

Primary Music Curriculum Frameworks: A Critical Comparison of the International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme and the NSW Creative Arts K-6 Syllabus

Timothy David Norman

Burgmann Anglican School

Abstract

This article compares and evaluates the music components of the International Baccalaureate (IB) Primary Years Programme (PYP) and the NSW Creative Arts K-6 Syllabus. To guide the analysis, this article employs Bernstein's (1971) concepts of classification and frame, and the two levels of 'best practice' in primary music education proposed by Jeanneret and Stevens-Ballenger (2013). Adoption of the PYP by schools has increased significantly throughout the past decade to the extent that it is now the most widely implemented of the four IB programs currently available in Australia (Kidson, Odhiambo, & Wilson, 2018). However, despite its growth in popularity, little research within Australia has focused on the PYP and even fewer, if any, studies have explored its implications for music education practice both nationally and internationally.

Key words: Primary music education, curriculum frameworks, International Baccalaureate (IB), Primary Years Programme (PYP), Creative Arts K-6 Syllabus, best practice, Bernstein, classification, frame

Introduction

The purpose of this article is to critically compare the music components of both the International Baccalaureate (IB) Primary Years Programme (PYP) and the New South Wales (NSW) Creative Arts K-6 Syllabus (CAK6S). I have selected these two curriculum frameworks because I have experience teaching both as a primary music specialist. Initially, I taught the NSW CAK6S (Board of Studies [BOS] NSW, 2006) in Australia and then later, the IB PYP (International Baccalaureate Organization [IBO], 2009a, 2009b) when I moved overseas to take up a position in an international school in the Middle East. These two differing experiences revealed a number of strengths and limitations present in each curriculum framework. These will be discussed in relation to the academic literature and my own professional experiences.

As the purpose of this article is to critically compare two curriculum frameworks, I have termed it a comparative curricular study. Phillips and

Schweisfurth (2014) rightly note that comparison "is a fundamental aspect of intellectual inquiry" and that it "is indispensable to our thought processes" (p. 30). Recognising the complexities in trying to form a widely accepted definition of a 'discipline' like comparative education, they tentatively propose the following: "The study of any aspects of educational phenomena in two or more different national or regional settings in which attempts are made to draw conclusions from a systematic comparison of the phenomena in question" (p. 41). These conclusions are not as simple as either-or, but are nuanced and context specific. Thus, the purpose of this article is not to conclude that one of the two curriculum frameworks is necessarily more successful or effective than the other, if such a conclusion is even possible, but rather through the act of comparing illuminate various strengths and limitations present within each. Phillips and Schweisfurth note, that in addition to researchers, "education generalists and practitioners have an

important role to play in grounding comparisons in classroom realities" (p. 18). This article aims to do this, by not only analysing each curriculum framework's formal documents, but by also drawing on my professional experiences teaching as a primary music specialist both in Australia and internationally.

The structure of this article will proceed as follows. First, the music components of the IB PYP (IBO, 2009a, 2009b) and the BOS NSW (2006) CAK6S will be introduced. Second, literature exploring what constitutes 'best practice' in primary music education will be discussed in order to establish a set of criteria by which the two curriculum frameworks can be 'judged'. Third, in light of these criteria and through employing Bernstein's (1971) concepts of classification and frame, the two curriculum frameworks will be systematically compared and evaluated. Last, conclusions will be drawn regarding the overall strengths and limitations of each curriculum framework and potential areas for future research and development will be discussed.

Background

Music in the IB PYP

The IB PYP was introduced in 1997 and is taught to students aged 3 to 12. As of March, 2017, there are 1,472 schools using the PYP in 109 different countries around the world (IBO, 2018a). Currently, 132 PYP schools are located within Australia, which has seen a significant period of expansion for the PYP during the past decade (IBO, 2018b; Kidson, Odhiambo, & Wilson, 2018). However, despite its growth in popularity, the PYP has received little attention by academics and researchers within the context of Australia (Kidson et al., 2018). This paper is one small step in the direction of rectifying this situation.

The PYP emerged from the International Schools Curriculum Project, which over a ten-year period aimed to develop a curriculum that would provide continuity in learning to students living abroad and promote international mindedness (IBO, 2018a).

The IB's overarching aim for the PYP "is to create a transdisciplinary curriculum that is engaging, relevant, challenging and significant for learners" (IBO, 2009b, p. 8). It consists of three interrelated components: the written curriculum, the taught curriculum and the assessed curriculum. However, this will change with the upcoming release of the "enhanced Primary Years Programme (PYP) in October 2018" (IBO, 2017, para. 1), which will restructure these areas into "the learner, learning and teaching and the learning community" (para. 2).

