attempt

The message system pedagogy in this case can be described using the concept of frame (Bernstein, 1975). The data show, again, quite marked differences in the treatment of popular and art musics in the ensembles organised by the school. There was a further difference, even within the ensembles playing popular music, between pedagogy in the stage band and pedagogy in the guitar groups.

Within all the art music ensembles there was a formal relationship between the conductors or tutors and the students involved. The choice of repertoire seemed to lie entirely with the tutors. Certainly, there was no negotiation of curriculum observed in any of the art music ensembles. Also, in these ensembles, every student playing a melodic instrument was provided with a fully notated part which they were expected to, and did, read. In the guitar ensembles, however, the relationship between the tutor and the students was informal, repertoire was negotiated and the students demand to play only popular music, mostly rock, was complied with. Also, it was accepted that some students would not read music and, because the repertoire demanded it, that many would play from chord symbols exclusively. In the stage band, the tutor-student relationship was formal and all instruments, except guitar, played from notated melodic parts. Interestingly, the stage band and the guitar ensembles were directed by the same tutor.

What were considered to be legitimate texts and communications within the pedagogical relationship in the guitar ensembles were not accepted as such in the art music ensembles. Within the guitar ensembles both the internal and external framing was weaker. Internally, at the level of selection, it was the students who were in control, they being the ones who determined what was legitimate curriculum content. Similarly, at the level of organisation the students were permitted to decide what constituted legitimate practice. Thus, if they did not want to read music, they did not have to. At the levels of pacing and timing, pedagogy in the guitar ensembles was negotiated.

External framing values in the guitar ensembles were also weaker. The modes of discourse permitted, such as swearing and informal conversation, represented external framing values. It was an example of everyday community modes of discourse entering into a pedagogic relationship within a school. The music played within the guitar ensembles, drawn from the popular genre, was also a text normally privileged outside the school being accepted as legitimate here too. In other words, the distinction between what constituted legitimate school and external texts and modes of discourse was weak in the guitar ensembles. This was in contrast to the pedagogy of the art music ensembles, in which framing was stronger.

Framing was strong in the art music ensembles - internally, because control over curriculum selection and organisation lay entirely with the teachers. Pacing and timing, too, were controlled to a large degree by the teachers in that they decided when various pieces should be rehearsed and performed. External framing was strong because everyday modes of discourse were not permitted and the music performed represented the text privileged by the local pedagogic practice of the

school. Thus, the only acceptable communications between teachers and students were formal ones, and only the only music performed was drawn from the genre of western art music.

Framing in the stage band tended to be strong for all students except, internally at the level of organisation and externally at the level of mode of discourse, for the guitarist. That is, the guitarist, in reading from chord symbols instead of standard notation, was engaging in a mode of discourse privileged in certain contexts outside the school but not in the school, and the pedagogical encounter for him was organised such this mode of discourse was accepted as legitimate. For all students in the stage band external framing at the level of content was weaker in that popular music was legitimate instead of art music, the text normally privileged in the co-curricular music program of the school.

The weaker framing where guitarists were concerned allowed them to shape their own curriculum to a large extent. By choosing to play only popular music and to include a range of non-literate modes of discourse in their ensembles, the guitarists effectively isolated themselves from the privileging text of western art music. Unlike in the other ensembles, the music staff at the school did nothing to compel the student guitarists to acquaint themselves with the privileging text and the guitar group tutor did not provide his students with any opportunity to do so. A consequence of this must have been to exclude this group of students from gaining access to the privileging text. If the guitarists had no experience of the privileging text, then it seems most unlikely that they could have derived any of the benefits to be gained by familiarity with it.

The third message system in Bernstein's (1975) model, evaluation, is described by both classification and framing taken together. In this case, the weaker classification and framing for guitarists resulted in different evaluation criteria being applied to them than to students playing other instruments in the ensemble program. From the perspective of the dominant pedagogic practice in the ensembles, the standards expected of guitarists were lower than those for other instrumentalists. It was, for instance, acceptable for a guitarist not to be able to read music. Where this was the case, allowances were made for it. By contrast, such a thing was never acceptable from students playing band or orchestral instruments. Indeed, by virtue of the repertoire played and the organisation of rehearsals, it would have been impossible for such a student to be involved in the ensemble program at all. In the ensemble program, then, strong classification meant that the activities which involved guitarists were kept well apart from the rest of the ensembles. The message implicit in this is that the guitarists constituted a "different" group, a special case. The weak

framing meant that different, less stringent evaluation criteria such as those described above were indeed applied to guitarists.

