

Chapter XIII

Policy and Research Endeavours

Katherine Zeserson¹ and Graham Welch²

¹Independent Music Learning Consultant

²UCL Institute of Education, London

Introduction: Pinning down the spinning triangle...

In the course of writing this essay, the authors sought perspectives from a number of key people who have been instrumental in the development of music education policy and practice in England, Ireland and Brazil over the last decade—and in some cases for significantly longer. The political and economic circumstances in which each has operated are in many ways dissimilar, their particular roles in the stories that they tell are different and their views on the success or otherwise of their endeavours also vary. However, three points of commonality recur:

- Each is cautious in their judgment as to how far systematic *research* really influenced the development of government or institutional policies in their situations; as distinct from evaluations, feasibility reports, inspections and other reviews – the distinction being that the latter types are usually commissioned specifically to examine the impact of a particular policy initiative, whereas the former, i.e., independent research-focused studies, are often more indirect in their effect and, as argued by Nisbet (1974), can be more about 'sensitizing' policymakers to problems rather than solving them...;
- They concur in experiencing recurrent difficulties when trying to take action to influence policy on the basis of research evidence—or evaluative material—that is not aligned with the dominant political mood of the day;
- They are eager to see stronger connections between researchers/research, practitioners and policy makers because they recognise that, where those stronger connections exist, change is more sustainable and outcomes are better.

In each of the case studies briefly articulated in this chapter, it can be argued that policy-led structural or practice innovation, or practice-led policy or structural change, have been achieved. Nevertheless, the degree to which research data have played a part in those achievements varies, as does the nature of the research material itself, as noted above. Pollard (2015), in reviewing current research practice, notes that there is a growing sense that research users, such as policy makers, appear to prefer the terms 'research-informed' and 'evidence-informed'—or even 'research-augmented' (Bennett, 2015)—to signify the often non-linear relationship between research and policy and to allow them flexibility in their interpretation and application of evidence for their own uses. This is understandable, given that the sense of 'audience(s)' for the original research may not have accounted for the subsequent perspective of particular policymakers who decide to interpret research data for their own purposes. It is important, therefore, as Hammersley (2013:54) argues, to remember (and for users to remember) that '...what counts as evidence, and as good evidence, is always a functional or contextual matter: it is relative to the questions or problems being addressed. It cannot be determined in the abstract.' What seems clear to us is that, in each of the cases reported in this chapter, there is an iterative cycle in play—research, feasibility or evaluative evidence is gathered, analysed with varying degrees of objectivity, and that analysis subsequently informs aspects of the decision making process (*cf* see Howlett et al, 2009 on the nature of policy cycles). It may be that a closer partnership between the researchers and the policy makers enhances the possibility that any 'gap' or 'mismatch' in evidence framing and interpretation is reduced. However, there is also the possibility that such close partnership may impede the researchers from gaining an appropriate conceptual distance from the policy makers.

For example, music education policy in England has changed significantly over the last 20 years, and it is possible to identify a series of reports and research papers that have been deployed to both drive and underpin those changes, such as the recommendation for the creation of collaborative regional 'music education hubs' across the country in 2006 (DfES, 2006) that was implemented subsequently as part of a unique 'National Plan for Music Education' in England in 2011 (DfE, 2011). However, research itself is clearly not enough. Amongst other factors, timing appears to be critical. The story behind the development of the National Plan for Music Education (*ibid*), for example, is peppered with moments of

considerable skill and judgement on the part of colleagues in a variety of roles, seeming to know almost down to which day of the week and at which moment to present which piece of evidence to which civil servant or politician in order to advance a sector-wide strategic mission to increase access and quality of music education for all children and young people.

The behaviours of people at all levels are also critical. The implementation of policy change and the transmutation of research knowledge into practice are challenging and difficult to map. Opinions are widely and sometimes hotly divided as to whether those English music education policy changes underpinned by the National Plan for Music Education are in fact being realised on the ground with the consistency and quality to be expected of a 'National Plan', with evidence from recent survey reports suggesting 'not yet' (Ofsted, 2012; Zeserson et al, 2014; Derbyshire, 2015). Furthermore, there is evidence that the classroom and community practitioners upon whose shoulders the responsibility for realising change rests are often largely isolated from direct contact with research, with researchers, or with evidence derived from practice contexts that could help them to improve outcomes for children and young people (*cf* Johnson, 2015; Ofsted, 2012; Welch & Henley, 2014). For example, the Department for Education in England recently published (2013) a brief monograph of research priorities and questions concerning teachers and teaching, claiming that 'Robust evidence needs to inform policy and practice in order to deliver effective education and children's services' (p.3) and claiming that all teachers need to make effective use of research evidence. Nevertheless, this begs the question of 'whose' robust evidence, given that researchers are not necessarily characterised as exhibiting a single voice and, in particular, one of the characteristics of education policy is that it is a contested topic area. In particular, Hammersley (2013) suggests that evidence-based policy is a convenient slogan whose rhetorical effect is to discredit opposition to a particular policy initiative.

It is as if this spinning triangle—research, policy, practice—slows down for brief moments, enabling connections to be made that then lead to significant innovations, but without an easily predictable, systemic and observable algorithm in play. Why, for example, does a UK Government commission action research into the development of whole class ensemble teaching in primary schools (Ofsted, 2004) and then decline to implement any statutory

mechanism for integrating those effective models into the music curriculum? Why does a state in Brazil fund sustained extra-curricular music education for over 50,000 children, but without putting a systematic research or qualitative evaluation framework in place to assess practice in relation to outcomes? Why hasn't the forest-weight of evaluation studies and end-of-project reports produced by every philanthropically funded or Arts Council music participation programme in England had a more demonstrably significant impact on English music education practice?

Of course at one level, the answers to all these questions can be seen to have the same three roots—political expediency, financial leverage and systemic inertia. What can practitioners, managers, researchers and leaders of music education do to make more systematic, consistent and fruitful connections between policy, research and practice? Who's who in this matrix? How does the school-based or community musician develop as a researcher, bringing self-generated and external evidence to bear on practice development, and then how does (should) the education manager or leader bring that developed practice to have influence on institutional, local, regional or national policy?

It seems likely that our sense of agency is all. Teachers who feel powerless are less effective in supporting students to learn; managers and leaders who feel powerless are less effective in motivating teachers; students who feel powerless have no motivation to learn (*cf* Zimmerman et al, 1992). Harnessing the power of evidence to shape policy and practice can both build our sense of agency and is dependent on it. Or to put it another way—each time a child experiences their capacity to change the world around them as they intended, they are more empowered to do it again. This works on the micro and the macro level.

The establishment of a National Singing Programme in England 'Sing Up', supported by the two Ministries of Education and Culture, and funded by two successive UK Governments for five years from 2007-2012 at a cost of £44m (US\$62m), and now operating as an independent company, was based on a rich mix of institutional leadership, empowerment and support for visionary individual practitioners, highly skilful management of the political context, effective utilisation of research evidence and feedback, a public relations campaign, and the promotion and celebration of singing in specific classrooms, led by

specific teachers, working with and in support of others, over and over again (CUREE, 2012; Welch et al, 2010).

The catalysing factors that unlocked the unprecedentedly high levels of Government investment in Sing Up were generated by a combination of targeted lobbying by high profile figures in music (e.g. composer Howard Goodall), passion from politicians with specific childhood associations with singing or music (e.g. Lord Andrew Adonis, then Minister of State for Schools and David Miliband then Secretary of State for Education), structured cross-sectoral advocacy and campaigning through the Music Manifesto, founded by David Miliband, as well as quiet cultivation of civil servants through both personal and professional networks. Very little research evidence of the benefits of high quality singing in schools was deployed in this advocacy process, which was underpinned more by vivid anecdote, authentic craft knowledge and appeal to an ethical and moral proposition about social inclusion.