The IB is committed to a transdisciplinary model of teaching and learning in the PYP, "whereby themes of global significance that transcend the confines of traditional subject areas frame the learning" (IBO, 2009b, p. 6). These transdisciplinary themes include Who We Are, Where We Are in Place and Time, How We Express Ourselves, How the World Works, How We Organize Ourselves, and Sharing the Planet. Each of these six transdisciplinary themes find their origins in the writing of the American educator and researcher Ernest Boyer (1995). The IB attests that these transdisciplinary themes are "shared human experiences" common to all people regardless of their nationality, ethnicity, race and religion (IBO, 2009b, p. 11). In addition to these six transdisciplinary themes, the IB also acknowledges traditional subject areas. In the PYP, the traditional subject areas include language; mathematics; social studies; science; personal, social and physical education; and the arts. For each subject area, there is a set of content organising strands and overall expectations, specified in what the IB term, "detailed scope and sequence documents", which they attest are "exemplar material" (p. 11).

In the PYP Arts Scope and Sequence (AS&S), music is addressed alongside the artforms of dance, drama and the visual arts (IBO, 2009a). In this document, these four artforms share 'arts' generic overall expectations, conceptual understandings and the content organising strands of creating and responding, which the IB state "apply across the different art forms and define the critical artistic processes" (IBO, 2009a, p. 1). These overall expectations and conceptual understandings are

outlined in four phases of development in relation to these two content organising strands. Each artform does, however, have its own subject-specific learning continuum, which the IB states has been created “in order to respect the integrity of each art form and provide a useful planning tool for teachers” (IBO, 2009a, p. 6). These learning continuums contain subject-specific learning outcomes for both the creating and responding organising strands, which the IB describe as “observable behaviours or actions that will indicate to teachers how students are constructing, creating and sharing meaning through arts” (IBO, 2009a, p. 6).

Music in the NSW Creative Arts K-6 Syllabus

The NSW CAK6S is one of six key learning area syllabuses, which collectively constitute the primary school curriculum in NSW. It was first published in 2000, then later revised in 2006, and is used by all primary schools that fall within the jurisdiction of the state of NSW. As a curriculum framework, it covers the subject areas of visual arts, music, drama and dance (BOS NSW, 2006). Overall, the ‘arts’ as a key learning area is allocated 6 to 10 percent of total teaching time in NSW primary schools, which equates to approximately 1.5 to 2.5 hours a week (NSW Education Standards Authority [NESA], 2017b). In NSW, music is compulsory at the primary school level (*Education Act 1990* (NSW), s.8; Groulx, 2013). Currently, the CAK6S is in the process of being reviewed to include Australian Curriculum content (see NESA, 2017a).

The aim of the CAK6S is “to enable students to gain increasing understanding and accomplishment in the visual arts, music, drama and dance and for students to appreciate the meanings and values that each of the artforms offer personally, culturally and as forms of communication” (BOS NSW, 2006, p. 8). Like the PYP, these four artforms are also grouped together under the umbrella term of the ‘arts’. However, unlike the PYP, each artform has its own subject-specific content organising strands, rather than ‘arts’ generic strands. This

decision reflects the BOS NSW’s (2006) statement that, “Each of the artforms is acknowledged in the syllabus for its unique contribution to the Creative Arts and students’ learning” (p. 7). For music, these content organising strands include performing (singing, playing and moving), organising sound and listening. In addition, the music section of the CAK6S contains information regarding musical concepts (duration, pitch, dynamics, tone colour and structure) and repertoire (vocal music, instrumental music, student compositions and movement). These content organising strands have a central place in the CAK6S and distinguish music from the other three ‘arts’ subjects listed. For each strand, the CAK6S contains a series of learning outcomes and indicators, which are arranged according to four stages of development.

What constitutes ‘best practice’ in primary music education?

Before undertaking a critical comparison of the music components of the CAK6S (BOS NSW, 2006) and the PYP (IBO, 2009a, 2009b), it is important to consider what constitutes ‘best practice’ in primary music education. However, what is meant by primary music education? Groulx (2013) rightly identifies that it is difficult to precisely define due to how it has and continues to change over time. In his paper, he proposes that primary music education “refers to the intentional study of music in an elementary school that is offered to all students in the school without the need for specialized training or experience” (p. 138). This type of music education can be taught by either a classroom generalist teacher or music specialist. This paper will adopt Groulx’s (2013) definition framing primary music education in relation to classroom activities, available to all students within a school, while recognising the relative importance of instrumental lessons and co-curricular ensemble programs. These too are important dimensions of music education. However, they are not the focus of the two curriculum frameworks analysed in this article.