The weaker classification and framing for guitarists, resulting in comparatively less stringent evaluation criteria being applied to them had the effect of excluding them, as a group, from the privileging text. Musical literacy was a vitally important aspect of the privileging text, both in the co-curricular music program of the school and in the classroom. Despite this, however, the lower standards set for guitarists reduced their chances of becoming musically literate. It is probable that practices such as allowing students to play by ear were used as a means in the guitar ensembles of including students who could not read music. However, despite being inclusive, such practices cannot teach non-literate students to read music. They will have the opposite effect of ensuring that they never learn to read, especially not at the standard required by the high- status HSC music courses and tertiary music courses. Such a lowering of standards to accommodate low-achieving students, as Bernstein (1990) notes, will have the effect of creating a stratification of students. This type of stratification is clear in the structuring of the different HSC music courses, in which 2 unit course 1 is at a lower level than the 2/3 unit courses and is less likely to meet the entrance requirements of tertiary music courses. This is significant because, as the teacher interviewed noted, 2 unit course 1 is the course which electric and plectrum guitarists are most likely to attempt.

The structuring of pedagogic discourse in the case as described above represents a realisation of the play of external social power relations. It has already been noted that western art music, historically, has been the musical text of the middle and upper classes and that popular music has been the text of the working class. The play of power was clear in the co-curricular music program of the school in that western art music was privileged whilst popular musics were isolated by the curriculum structure and were denigrated by the relaxation of classification and framing. The same set of power relations affected students who chose to specialise in electric or plectrum guitar.

The music with which the electric and plectrum guitar is most readily associated is popular music. Indeed, it was the musical instrument which facilitated the development midway through the twentieth century of rock music and, hence, of all its derivatives (Sanbury & Murray, 1993; Trynka, 1993 & 1993a; Danner & Davies, 1986). In addition to this, the electric and plectrum guitar is the only major musical instrument not traditionally included in some form of western art music ensemble. Thus, it is an instrument which is uniquely associated with the music which developed as a text of the working class and in practice is uniquely excluded from the musical text of the middle and upper classes. As a result of this association, guitar-specialists at the school were excluded from the

high-status art music ensembles and from the privileging text. The relationship between the electric guitar and art music in the school's co-curricular program mirrored the same relationship in the wider musical community and social power relations in general. The function of the way in which pedagogic discourse is structured is to reproduce and maintain the hegemony of the socially powerful at the expense of the weak. Just such a process is apparent in the structuring of pedagogic discourse in the case of the electric guitar at the school.

The pedagogic device shaping the involvement of the electric guitar in this case can be described using Bernstein's theory, based on the preceding analyses. That is, it is possible to describe the means through which the principles of social power relations came into play in the findings of this study. The data show that in this case the pedagogic device at the level of the school consisted of four main elements: classification, framing, evaluation and curriculum structure. Strong classification kept the guitar apart from the privileging text. Weakened framing values reduced the likelihood of guitarists gaining access to and proficiency with the privileging text, as did the creation of special evaluation criteria applicable only to guitarists. The structure of the curriculum, both in the co-curricular music program, and in the formal requirements for classroom music, was such that western art music and its instruments were privileged whereas electric guitar stood at a distinct disadvantage.

In addition to the four major components of the pedagogic device at the school level, others can be speculated at the levels of tertiary education and other primary fields of production of music and musical knowledge. Because of the disadvantage under which guitarists must work in HSC music and in view of the generally low to average marks the teacher interviewed reports them as scoring, they must be less likely to gain entry to high-prestige tertiary music courses. This means that few, if any, electric guitarists will become highly educated in the privileging musical texts or influential members of the academic musical community. It also means that few electric guitarists will become school music teachers, thus making it likely that the same conditions leading to the disadvantage experienced by guitarists will be reproduced in future generations. Indeed, the data show that the teacher interviewed received no exposure to electric guitar whatsoever in his teacher-training and, currently, students studying for a Bachelor of Music Education at the Sydney Conservatorium of Music are not permitted to major in electric guitar (whereas classical guitar is accepted). Furthermore, 2 unit course 1 music (the HSC course into which electric guitarists at the study school tended to be streamed) does not meet the admission requirements to the Bachelor of Music Education at the University of New South Wales (UAC, 1995).