Once the money was on the table and consortia of organisations were invited to bid for it, the role of research became more prominent, with different consortia looking to make their own particular case to lead the programme. The successful consortium (a triumvirate of Youth Music, Faber Music and Sage Gateshead, with campaigning agency AMVBBDO as partners) placed the aspiration to generate research outputs inside their proposition for the programme. This meant that throughout the first four highly funded years, the Institute of Education in London was able to use the programme to carry out a significant longitudinal study on children's singing behaviour and progress (Welch et al 2012; Welch et al 2014). In addition, The Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education (CUREE) produced a complex, comprehensive evaluation of the whole programme which mapped dominant themes and phenomena, enabling useful and robust conclusions to be drawn about various key issues, include teacher development needs, best models to support long term singing development in schools and more (CUREE, 2012).

In this way, the research evidence generated through the programme enabled its architects to help ensure that both the National Plan for Music Education and—crucially, the Arts Council England funding guidelines for Music Education Hubs (MEHs) which shortly

followed— included a commitment to and requirement for MEHs to developing singing strategies for their areas, and to ensure that all children in schools in their regions are singing regularly and well.

In this story we can see a dynamic, fluid iteration between passion, politics, evidence, craft knowledge, ethics, values, context and time. It's not possible to map the journey of policy and practice change and the role of research in a linear way, because it is just not a linear process – the evidence of our experience tells us that.

So how to pin down the spinning triangle? In this next section, we articulate four case studies from which we extrapolate some patterns and principles that we believe could help build more consistently integrated and fluidly iterative relationships between music education policy, research and practice, at both individual and institutional levels.

Case Study (1) – Whole Class Ensemble Teaching (England)

One of the most significant paradigm shifts in music education practice and delivery in the last 20 years in England has been the focus in primary schools on *Whole Class Ensemble Teaching* (WCET). Initially called *Wider Opportunities*, this inclusive approach to practical music learning was developed in response to the then Secretary of State for Education David Blunkett's now famous pledge in the Department for Education and Skills' (2001) Schools White Paper:

"Over time, every primary school child that wants to should have the opportunity of learning a musical instrument"(DfES, 2001)

This commitment emerged from the confluence of several politically charged processes. From the music education point of view, one of the most challenging legacies of 18 years of the previous Conservative Government education policy (1979 – 1997) was the destabilisation and partial deconstruction of the network of local (education) authority (LA/LEA) Music Services, which had existed in some form or other since the 1960s (Cleave, 1989), each with a responsibility for the provision of music education in a particular geographical area. By 1997, free individual instrumental tuition was being squeezed out of

most areas of the country by a mixture of local authority funding cuts and increased devolution of budgets to individual schools. A Times Educational Supplement (TES) survey of 692 primary schools reported that one in five was 'cutting down on music teaching as a direct result of Government policy' (Lepkowska, 1998). The TES led its report with the statement 'the musical life of British children is at risk' and began a 'Music for the Millennium' campaign. The conductor Sir Simon Rattle's high-profile Channel 4 Television documentary 'Don't Stop the Music' (Rattle, 1998) increased the public pressure by calling for a renewed financial commitment to school music-making.

Furthermore, in some parts of the country, better-off families' ability to pay for music lessons was driving a somewhat patchy take-up of opportunities. In some local authority areas, group instrumental teaching had begun to emerge as a strategy for sustaining opportunities in this constrained (political and financial) environment. Significant lobbying pressure was brought to bear on the new Government (elected 1997) from Heads of Local Authority Music Services, educationalists, music teachers and high profile musicians and composers, calling for re-investment in LEA Music Services to ensure fairer access for all children to high quality music learning opportunities.

Against this background, in 1999 the Department for Education and Skills (DfES) in England introduced the Music Standards Fund to protect and expand LEA Music Services, with an initial five-year funding pledge. The same year saw the establishment of the National Foundation for Youth Music (now more commonly known as Youth Music), distributing an annual grant of £10m from the National Lottery, which spear-headed a gentle revolution in music participation for children and young people, *"providing music-making opportunities for children and young people up to the age of 18 who mainly live in areas of social and economic need, targeting those who would otherwise not have the opportunity"* (Davies and Stephens, 2004). This investment in community music focused on empowerment, inclusion and learning in groups, and opened up an important dialogue about why and how young people learn and grow through music that is continuing to dynamise UK music education today (e.g., Hallam, 2015; Henriksson-Macaulay & Welch, 2015; Plummeridge, 2012). Specifically, in relation to *Whole Class Ensemble Teaching* (WCET), Youth Music's investment enabled a

new generation of practitioners to enter the field of music education with a focus on group music-making, dialogic learning and popular/vernacular musics (Davies, 2004).

The nature of the evidence that underpinned the WCET policy initiative is cumulative across the previous fifty years and multi-faceted. For example, post-war Britain had seen a growing interest in orchestral music, derived in particular from shared communal experience across social classes of wartime music provision (*cf* Rainbow & Cox, 2006). The following decades saw the growth of new orchestras and sustained interest in instrumental music making in schools, but partial actual provision. Limited access was due to insufficient numbers of specialist teachers and instruments, as well as a school examination system that favoured other non-music subjects (shades of the current situation in the UK); the exceptions were specific locations nationally where targeted local funding for music was made available, such for local music ensembles drawn from across schools (Adams, McQueen & Hallam, 2010). Although clear disparities were evidenced between the primary and secondary school sectors (i.e., few opportunities in the former, more in the latter), the actual proportion of the total pupil population in England who were receiving *individual* instrumental instruction at any one moment in the period from the 1950s through to the 1990s was small, varying nationally between 7-8% overall—as evidenced in a wide range of studies (by academics, policy makers, music industry, and school inspectors – see Purves, 2016 for a review).

And 1999 was an important year for arts in education more widely; alongside its significant new commitments to music education, the recently elected Labour Government established the National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education (NAACE) chaired by Ken Robinson. The commission's report, *All Our Futures* (NAACE, 1999), laid the foundations for a decade of funded innovation in arts and culture in education, including the establishment of Creative Partnerships. This continues to have an impact today on thinking and practice concerning the nature and value of creativity in education, within and beyond the UK (e.g., Leong et al, 2012; Odena, 2012).

Politician David Blunkett's 2001 instrument learning pledge was welcome—but challenging—to many working on the ground in music education. Clearly, the entitlement

to learn a musical instrument could not be delivered through individual tuition, and a new approach—in both pedagogical and structural terms—needed to be found. A National Working Group was established to support the development of new models. This group included Ofsted (then the Office for Standards in Education, now the Office for Standards in Education, Children’s Services and Skills) and the Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (QCA) amongst its members, and in 2003 the Ministry of Education (DfES) and Youth Music between them commissioned 13 pilot programmes designed to research and articulate best practice for delivering group instrumental learning. Margaret Griffiths (then Ofsted Her Majesty’s Inspector [HMI] for Music) reported on twelve of the models (six funded by the DfES and six by Youth Music), working closely with Tony Knight at the QCA. Youth Music also carried out an evaluation on the seven pilots that it supported, led by highly experienced music educators Leonora Davies and John Stephens.

The Ofsted/QCA report *'Tuning In'* was published in 2004 with a DVD (Ofsted, 2004) and distributed to all English primary schools. It gave practical information about how to provide successful music programmes, how these linked with the National Curriculum for music and how they related to beyond school and/or out-of-classroom ensembles. Also in 2004, Youth Music published *'Creating Chances for Making Music'* (Davies, 2004), which included considerable detail on how each pilot programme was delivered, alongside research references and other resources to support effective management and delivery.

The pilots each used a partnership delivery model, pairing a classroom teacher with a visitor – either a Music Service teacher or a free-lance musician. The instruments being learned varied, as did the structure and teaching strategies. However, the findings from both the Ofsted/QCA and Youth Music reports were strongly positive. Over 70 % of children who had participated for one year wanted to continue learning (DfE, 2006) and the pilots yielded a rich harvest of effective practice advice and resources. Using this material, in 2006 the DfES published *'Instrumental and Vocal Tuition at KS2 [ages 7-11y]– making it work in your school'* which brought together all the findings and references to date into one guidance document for primary [elementary] schools.