Establishing what constitutes 'best practice' in primary music education is not an easy task. Unsurprisingly, primary music education is a much researched area within the literature, with various studies having been conducted exploring topics like the historical development of primary music curricula (Groulx 2013; Stakelum, 2008); contemporary curricular approaches and pedagogies (Forrest & Watson, 2012; Jeanneret, 2010); primary generalist and specialist teachers' beliefs, confidence, values and attitudes regarding teaching classroom music (Battersby & Cave, 2014; Hallam et al., 2009; Hennessy, 2000; Power & Klopper, 2011; Russell-Bowie, 2002, 2009; Shouldice, 2014); interest development in the primary music classroom (Roberts, 2015; Vicente-Nicolás & Ruairc, 2014); and the impact of established music educationalists like Orff, Kodály and Dalcroze on classroom practices (Anderson, 2011; de Vries, 2001; Shiobara, 1994; Taylor, 2012). Fortunately, for this relatively short paper, Jeanneret and Stevens-Ballenger (2013) directly address the question of what constitutes 'best practice' in primary music education in their article discussing the findings of a report conducted into the state of primary music education in Victoria (that is, Jeanneret, 2009, as cited in Jeanneret & Stevens-Ballenger, 2013) and the impact it has had on their university's pre-service teacher training program. From their perspective, 'best practice' in primary music education functions on two levels. The first involves music teachers utilising a developmental approach to the integration of both music skills and knowledge and the second refers to music teachers' wider pedagogical practices.

Focusing on the first level, Jeanneret and Stevens-Ballenger (2013) define musical skills in relation to the experiences of moving, playing, singing, composing and listening. Musical knowledge, on the other hand, primarily refers to the musical elements. In the Victorian curriculum documents, the musical elements are listed as "rhythm, pitch, dynamics and expression, form and structure, timbre and texture" (Victorian Curriculum and

Assessment Authority, 2015, "The elements of music"). It is important to note, however, that there will be some variation in regard to how both the skills and knowledge components of music curriculum frameworks are conceptualised by teachers, depending on their education, training and prior professional experiences.

Jeanneret and Stevens-Ballenger (2013), to support their claim that an integrated approach to both musical skills and knowledge is 'best practice' in primary music education, refer to the findings of the National Review of School Music Education [NRSME] in Australia conducted by the Department of Education, Science and Training [DEST] (2005). One of the conclusions drawn in this review, which Jeanneret and Stevens-Ballenger (2013) specifically refer to in their article, states:

The prevailing characteristic of the successful music programmes at virtually all site schools was its basis in practical classroom activities which developed the learning of musical knowledge and skills through integrated performance, listening and (to a lesser extent) creative activities. (DEST, 2005, p. 70)

It thus appears that at least in regard to the context of Australia, an integrated approach to musical skill and knowledge development is generally considered to be 'best practice' in music education. However, this perspective may not be held by music educators outside of the Australian context. Personally, reflecting on my own pre-service music education training in NSW, this approach of integration was advocated strongly throughout the course content. However, when teaching abroad, I found that my colleagues from other countries had different perspectives on this matter, which were no doubt influenced by both their professional and educational backgrounds.

The second level of 'best practice', identified by Jeanneret and Stevens-Ballenger (2013), concerns primary music teachers' pedagogical approaches in general. In defining this aspect of 'best practice', Jeanneret and Stevens-Ballenger refer to Zemelman, Daniels and Hyde (2005), who through examining a range of educational research,

including a large number of national curriculum reports in a variety of different subject areas, found “a strong consensus definition of Best Practice, state-of-the-art teaching, in every critical field” (Zemelman et al., 2005, p. 6). However, they note that this is largely an “unrecognized consensus” (p. 6). In all, in the most recent edition of their book, they propose “fourteen interlocking principles, assumptions, or theories” which they consider characterise ‘best practice’ teaching and learning (Zemelman, Daniels, & Hyde, 2012, p. 8). They group these into three clusters: student centred (experiential, holistic, authentic and challenging); cognitive (developmental, constructivist, expressive and reflective); and interactive (sociable, collaborative and democratic). The student-centred cluster emphasises that students’ interests and questions should guide the development of learning engagements rather than distantly and arbitrarily selected content. The cognitive cluster describes how powerful learning occurs when teachers help their students to develop effective metacognitive strategies and deep understanding of concepts through higher-order thinking skills associated with the different subject areas. The interaction cluster asserts that powerful teaching and learning occurs in classroom environments that contain discussion, debate and lively conversation (Zemelman et al., 2012).