These processes by which the low status of the electric guitar is reproduced seem to be enhanced by the views and actions of guitarists themselves (May, 1988), many of whom seem to believe that the electric guitar and popular music represent a qualitatively unique case which cannot operate on the same terms as western art music. This is, essentially, the same view as that which is held by many theorists and was described in chapter one above (Shepherd and Vulliamy, 1983; May, 1988; Cutietta, 1991; Kuzmich, 1991). Such a view may well have been implicit in the choices of curriculum content and modes of discourse made by the students in the guitar ensembles.

The data seem to indicate that the guitar was involved in the co-curricular music program of the school to a limited extent only and that the manner of its involvement frequently did not represent sound educational practice. Bernstein's theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse has been able to offer an explanation for the reasons behind this and has provided a description of the means by which these causes have been translated into pedagogic practice. This is in contrast to the alternative socio-musicological theory posed by Shepherd and Vulliamy, which was unable to account for or predict the full range of patterns evident in the data. It is thus reasonable to suggest that, in this case, the extent and manner of the guitar's educational involvement and its popularity among older children and adolescents was much the same as it has been found to be in England and the United States. It can be argued further that Bernstein's theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse has provided an adequate explanation of the processes involved and that this case has provided a useful illustration of the theory in practice. This being the case, there are a number of implications for music education which can be derived from these findings.

### **5.5 Implications of this study**

The number of students who were identified as playing the guitar at the school was roughly the same as the numbers playing each of the more popular band and orchestral instruments. This means that the issues discussed in the previous section apply to a significant group of students, a group which is clearly placed at a considerable disadvantage within the music curriculum of the school. As a large majority of the guitarists identified played electric or plectrum guitar, this is the group most disadvantaged by the structure of the co-curricular music program. Students who choose to specialise in this style of guitar are placed at a greater disadvantage than those specialising in classical guitar, because classical guitarists at least have some access to the privileging text and because classical guitar is privileged by the formal requirements of the elective (years eight to ten) and HSC music courses. If, in other schools, the popularity of the electric guitar is similar to

that found by this study, then there will be a large group of students disadvantaged by the present music curriculum structure. Indeed, it seems unfortunate and illogical that the most significant musical genre of the twentieth century, popular music, receives so little recognition in the current New South Wales syllabus documents.

The inadequate involvement, both in extent and manner, of the electric guitar in the music curriculum at the school in this study seems likely to be true of many other schools too. The high degree to which the patterns predicted from the literature and the theory matched the patterns found by this study, as well as anecdotal evidence and personal experience, suggest that the same patterns may well be more widespread than this school alone.

The deficiencies in guitar education identified by this study are not due to the nature of the instrument, a lack of popularity or any difficulty in including the electric or plectrum guitar in educationally appropriate ways in school music curricula. The electric guitar is a serious melodic instrument which can easily be included in virtually any mixed ensemble, playing music of any genre. Given the apparently large numbers of students playing the electric guitar, publishers and arrangers of educational music should include notated melodic parts for guitar and music teachers should ensure that guitarists play from such parts. The electric guitar can also be used to play solo music of any genre, be it written specifically for guitar 'or for some other non-chordal instrument. Using the electric guitar in this manner would immediately negate many of the limitations in the syllabus documents which are currently used to disadvantage guitarists. Given that current deficiencies in guitar education are not related to any problem inherent in the instrument itself, the reasons must be external. This study has demonstrated that the true reasons can be found in tacit processes of curriculum selection and that such processes can be described using Bernstein's model. It seems likely that the electric guitar is misused in music education because it is so closely associated with the genre of popular music which is, by virtue of the social groups with which it in turn is associated, subordinate to the dominant genre of western art music.

The electric guitar, an instrument which uniquely represents all the issues associated with popular music, can and should be included in the formal music programs of schools. Children who learn to play the electric guitar need and deserve access to the same opportunities to play serious, high quality music from all genres as are routinely given to those who choose to play traditional orchestral or band instruments. Electric guitarists also need to be encouraged to play melodic material which is written in standard musical notation. Musical literacy is crucial for any musician to gain access to high status musical knowledge and skills. Playing by ear is an important skill, but the

ability to read music is essential if electric guitarists are to succeed within the present dominant musical culture as well as across a wide range of musical genres. It is not possible, as has been pointed out above, to study music at either 2/3 unit HSC or tertiary level without being musically literate. Those advocating a qualitatively different treatment for the electric guitar and popular music (such as Shepherd and Vulliamy) are in effect arguing to maintain the current low status of the electric guitar and are, essentially, advocating the failure in music education of the children who play it.