The distinctive specific lessons extrapolated from the findings in both reports clustered around:

- The central importance of the dynamic, practical partnership between class teacher and visiting musician and the need for time and energy to nurture that relationship;
- Ensuring that all the music leaders—class teacher and visitor—had a secure pedagogy for this way of working and were supported by engaging, relevant CPD;
- Being clear about the holistic educational and musical purposes of the activities—not just focusing on technical instruction on an instrument; and
- Involving all key stakeholders in planning, including the school leaders, class teacher and visiting musician.

So far, so good. A clear focus was emerging on improving quality and reach of instrumental learning opportunities in the English classroom, supported by Government, underpinned by research and evidence in respect of partnership and pedagogy, and supported by case studies. What is less clear, however, is whether and/or how the findings, resources and evidence from that research found their way to the classroom. Several reports suggested, for example, that—at any one time—only 10% of children in Local Authority schools were actually learning instruments (*cf* Purves, 2016).

In 2009, the Federation of Music Services commissioned Ann Bamford and Paul Glinkowski to carry out an evaluation of the whole class instrumental programme *Wider Opportunities*. It was a febrile moment in the evolution of the English music education infrastructure, as Government and the sector grappled with the reality of implementing its imminent National Plan for Music Education in a political and economic context that was worlds away from the New Labour environment in which the Plan—and *Wider Opportunities*—had been developed. The alignment between the Departments of Education and Culture, the music education practice community and the University research community that had developed under the Labour Government was in danger of being fragmented for purely ideological reasons – incoming Governments often choose to sweep away the initiatives of their predecessors in order to stake out their own policy territories. Concerted lobbying by sector leaders and—again—high profile figures in music succeeded in convincing the incoming Conservative/Liberal Democrat coalition that music education should and could

be seen as a non-party political issue, and (once again) individual politicians' personal passions for music and their own memories helped to ensure that the forward momentum of the Music Manifesto and the National Plan were taken forward under the new regime, albeit with some changes of flavour and a bit less money....

In that context, Bamford and Glinkowski's (2009) research was particularly important in helping to make the case for embedding whole class/large group instrumental teaching in into the framework development for new Music Education Hubs. The researchers found evidence of positive impact and engagement in their research sites—as clearly evidenced in the title of the report—and made precise recommendations about the conditions necessary to maximise that potential across the country. These were focused on teacher development, child and community involvement, partnership working and financial support, and their report also clearly implied that the well-disseminated insights from 2004 and 2006 had not been as well embedded throughout the implementation of programmes on the ground as all might have hoped. This points us to a finding that recurred throughout the Inspiring Music for All (Zeserson et al 2014) review process – there seems to be a structural disconnect (in the English context at least) between research evidence, initial teacher education and subsequent CPD, and practice innovation.

In 2013, the delivery of what was re-named *Whole Class Ensemble Teaching* (WCET) was made a core condition of grant funding from the Arts Council England (acting on behalf of the Ministry of Education) to the new Music Education Hubs, which incorporated Local Authority Music Services. Hubs were conceived as networked, diverse providers working together to supply geographic areas and groups of schools, including (and in most cases led) by Local Authority Music Services. Music Mark (the body that subsumed the Federation of Music Services in February 2013) has recently (2016) commissioned a further evaluation to see how the commitment to WCET is shaping up in the new environment, but the anecdotal evidence from the field would suggest that the resources—financial and human—to implement the Bamford and Glinkowski recommendations in most cases have not been available, suggesting that delivery is unlikely to be achieving potential impacts consistently across the country. Notably, the new National Curriculum for Music, published in 2013 (DFE, 2013) for enactment in 2014, set out brief expectations for children's

instrumental learning as to 'have the opportunity to learn a musical instrument', but makes no reference to WCET as a means, nor even to the Music Education Hubs—nor Music Services—as a mechanism. In other words, notwithstanding several policy initiatives by different Governments over time to support widespread instrumental learning by children and young people, there continues to be a mismatch between the ideal and the reality on the ground. There *is* much exciting and effective music education provision and this *is* much more widespread than a decade earlier (Zeserson *et al*, 2014), but the means (political and economic) for ensuring high quality music education for all are (to date) not consistently ensured. We will consider this point further in our discussion of Case Study (4) later in this chapter.

Case Study (2) – Music Generation Ireland

Music Generation Ireland (www.musicgeneration.ie) (MGI) is Ireland's National Music Education Programme. The story of MGI has its roots in the 1985 Arts Council Ireland report entitled *Deaf Ears? – A report on the provision of music education in Irish schools* in which the author asserted that '*the young Irish person has the worst of all European musical "worlds"*'. In response to this criticism, the Dublin Institute of Technology convened and sponsored the Music Education National Debate (MEND) initiative. The public phase of that project lasted from February 1994 until November 1996:

"MEND took the form of a one-day Heralding Conference (October 1994), three weekend-long Conferences (including a central fully international one) representing carefully phased inputs (Phase I – April 1995; Phase II – November 1995; Phase III – November 1996). A half-day special seminar dealing with Irish Traditional Music was held as a pendant to Phase I in May 1995. The Music Education National Forum was established during Phase III in November 1996. There were, in all, 34 invited scholarly presentations including 14 from abroad, and 33 debates. The attendance at MEND (some 1500 recorded attendances over all the phases) was representative of the whole constituency of music education interests in Ireland" (Heneghan, 2002).

Before considering the legacy and impact of MEND, it is worth pausing to note the distinctive participatory character of the process. From the title through to the structured

discursive process, this consultative approach built up a layered and consensual map of the needs and opportunities in the Irish music education landscape which underpinned the policy and investment actions that followed. This consultative approach to research brought anecdotal material together with quantitative evidence to create a richly textured picture of what was happening across the country, how it sat within a wider international landscape, and what might be the routes forward to a more inclusive and comprehensive range of music learning opportunities for children and young people in Ireland. The broad range of contributors encompassed researchers, educators, cultural policy makers and music practitioners, ensuring that the resulting recommendations and research outputs would be truly representative and nuanced.

Following on from the outputs of this major consultative research initiative, Music Network (originally created in 1986 by Arts Council Ireland to develop music in Ireland) was commissioned by the Minister for the Arts to carry out a feasibility study into a Local Authority-based partnership model for delivering 'performance music education' (Music Network, 2003). This research took two years to complete, and generated a substantial, rigorous and visionary document, which recommended the following to the Irish Arts and Education ministries:

".....a project where (those two departments) can find common cause: the establishment over time of a national system of Local Music Education Services that would enrich the lives of communities up and down the country...a service that could transform the musical, cultural and community life of towns and townlands throughout the country... we lack the kind of systematic provision appropriate to a twenty-first-century European country so distinguished by its cultural achievement and identity. Whole regions of Ireland lack appropriate provision and hundreds of thousands of citizens are thereby culturally deprived. This report rests firmly on the principle of equality of access for all citizens, complementing the right of an individual to realise his or her full human potential, including the potential for development musically. In structural terms the report offers the kind of 'joined-up' thinking which is appropriate to lifelong learning and to public service efficiency..." (Music Network, 2003: 1).

The report was received positively by Government and, in 2005, the Irish Department of Education and Science awarded €100,000 per annum for five years in the first instance to pilot schemes in County Donegal and City of Dublin. In 2007, Music Network established a Music Education Working Group, funded by the Arts Council Ireland, to raise awareness of the value of music education. The group presented a proposal to the Government's Special Committee on Arts and Education that outlined the key recommendations of the 2003 report, and hosted a significant seminar focusing on the development of music education services at local level. Alongside this, from 2006 – 2008 Arts Council Ireland co-funded a research partnership between St. Patrick's College and three Local Authorities to investigate the potential role for Local Authorities to work with the wider music sector to develop music education provision. *Knowing the Score*, (Kenny, 2009) made a series of detailed, practical recommendations, including sketching out the concept of the Music Education Partnerships. Also in 2008, an independent evaluation of the Dublin and Donegal pilot programmes concluded: "*this partnership model provides a workable and replicable framework for development of music education services ... on a wider scale throughout Ireland*" (Thompson, 2008).

This development of structural models and innovative partnerships was taking place as Ireland's economy began to collapse after the heady years of the Celtic Tiger. The vision for local music education partnerships—bringing together large and small music organisations at a local level with the County VECs (Vocational Education Committees)—was well articulated and underpinned by some evidenced findings; two Government ministries were in support of the vision and had invested in its development, but the economic model was difficult to conceptualise in Ireland's tricky economic circumstances. Enter U2:

"We had been looking for some time for a way to get involved in an initiative in music education in Ireland. After talking to various people in Ireland about what to do, we came to the conclusion that the Music Network scheme is really well thought out and that we, in partnership with the Ireland Funds, should just get behind it." The Edge (www.musicgeneration.ie).

In July 2009, U2 and The Ireland Funds pledged €7 million to Music Network to allow the roll out of the report's recommendations on a phased basis between 2010 and 2015, and in

January 2011, Music Network established Music Generation as an independent subsidiary company to lead Ireland's National Music Education Programme.

Music Generation Ireland (MGI) was developed as a clear response to identified need, based on a carefully researched model. The volume and depth of the underpinning research described above both arose from and pointed up the lack of joined-up thinking around performance music education and, specifically, the lack of clear, strategic policy and appropriate investment to address the inconsistent 'patchwork' of provision for performance music education uncovered by the researchers.

In 1989 (the beginning of the journey described here) sustained performance music education (i.e., beyond one-off projects) was falling between the remits of two government departments—arts and education—and being addressed by neither. The partnership between Arts Council Ireland, independent education researchers, musicians and music organisations generated a forward momentum which was sustained over a 25-year period, with leadership passing at different stages between the stakeholders. Reading the reports cited above gives a strong sense of an articulated conceptual line pushing the thinking process forward, even though conversations with key individuals involved over time would suggest that the reality was of course messier, more complicated and less orderly than hindsight would suggest. However, there is no doubt that a sustained, progressive movement toward the articulation of a new model for music education in Ireland was facilitated through this particular mix of processes.

To date, MGI has established 12 Music Education Partnerships (MEPs), working with a total of 26,000 children. They are each funded on a tapered basis for six years, and were selected through competitive application against stringent criteria. Applicants had to demonstrate strength of partnership, inclusive social and musical strategies, commitment to quality and a capacity to generate 50 % of their revenue base from the beginning.

MGI set out specific goals for 2010–2015 in relation to Irish music education policy and practice (MGI, 2009). The specific 'over-arching' policy goal for this first phase was to set up a national partnership infrastructure for performance music education. This infrastructure is

now well embedded, and progress on the policy change can already be seen at the local level, as goals for Music Generation/music education are being written into long term policy and planning documents for Local Authorities and Education and Training Boards, representing a significant shift from a local development perspective.

Research has been central to both the establishment and the evolution of MGI. Planning and development was approached from an 'action research' perspective, and MGI embarked on a structured research partnership with St. Patrick's College Drumcondra in 2013, with a post-doctoral research study entitled Developing Diversity in Music Education in Ireland completed in autumn 2015.

"The concept of diversity is central to Music Generation's approach in developing a national infrastructure for music education that includes many types of music and music practices, from pop to classical to marching bands to traditional and beyond. The ambition of the programme is to be inclusive; ensuring that access to performance music education of a high artistic standard is not limited by geographic, cultural, socio-economic or physical factors. Music Generation seeks to include but go beyond conventional models of instrumental and vocal music education. Rather than developing a 'one size fits all' approach, it allows a diversity of approaches to evolve, in response to local need and context. The research will document and assess the ways and extent to which this diversity is achieved, locating the developments within comparable international contexts. In the process, valuable information about music education in Ireland will be gathered in order to address a knowledge gap in this area. The findings of the research will inform the strategic development of this new infrastructure for performance music education in Ireland. A strength of the partnership is the linkage between the higher education sector and the cultural/educational sector which aims to provide clear pathways for knowledge transfer."

The research will be publicly available from Spring 2016. The findings will indicate that significant positive outcomes have been achieved for young people, and show how the distinctive model of MGI has enabled those, as well as making recommendations for

development and improvement.

In late 2015, U2 made further pledges of €2 million (US\$2.16m) and are committed to continue to seek support through the Ireland Funds. MGI has secured ongoing annual sustainable partnership funding from Government (€2.5m) and local Music Education Partnerships (€2.2m), together estimated at €4.7m annually from 2016 onwards. In response to the significance of large-scale philanthropy in driving this national change programme, MGI has also commissioned research into the principles of philanthropy and what it sought to achieve. U2's Bono is very clear on that point: "*What we want to do is really simple. We just want to make sure that everyone, whatever their background, gets access to music tuition. That's the idea.*" www.musicgeneration.ie.

This private-public collaboration dimension of Music Generation Ireland also makes it an interesting case study of innovation in public policy development, private investment and large-scale implementation in any field – not just music education. The relationship between U2, the MGI National Development Office and the Irish Department of Education has to date—at least as seen from the outside—been characterised by high levels of mission congruence between all parties, notable absence of promotional egotism from the band and a well-defined synergy of roles in relation to delivering the goals of the programme. Readers interested in how this case aligns with examples from other sectors and other countries may wish to explore the work of John Donahue and Richard Zeckhauser (2012) on this point.

Case Study (3): Guri Santa Marcelina (Brazil)

Guri Santa Marcelina (GSM) www.gurisantamarcelina.org.br was established as a programme of Santa Marcelina Cultura www.santamarcelinacultura.org.br in 2008 in order to develop and provide music education programmes for young people in vulnerable communities in the city of São Paulo, commissioned by Secretaria de Estado da Cultura Sao Paulo (São Paulo State Secretary of Culture). The team operate alongside colleagues from a sister organisation Projeto Guri (www.projeto-uri.org.br) which runs a programme

with similar goals, commissioned through the same policy field, working with c. 35,000 young people per annum in the State of São Paulo.

The notion of music/culture as a both a context and tool for personal and social development is well established within the policy landscape of contemporary Brazil.

"The arts are seen as a strategy of empowerment, and as an important stimulus of self-esteem in communities that have limited opportunities and few means of asserting their rights. In the face of severe social crises in relation to education, health, employment, social exclusion, and public security, Brazil has looked to culture as an important instrument for individual development and social transformation."

(Heritage, 2009).

The development of a socially interventionist music education policy for the State of São Paulo, backed by significant structural investment, emerged from a unique conjunction of national and local circumstances. The (2007) Secretary of State for Culture appointed a Special Advisor for Music to research the position of music education within the State as it related to the wider social agenda, considering both the question of provision quality and of social access. This investigation took place within the wider context of Gilberto Gil and then Juca Ferreira's incumbencies as Federal Ministers of Culture, and the focus of the Cultura Viva (Living Culture) programme on "... *building the cultural capacity of social agents, activists and artists to "shape rights, behaviours and economics"* (Brasil MinC, 2005).

Within the State of São Paulo, the moderate social democratic state government (significantly further to the political right than the federal government) was actively constructing and implementing a strategy of delegated service delivery through the '*organização social*' model, i.e., the contracting of public services to NGOs on fixed term (typically 3-5 year) contracts, tied to very precise locations, outcomes and financial parameters. This meant that the Culture Secretariat could out-source music education provision, thus enabling specialist leadership—in terms of music pedagogy, education management and social provision—to drive innovation.