If the findings of this research are generalizable to other schools beyond the study school then, as has been foreshadowed in the preceding discussion, the study has a number of implications for school music teachers and their training. First, teachers need to be aware of the true potential of the electric guitar for involvement in music of all genres and in a wide variety of performing ensembles. The strong classification of genres described in this case needs to be weakened in order to create a more inclusive and equitable pedagogic practice. Second, the electric guitar and popular music need to be treated and evaluated with the same rigour as is applied to western art music and its instruments. For guitarists, both internal and external framing values need to be strengthened to reflect those applied to other instrumentalists. This is not so as to alienate student guitarists from school music, but to teach them to be able to control the texts and modes of discourse which are appropriate to the full range of contexts which they will encounter both within school and outside it. Music teacher education courses should provide teachers with some exposure to the electric guitar and educationally appropriate ways of involving it in school music. Such courses should also allow electric guitar as a major study instrument.

The issues raised by this study also have implications for educational policy. Whilst, on the one hand, teachers should understand that the electric guitar is quite capable of performing music from any of the topic areas prescribed by the current Board of Studies syllabus documents, the music for which the instrument is most naturally suited is denigrated by the curriculum structures they construct. The syllabi for the high-status 2 unit related and 3 unit HSC music courses should include popular music as a major area of study. This would reduce the perceived need for electric guitarists to be relegated to the low-status 2 unit course 1 simply on the basis of their choice of instrument.

In chapter three above, it was mentioned that this study was originally intended to include a second school in the case, one located in a largely working class area. Although this was not possible, it would have permitted some interesting comparisons to have been made between the practice of

music education in the two sites. Based on Bernstein's theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse, it might have been expected that at the second school popular music and its modes of discourse would have been privileged instead of western art music and that the available performing ensembles would have been far more likely to include electric guitar. Despite this, however, the same sociological processes were expected to be apparent, with the same result: the exclusion of electric guitarists from access to western art music, the musical text which is privileged by HSC and tertiary music.

Being restricted to the one site, this study was unable to allow such a contrast to be drawn between music education in a middle class school and music education in a working class school. Nor was it able to use Bernstein's theory to predict or describe such a contrast. This would, then, be a logical subject for any further research of a similar nature. The accuracy with which the patterns predicted from the literature and by Bernstein's theory were matched by the data gathered in this study suggests that further research in a socially contrasting context could be worthwhile. If the popularity of the electric guitar is the same in other schools as that found overseas and by the present study, then the issues highlighted by this research will be of relevance to a large number of school students.

## **5.6 Conclusions**

The aim of this study was to investigate the performance opportunities available in the co-curricular music program of the study school to students who chose to play electric guitar and to examine how these compared with those available to other instrumentalists. In order to achieve this, three research questions needed to be answered: first, how many students at the school play the various types of guitar?; second, to what extent was the guitar involved in the school's co-curricular music program?; and, third, in what manner was the guitar involved in the co-curricular music program of the school? The data showed that the guitar was played by at least 55 students throughout the school, making it one of the most popular musical instruments among the students to play and learn. It was also shown that, despite its relative popularity, the guitar was included in the co-curricular music program of the school only to a limited extent and only in a restricted number of contexts. Finally, the data showed that the guitar, particularly the electric and plectrum guitar, tended to be used in educationally inappropriate ways which isolated student-guitarists from

the privileging text of western art music in such a way as to make it more difficult for them (than for other instrumentalists) to achieve academic success in school music.

Bernstein's theory of the structuring of pedagogic discourse was used as a descriptive framework within which to analyse the above findings. Through this analysis it has been possible to demonstrate in some detail the tacit processes by which the content of the music curriculum at the study school was selected and how its structuring worked to differentiate and stream electric and plectrum guitarists from the main co-curricular program. These processes clearly reflected sets of social power relations external to the case itself. In other words, the instructional discourse of music education in the school was embedded in and shaped by the regulative discourse created by these sets of social power relations, to the detriment of students playing the electric guitar.