There are several contextual factors for this initiative. The teaching of an Art subject in the basic education system was enacted into law in 1996 (Brasil, 1996). However, although supplementary clauses to the 1996 law defined the nature of the Arts as visual arts, dance, music and drama, the law did not state which particular Arts should be taught in the curriculum, nor what artistic qualifications were needed by the teaching force. Consequently, the tri-partite educational systems (Federal, State, Municipal) were free to devise their own particular Arts projects. This meant in some instances that a single teacher was responsible for all the Arts, drawing on an earlier conception of arts education from the 1970s (Figueiredo, Soares & Schambeck, 2016). Furthermore, for historical reasons, the visual arts tended to dominate in Arts curricular provision (Penna, 2002). The outcome was a commitment to the Arts in principle, but very limited and inconsistent provision for music. It was not until 2008 (Brasil, 2008) that a law was passed which stipulated that music was a compulsory curriculum component and should be taught to all students. However, the challenge remained of ensuring that there were (and are) sufficient appropriately qualified generalist and specialist teachers to ensure that music education is provided for all pupils—hence the importance of the Sao Paulo initiative.

The articulation of the pedagogical plans for GSM were firmly grounded within the theoretical framework of Paulo Freire (Freire, 1995). His formulations of social pedagogy and critical thinking were taken as the underpinning platform upon which music education structures, actions and evaluations were developed. Brazilian's openness to social pedagogy were likely grounded in an earlier form of compulsory music education in Brazilian schools that was established in the 1930s under the guidance of the composer Villa Lobos (Noronha, 2011). This was a system of choral music whose main purpose were to teach citizenship, discipline and artistic education.

The GSM mission statement expresses this socio-musical conception clearly. It is:

"...the music education and socio-cultural inclusion of children and adolescents in São Paulo" (www.gurisantamarcelina.org)

The influence of Freireian models (*cf* Freire, 1995) is clear in the organisation's statement of

values as expressed on their website:

"OUR VALUES

- *Social responsibility;*
- *Use of culture (music) as a tool for the development of human values and promotion of social inclusion;*
- *High quality of teaching staff, social pedagogues and administrative staff;*
- *Artistic excellence: quality of teaching materials and musical practice (facilities, methods and musical instruments);*
- *Continuity, sensitivity of processes and social transformation;*
- *Commitment to students, families and communities;*
- *Working in line with the precepts of the Child and Adolescent (ECA) [this is a Brazilian law protecting the rights of the child]"*

The programme works with around 15,000 young people per annum aged 6–18, in 46 centres (mostly community schools) across the city of Sao Paulo. Participants attend regular school in either the morning or the afternoon, and then enrol in music for in the other half of the day. The music pedagogical plan is configured in stages: musical initiation for students 6-9 years; sequential courses for students 10-18 years; modular courses for students 10-18 years; and music education for adults. Each student participates in around four hour-long collective music lessons per week (singing or instrument; choral; music theory and collective practice), and has the opportunity to join an ensemble, in addition. Provision is free, and the programme is fully funded by the state.

GSM have developed sophisticated co-working models that bring together musicians with social pedagogues (Partington et al, 2014) so that young people's engagement is supported at a deep level through complementary activities that develop critical thinking, social interaction and personal autonomy, as well as family support. The Freireian philosophy is actively expressed in daily action, as well as in the policy framework and contractual language that governs the programme. Educational activities and social support go hand in hand with music learning sessions, creating a favorable environment for learning. Students

and families are accompanied by social workers on a daily basis, and encouraged to participate in group activities at the centres. They are also invited and supported to attend concerts, exhibitions and other cultural activities to enrich the process of personal development. Funding is in place to provide food and transport to support student engagement.

There is a striking level of conscious commitment to developing inclusive music pedagogical strategies that integrate approaches from popular and vernacular music learning alongside European-style classical models, and a culture of critical reflection and continuing professional development delivered within a critical thinking model. Regular professional development for all c.300 tutors includes the opportunity to develop and implement personal research enquiries within the delivery of the programme, such as devising and testing voice teaching strategies that do not utilise piano accompaniment, exploring approaches to teaching notation and aural skills conjointly, and developing personal improvisation and composition skills. There is a high value placed on celebration, sharing and performance within local communities with remarkable levels of family engagement in stressed, under-resourced communities.

Since 2008, GSM has been collecting statistical data on student outcomes/progression, and conducting an annual satisfaction survey. As yet, there has been no systematic research into the connections between social pedagogical strategies, music teaching approaches and an underpinning cultural policy in driving the positive outcomes for young people, which are becoming increasingly evident through GSM's work and evidenced in reflective teacher action, based on dialogue and sense of community. However, the team has been gradually building a collection of student and family case studies that provide powerful testimony as to the value and impact of participation in the programme. It does seem likely that the insistent policy driver of social inclusion, underpinned by rigorous commitment to a Freireian approach, is producing a robust and beneficial music learning environment from which there is a great deal to learn.

The distributive model of policy development that supports the Guri programme is prescriptive, in that the contracts with the State which underpin the programme are

detailed at a very precise level, covering day-to-day specific delivery and operations, musical organisation (and some content – e.g. ensemble types) and teacher development over a five-year period. This micro-level planning demonstrates both a great confidence that the actions of the programme will bring about the intended goals, and also the high level of State involvement. The task now could be to collect the evidence or otherwise of the impact of the actions as delineated, and to see whether the policy field and implementation mechanisms can flex and adapt in the light of lived experience.

The Guri programme would provide a rich site for research into the efficacy (or otherwise) of several important components: local level implementation of state and government policy initiatives, the impact of specific musical pedagogies on the social inclusion of individuals, the relationship between wider social context and musical learning.... and likely much more.

Case Study (4) – ‘inspire-music’¹

‘inspire-music’ is an ongoing professional learning initiative designed to help make musical learning more consistent, higher quality, more diverse and more sustainable for children and young people in England. It was established in Spring 2015 by a major UK charity, the Paul Hamlyn Foundation (PHF), whose funding strategy includes a keen interest in supporting arts initiatives. **inspire-music** is based on key recommendations from the research-based report that the Foundation had commissioned from this chapter’s authors (Zeserson & Welch) and that was published in Spring 2014 as *‘Inspiring Music For All: The next steps in innovation, improvement and integration’* (Zeserson et al, 2014).

PHF has made a significant contribution to music education in the UK over the last decade, including investing in Musical Futures (<https://www.musicalfutures.org>; e.g., see Hallam et al, 2009) since 2003 and, since 2009, Musical Bridges (<http://www.musicalbridges.org.uk>;

¹ Because of OUP hardcopy publication space limits, this fourth case study appears as a linked webtext in a companion website, see

<http://global.oup.com/us/companion.websites/9780190246150/resources/policy/>

The website for the book is <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/policy-and-the-political-life-of-music-education-9780190246143?cc=us&lang=en&>

see Ashworth *et al*, 2011). The **inspire-music** research was commissioned in the first instance to inform the development of the Foundation's new strategic plan, and was focused on four clearly identified areas:

- Identification of key issues and challenges relating to schools-based music education, with an emphasis on those of relevance across the sector;
- Identification and analysis of the key strategies, drivers and agencies currently influencing schools-based practice;
- Assessment of the value and significance of the Musical Futures programme to schools and its impact on musical education in the UK; and
- Identification and analysis of potential opportunities for PHF to make a distinctive contribution to tackling the key issues identified and achieve further significant impact in the field of music education.

The report team used a five-strand approach to generating findings: in-depth structured interviews with around 50 key figures in the field (including Headteachers, Ofsted staff, researchers, academics, policy makers, practitioners), a survey of around 650 teachers, group discussions with a further group of sector leaders, work with three youth focus groups, and a detailed and comprehensive recent literature review. This last element used a dynamic matrix of themes and key issues; as areas of focus or concern emerged in interviews, the matrix of analysis was adjusted to account for that. A range of research and evaluation materials were included in the review, including, for example, Government commissioned documents such as the Ofsted Triennial reviews of music education in schools, Government White Papers [published policy intentions], reports relating to the National Plan for Music and associated matters; as well as independent up-to-date research studies carried out by a number of UK Universities concerning pedagogy, various aspects of music in schools and teacher development; alongside the funder's own reports and internal evaluations.

The headline findings in the research report were that:

- The place and status of music in English schools continues to vary widely across the country;

- The best music in schools is significantly more inclusive, more musically diverse and better quality than it was a decade ago; but
- The quality and reach of schools-based music education is still unacceptably variable and inconsistent at all levels.

The key underlying issues emerging from the data analyses were identified as:

- Low teacher confidence stemming from insufficient depth of ITE and lack of engagement with post-qualification CPD and professional networks;
- Widespread weaknesses in curriculum and pedagogy;
- Inconsistency of retention and progression in music;
- Insufficient support from Senior Leadership teams for music;
- Insufficient local and national support structures for practitioners; and
- Impact of education policy changes since 2010.

The authors made three recommendations based on their research findings that were aimed at addressing those six underlying issues. All three recommendations were adopted in some way by PHF and influenced their new 10-year strategy launched in summer 2015. So we can see that a wide spectrum of research and evaluation materials in this case directly influenced the Foundation's new strategy. It is worth noting that this direct connection between research and policy in a funding body appears to be (as yet) relatively unusual in the UK context, and the PHF are part of community of charitable trusts (such as the Esmée Fairbairn Foundation Charitable Trust, Clore Duffield Foundation and Calouste Gulbenkian UK) who are making their grant making goals and underpinning policies both more transparent and more explicitly evidence-based than has been the case in the past.

The first recommendation in Inspiring Music for All was to establish a Music Education Innovation Fund. The fund's purpose would have been to stimulate and disseminate teacher-led innovation in music education through supporting teachers and other classroom practitioners to develop action research projects in partnerships between schools and/or with cultural partners. This recommendation in fact helped to inspire the establishment of PHF's Teacher Development Fund:

"...we have created a new fund specifically focused on helping teachers develop their skills in supporting learning in and through the arts in schools in all four nations of the

United Kingdom. We want to build teachers' skills, knowledge, confidence and interconnectedness to maximise the impact of arts for young people. Our focus is on school-based projects with an emphasis on:

- . primary schools;*
- . working with disadvantaged and/or vulnerable children; and*
- . supporting professional development and learning via evidence-informed approaches" (Paul Hamlyn Foundation, 2015).*

The second recommendation was to

"establish a time-limited Expert Commission. The Commission's purpose would be to create a set of clear, usable guidelines and tools for schools, teachers, music organisations, Hubs and others to use as common references for delivering the National Curriculum and NPME with consistency, integrated working practices and high quality standards." (Zeserson et al, 2014).

The third recommendation was that PHF should "...support Musical Futures in making the transition to becoming an independent enterprise" (Zeserson et al, 2014). This was acted on as of April 2015, with the Musical Futures team receiving three years transitional funding to establish it as a not-for-profit music education business.

The second recommendation led to the establishment of the current **inspire-music** initiative and National Working Group (www.inspire-music.org) from 2015. The Working Group consists of 20 highly experienced and knowledgeable practitioners, researchers and educators drawn from across music education contexts and locations (<http://www.inspire-music.org/people.html>). At the core of the programme is a mission to connect practitioners and policy makers with the principles that underpin effective music education—recognising and accounting for a diversity of goals, contexts, musical languages, pedagogical strategies—through case-study based evidence and analysis.

Drawing on extensive experiences in policy and practice initiatives in the UK and internationally, **inspire-music** is an experiment in connecting policy, research and practice. It takes a stand against a deficit-driven model of practitioner development; in contrast, it

adopts an affirmative, asset-based approach to collective reflection and professional learning. It makes some key assumptions about professional practice:

- **Outcomes matter** – teachers and music learning professionals want to do their best to support students to flourish and make progress;
- **Reflection matters** – the better we understand what is going on in our learning environments, the easier it becomes to make new or different choices;
- **Information matters** – the more we know about what other people have tried and what they've learned, the more we have to draw on in making our own choices;
- **Context matters** – one person's 'excellent' practice might not be viable in another situation;
- **Support matters** – feeling understood, valued and respected encourages us to take risks, try new things and share our experiences honestly.

The process of work generating this thinking has been grounded in a dialogic, ground-up approach, with the Working Group members presenting both evidence and craft-knowledge based perspectives; sharing stories, assumptions and models drawn from their own informal or formal research with one another for discussion and scrutiny in a series of all-day sessions. This process of active, shared reflection mirrors the processes that the Working Group members and report authors believe underpin the natural process of effective professional learning. In this way, the work of inspire-music itself aims to model one of the key principles that it will be sharing with the sector: namely, that asking questions is more useful than becoming attached to answers. Or to put it another way, living your professional life in the mindset of the researcher will provide a framework for understanding what happens in the living practice of music education and how it connects to context, evidence and theory, thus enabling development, improvement and innovation.

Another key feature of the Working Group's process is that it comprises highly experienced and knowledgeable colleagues drawn from all aspects of 'music education' in England – both direct teacher/practitioners and researchers working across the age span from early

childhood through to adulthood. This diversity of viewpoints brings a spiral learning quality to the discourse, meaning that moments of unexpected connection and recognition generate new insights about positions or phenomena that colleagues had perhaps hitherto held with high degrees of personal certainty – people sometimes even change their minds! And, of course, it reminds us that one person’s story is another person’s evidence, and that stimulating a culture of continuous investigation, reflection and innovation in our community requires us to cultivate an attitude of open-minded respectful interest, coupled with a high degree of disciplined intellectual rigour.

Early in the life of the initiative, the National Working Group took the decision not to talk about good, bad or even excellent practice; but rather to explore the idea of **effective practice**. This sought to address the questions through the case study research approach: What works in what situations and against what criteria? What specific ingredients are producing positive outcomes for children and young people? How are those positive outcomes being generated? What conditions are in place? How can those be learned from and / or replicated? inspire-music showcases a diversity of practices and philosophies, and makes explicit the elements that make such varied activities and approaches meet the effectiveness test. Practitioners can then make their own informed choices about how to learn from and use that information. To support the evolution of critical thinking described in the previous paragraph, we have created an Effective Practice Framework – a set of structured questions designed to support practitioners and policy makers in music education to investigate their reality and uncover what is going on. What is working? Why? What are the key features of the context? ...and so on.

At the time of writing (Winter/Spring 2015-16), the inspire-music team is using the framework to capture a wide variety of case studies, linked to established research findings and other evidence, to be presented (at least initially) through an interactive web portal, launching in July 2016. Through widespread ownership by the music education sector and its stakeholders, this resource is intended to enable teachers and other music practitioners to reflect on their current circumstances and behaviour, consider new approaches, access research and evidence to help support their thinking, and share their own effective music learning practice and strategies. The work intends to advance consistency, positive

partnership working and high quality standards through helping individuals and schools plan and organise better music learning opportunities; and to inspire teachers and practitioners to investigate a range of approaches to effective, emerging and innovative practice.

Concluding thoughts

We continue to have a pressing need for research-informed practice and policy change in music education – indeed in education as a whole – in the UK today. Although there is recent research evidence that the best music in schools is significantly more inclusive, more musically diverse, and better quality than it was a decade ago, the quality and reach of schools-based music education is still unacceptably variable and inconsistent – in both the primary and secondary sectors (Zeserson *et al*, 2014). It is paradoxical that the UK music industry contributed £4.1 billion to the UK economy in 2015 (UK Music, 2015), outperforming the rest of the British economy—with increased turnover, higher staffing, greater exports and live performances—yet the past five years of national music education policy has been characterised by, at best, ambivalence and, at worst, indifference concerning the value of music within the school curriculum. Overall, comparative data suggest that too little has changed in education overall for particular communities in the past three decades, despite myriads of successive policy initiatives² and at least £1.6 billion of investment in music between 1998 and 2014 (Whyte, private correspondence).

For example, the UK Commission on Inequality in Education reported in January 2016 that being in the top rather than bottom decile of family income was a *stronger* predictor of attainment scores for children born in 2000 than for those born in 1970, and that the geographic area from which a child comes has also become a more powerful predictive factor for those born in 2000 compared to 1970. So why haven't we utilised policy initiatives

² UK Government related music policy initiatives have included five versions of a 'National Curriculum' for music in England (1992, 1995, 1998, 2007, 2013), a 'Music Manifesto'—jointly launched by the Ministries of Education and Culture—in 2004, a 'National Singing Programme' *Sing Up* (2007-2012), small scale Sistema-type instrumental learning initiatives in Scotland (from 2007) and England (from 2009) and the launch of a National Plan for Music Education (2011)—a first for any subject area in England.

and funding more effectively to transform the education system to balance these factors out and give all children the best possible chance to thrive irrespective of socio-economic status and locality?

Furthermore, the last decade or more has seen tremendous growth in research across the clinical and social sciences, as well as the arts, that is focused on education and development *through* music, included that focused on social cohesion and community and individual health and well-being (cf Benedict et al, 2015; MacDonald, Kreutz & Mitchell, 2013). Why then is this research evidence not having a more visible and sustainable impact on music education policy and practice in the UK and elsewhere? The answer, in part, relates to the biography of the researchers and the nature of the research that they undertake. What counts as evidence and its interpretation for policy making is socially-constructed and socially-located, shaped by the particular and peculiar experiences that individuals bring to the research act. Although it seems sensible for the researcher to be an 'insider', in the sense of having sufficient expertise and insight to be able to understand the likely multi-faceted nature of the 'problem' that is the subject of investigation, in practice, such understanding may limit the type of evidence gathering and interpretation. Keeping a sense of distance is desirable, not least to ground the research in a multiplicity of perspectives that might, subsequently, have applicability for a diverse groups of users.

We can see from our four cases described above that when the spinning triangle of policy, research and practice slows down, dynamic lines of connection spark innovation, motivation and commitment to transformation. Research-informed policy and practice can and do generate positive outcomes for children and young people – but it's a delicate business. Practice and policy change both take their own time, and that is often too slow for the patience threshold of governments. Nevertheless, in each case, there was a 'policy window' (Kingdon, 1995) that opened up in the identification of a particular need that resonated with at least two of the main groups of likely stakeholders—politicians, professionals and researchers, thus allowing a coincidence of overlapping interests to advocate for the collection of evidence towards the addressing of that specific need.

Getting research-informed practice change to stick at the grassroots level is a messy business – as seen in the evolution of *Whole Class Ensemble Teaching* (WCET). Achieving significant systemic change requires a high level of leadership discipline, collective determination and at least some independence from government, as is so vividly clear in the Music Generation Ireland story; and in our Brazil example, we can see that getting music education right for all children and young people irrespective of social circumstances calls for practice that is underpinned by research and policy drawn from broader social and political spheres than those simply concerned with music pedagogy. Through the 'inspire-music' work in England, it has become clear that both theoretical and practice based research domains are too often a long way from the daily discourse of music educators lives, and that awakening the motivation and positive self-image of teacher-as-researcher could be key in transforming opportunities for children and young people.

We can see certain conditions in place in our example cases where policy, research and practice are in optimum iterative balance:

- *Patience, persistence and activism*: in all our examples, the research roots of policy and practice change go back at least 20 and as much as 80 years. Individuals that bring that research knowledge to bear on government thinking, programme and practice development keep testing and re-testing, proposing and re-proposing, and passing the baton to successive generations with an intense focus. There is lineage, and there is cultural memory.
- *Commitment to practice-led innovation*: it can be difficult for active teaching practitioners to find the time, space and the right kind of peer-culture to approach their work in a spirit of enquiry. Research materials and policy initiatives can be expressed in ways that feel remote from the daily business of music education, and senior leadership teams don't always respect the importance of trying things out that may not work first time. A culture of enquiry-based CPD within an active community of practice enables teachers to become researchers in their daily work, influencing both practice and policy.
- *Courageous, visible shared leadership*: It is beyond cliché to observe that as a species we are inclined to resist change. In all four of our cases, change leadership and the alignment of research, policy and practice are vividly and visibly led, by groupings that

- bring together independent, government and organisation-based advocates, experts and visionaries in common cause. Leadership is reflective, dynamic, vocal and strategic.
- *Collaboration and partnership*: bringing the right people together at the right time in the right place with the right information, as well ensuring that they stay committed and connected over long periods of time, is a highly skilled practice, and is fundamental both to effective policy transformation and implementation. Geoff Whitty (2016) writes: '*building partnerships amongst different stakeholders and making use of a range of opportunities beyond official channels to disseminate findings can be crucial*' and that is certainly born out in all our case studies.

Practitioners, teachers, policy makers, advocates, musicians, parents and learners all have a contribution to make in pinning down the spinning triangle. It *is* possible to bring together research, policy and practice to change government policy, rebalance funding, transform quality of experience and ensure inclusion. We know the difference music can make in children and young people's lives if we get that right – so it is simply our duty to do so.

References

- Adams, P., McQueen, H., & Hallam, S. (2010). Contextualising music education in the UK. In S. Hallam & A. Creech (Eds). *Music Education in the 21st Century in the United Kingdom: Achievements, analysis and aspirations*. (pp18-34). London: Institute of Education, University of London.
- Ashworth, D., Atherley, M., & Chappell, A. (2011). *Sound Tracks: supporting young people's musical progression from primary to secondary school*. London: Paul Hamlyn Foundation.
- Bamford, A., & Glinkowski, P. (2010). "Wow, it's music next": Impact Evaluation of Wider Opportunities Programme in Music at Key Stage Two. Leeds: The Federation of Music Services.
- Benedict, C., Schmidt, P., Spruce, G., & Woodford, P. (Eds.) (2015). *The Oxford Handbook of Social Justice in Music Education*. New York: OUP.
- Bennett, T. (2015). *Evidence-based education is dead – long live evidence-informed education: Thoughts on Dylan Wiliam*'. *Times Educational Supplement* 11 April. online
- Brasil (1996). Lei de Diretrizes e Bases da Educação Nacional, LDB: Lei n. 9394/96 [National Education Guidelines and Framework Law , LDB: Law No. 9394/96]. Brasília: Diário

- Oficial da União, Ano CXX XIV, n. 248, de 23/12/96, p. 27.833-27.841, 1996. See: <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/leis/l9394.htm>. Accessed: 10 Sept. 2015.
- Brasil (2008). Lei n. 11.769, de 18 de agosto de 2008 [Law No. 11.769, from 18th August 2008]. Brasília: Diário Oficial da República Federativa do Brasil, ano CXLV, n. 159, Seção 1, p. 1, 2008. See: <http://www.planalto.gov.br/ccivil_03/_Ato2007-2010/2008/lei/L11769.htm>. Accessed: 9 Sept. 2013.
- Brazil (2005) *Living Culture: National Programme of Art, Education, Citizenship and Solidary Economy* Brasilia: Ministry of Culture
- Cleave, S., & Dust, K. (1989). *A sound start: the schools' instrumental music service*. Windsor: NFER-Nelson.
- CUREE (2012) Synthesis Report – Sing Up 2007-2011 Programme Evaluation. Coventry: Centre for the Use of Research and Evidence in Education.
- Derbyshire, S. (2015). *Musical Routes: A New Landscape for Music Education*. London: Royal Philharmonic Society.
- DFE. [Department for Education] (2011). *The Importance of Music. A National Plan for Music Education*. London: Department for Education/Department for Media, Culture and Sport
- DFE. [Department for Education] (2013). *Research Priorities and Questions: Teachers and Teaching*. London: Department for Education.
- DfES. [Department for Education and Skills] (2006). *Making every child's music matter: Music Manifesto Report no 2*. London: Music Manifesto/ Department for Education/Department for Media, Culture and Sport
- Department for Education and Skills, (2001) Schools White Paper. London: Department for Education and Skills
- Davies, L., Stephens J, (2004) *Creating Chances for Making Music - the story of the wider opportunities pilot programme*. London: Youth Music
- DfES. (Department for Education and Skills) (2006) *Instrumental and Vocal Tuition at KS2 – making it work in your school*. London: Department for Education
- Donahue, JD, Zeckhauser, R. (2012) *Collaborative Governance: Private Roles for Public Goals in Turbulent Times*. Princeton University press
- Figueiredo, S., Soares, J., & Schambeck, R.F. (2016). Current Perspectives and Challenges Facing Music Teacher Preparation in Brazil. In. S.Figueiredo, J. Soares, & R.F. Schambeck (Eds). *The Preparation of Music Teachers: A Global Perspective*. (pp41–

62). Porto Alegre, Brazil: ANPPOM (ASSOCIAÇÃO NACIONAL DE PESQUISA E PÓS-GRADUAÇÃO EM MÚSICA).

- Freire, P. (1995). *Pedagogy of Hope. Reliving Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, New York: Continuum
- Hallam, S. (2015). *The Power of Music*. London: Music Education Council/International Music Education Research Centre
- Hallam, S., Creech, A., Sandford, C., Rinta, T., & Shave, K. (2009). *Survey of Musical Futures*. London: Institute of Education.
- Halves, T. (2013) <http://www.digitalcounterrevolution.co.uk/2013/ken-robinson-caricature-teacher-education-paradigms-or-changing-caricatures/>
- Hammersley, M. (2013). *The Myth of Research-Based Policy & Practice*. London: Sage.
- Henriksson-Macaulay, L., & Welch, G.F. (2015). The musical key to babies cognitive and social development. *International Journal of Birth and Parent Education*. 2(2), 21-25. <http://www.ijbpe.co.uk/index.php/87-issue-6/165-the-musical-key-to-babies-cognitive-and-social-development>
- Henderson, P. <http://www.lifelearningmagazine.com/1508/creative-schools-a-commentary-on-Ken-Robinson-book.htm>
- Heneghan, F. (2002) *Music Education National Debate*. Dublin: Dublin Institute of Technology.
- Heritage, P. (2009). *Intense Dreams: Reflections on Brazilian Culture and Performance*. London: People's Palace Projects.
- Howlett, M., Ramesh, M., & Perl, A. (2009). *Studying Public Policy: Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*. Ontario, Canada: OUP.
- Kenny, A (2009) *Local Authorities and Music: Knowing the Score*. Dublin: Arts Council Ireland
- Johnson, H, (2015). *Gone in the Air: Young People, Music and Rural Isolation*. NYMAZ. At: <http://www.nymaz.org.uk/news-and-views/post/north-yorkshire-charity-warns-that-children-in-rural-areas-risk-further-iso/>
- Kingdon, J. W. (1995). *Agendas, alternatives, and public policies* (2nd ed.). New York: Longman.
- Leong, S., Burnard, P., Jeanneret, N., Leung, B.W., & Waugh, C. (2012). Assessing Creativity in Music: International Perspectives and Practices. In G.E. McPherson & G.F. Welch (Eds.). *The Oxford Handbook of Music Education, Volume 2*. (pp. 389-407). New York: OUP.

- Lepkowska, D. (1998). Primary music in decline. *Times Educational Supplement*, 24 April 1998, 6-7.
- MacDonald, R., Kreutz, G., & Mitchell, L. (2013). *Music, Health and Wellbeing*. Oxford: OUP.
- Music Network (2003) *A national system of local music education services – report of a feasibility study*. Dublin: Music Network
- Music Generation Ireland (2009) *Policy and Priorities 2010 – 2015*
<http://www.musicgeneration.ie/content/files/Policy%20%20Priorities%202010%20-%202015.pdf>
- National Advisory Committee on Creative and Cultural Education. (1999). *All Our Futures: Creativity, Culture and Education*. London: DFEE.
- Nisbet, J. (1974). *Educational Research: The State of the Art*. Address to the Inaugural Meeting of the British Educational Research Association, Birmingham, April (reported in Whitty, G. & Wisby, E. 2016. *Research and Policy in Education*. London: UCL IoE Press).
- Noronha, L. M. R. (2011). O canto orfeônico e a construção do conceito de identidade nacional [The Canto Orfeônico Method and Building the Concept of a National Identity]. *Art-Cultura, Uberlândia*, 13(23), 85-94.
- Odena, O. (ed.) (2012). *Musical Creativity: Insights from Music Education Research*. Farnham, UK, and Burlington, VT: Ashgate
- Ofsted (Office for Standards in Education) (2004) *Tuning In: Wider Opportunities in Specialist Music tuition for pupils at KS2 – an evaluation of pilot programmes in 12 local authorities*. London: Ofsted
- Ofsted. [Office for Standards in Education, Children's Services and Skills]. (2012). *Music in schools: wider still, and wider*. Manchester: Ofsted.
- Partington, J., Bezulle, P. (2014) *Sage Gateshead – Guri Santa Marcelina Learning Exchange internal report*. London: British Council
- Penna, M. (2002). Professores de música nas escolas públicas de ensino fundamental e médio: uma ausência significativa [Music Teachers in Primary and Secondary State Schools: a Significant Absence]. *Revista da ABEM*, 7, 7-19.
- Pollard, A. (2015). Achievement, divergence and opportunity in education: Some outcomes and challenges for REF 2014. *Research Intelligence*, 126, 10-11.
- Rainbow, B., with Cox, G. (2006). *Music in educational thought and practice*. Woodbridge: Boydell Press.

- Purves, R. (2016). 'The Ten Percent': Young people's access to publicly-funded instrumental music tuition in England: findings from an idiographic geographical case study. *Ms submitted for publication.*
- Thompson, K (2009.) *Report of the Evaluation of Music Education Partnerships in Donegal and Dublin.* Dublin: Music Network.
- Paul Hamlyn Foundation (2015) *Strategy 2015.* London: Paul Hamlyn Foundation
- Plummeridge, C (2012). 'Schools', in Grove Music Online. Retrieved on 16.02.15 from <http://www.oxfordmusiconline.com:80/subscriber/article/grove/music/43103>
- Rattle, S. (1998). *Don't Stop The Music.* Channel 4 Broadcast on UK terrestrial television, 6th September.
- Slater, H., Davies, N. and Burgess, S. (2009), Do teachers matter? Measuring the variation in teacher effectiveness in England, *Working Paper No. 09/212*, Centre for Market and Public Organisation, University of Bristol. Available at: CMPO: Do Teachers Matter?
- UK Music (2015). *Measuring Music 2015.* London: UK Music
<http://www.ukmusic.org/research/measuring-music-2015/> retrieved 10 Jan 2016
- Welch, G.F., & Henley, J. (2014). Addressing the challenges of teaching music by generalist schoolteachers. *Revista da ABEM [Associacao Brasileira de Educacao Musical]*, 22(32), 12-38
<http://www.abemeducacaomusical.com.br/revistas/revistaabem/index.php/revistaabem/article/viewFile/459/383>
- Welch, G.F., Himonides, E., Saunders, J., Papageorgi, I., Preti, C., Rinta, T., Vraka, M., Stephens Himonides, C., Stewart, C., Lanipekun, J., & Hill, J. (2010). *Researching the impact of the National Singing Programme 'Sing Up' in England: Main findings from the first three years (2007-2010).* *Children's singing development, self-concept and sense of social inclusion.* London: International Music Education Research Centre, Institute of Education.
- Welch, G.F., Himonides, E., Saunders, J., Papageorgi, I., & Sarazin, M. (2014). Singing and social inclusion. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5:803. doi: 10.3389/fpsyg.2014.00803
- Whitty, G., with Wisby, E. (2016). Education(al) research and education policy in an imperfect world. In G. Whitty, with J. Anders, A. Hayton, S. Tang & E. Wisby. *Research and Policy in Education.* (pp.1-19). London: UCL Institute of Education.
- Zeserson, K., with Welch, G.F., Burn, S., Saunders, J., & Himonides, E. (2014). *Inspiring Music for All. Paul Hamlyn Foundation Review of Music in Schools.* London/Gateshead: Paul Hamlyn Foundation/Sage Gateshead.

Zimmerman, B., Bandura, A., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Self-motivation for academic achievement: The role of self-efficacy and personal goal setting. *American Education Research Journal*, 29, 663–676.