Jeanneret and Stevens-Ballenger (2013) rightly note that there is nothing really new in this model. Rather, it is “an interesting consolidation of ideas that embody the work of Bruner, Vygotsky, Piaget, Dewey and others” (p. 65). To contextualise this research, in relation to primary music education more specifically, Jeanneret (2009, as cited in Jeanneret & Stevens-Ballenger, 2013) provides a table summarising the effective primary music teacher and the environment they create. The list of attributes present in this table reflect many of the characteristics of effective pedagogy, as outlined by Zemelman et al. (2005), and was developed following multiple school visits in Victoria. In summary, it would appear that ‘best

practice’ in primary music education, at least within the context of Australia, involves music educators utilising an integrated approach to the teaching of musical skills and knowledge. Such an approach is embedded within more general and widespread pedagogical practices that reflect Zemelman et al.’s (2012) fourteen principles of ‘best practice’.

Critical comparison

Having introduced and outlined the key features of the two curriculum frameworks to be compared, and established some criteria regarding what constitutes ‘best practice’ in primary music education, this paper will now proceed to systematically compare the music components of both the IB PYP (IBO, 2009a, 2009b) and the BOS NSW (2006) CAK6S. However, as stated in the introduction, the purpose of this article is not to argue that one curriculum framework is more effective or simply better than the other, as such an analysis would be reductionist and devoid of an appropriate consideration of contextual factors. Rather, the purpose of this comparison is to highlight the similarities and differences between the two curriculum frameworks and in doing so draw attention to each program’s relative strengths and weaknesses in promoting and facilitating ‘best practice’ in primary music education. In order to do this effectively, I will utilise Bernstein’s (1971) concepts of “classification and frame” (p. 205). While Bernstein (1971) is ultimately concerned with how the classification and framing of educational knowledge codes are connected to issues of power and social control, I believe his theoretical concepts can be utilised independent of his wider sociological arguments for the purposes of this article.

Bernstein (1971) considers that “formal educational knowledge” can be understood in relation to the message systems of “curriculum, pedagogy and evaluation. Curriculum defines what counts as valid knowledge, pedagogy defines what counts as valid transmission of knowledge, and evaluation defines what counts as valid realization

of this knowledge on the part of the taught" (p. 203). For Bernstein, there are two broad types of curriculum: "collection and integrated" (p. 203). To distinguish between these two types of curriculum, Bernstein uses the notion of "contents", which refers to how periods of time allocated for instruction are used (p. 203). If the contents are clearly bounded and well insulated from each other then this type of curriculum is a "collection type" (p. 205). Conversely, if the contents stand in an open relationship with each other, and are not well insulated, then this type of curriculum is an "integrated type" (p. 205). There are, however, varying degrees of collection and integrated types of curriculum. It is thus useful to consider both types as occupying opposite ends on a continuum.

It is the degree of insulation between contents, or as Bernstein (1971) explains, "the strength of the boundary between contents" that determines the curriculum type (p. 205). This idea of boundary strength underpins Bernstein's concepts of classification and frame. Bernstein defines classification as "the degree of boundary maintenance between contents" (p. 205). When classification is strong, the contents will be strongly insulated with firm boundaries. When classification is weak, the contents will be weakly insulated and will have blurred boundaries. While classification is a message system of curriculum, frame is a message system of pedagogy. Bernstein's concept of "frame refers to the degree of control teacher and pupil possess over the selection, organisation, and pacing of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship" (pp. 205-206). If framing is strong, the boundary will be sharply defined. If framing is weak, the boundary will be blurred. Again, like Bernstein's notion of collection and integrated curriculum types, it is useful to consider the concepts of classification and frame on separate continuums, fluctuating between strong and weak, rather than as fixed and static concepts.

Classification

When applying Bernstein's (1971) concept of classification, it is immediately apparent that the

CAK6S (BOS NSW, 2006) suggests far stronger classification than the PYP (IBO, 2009a, 2009b). While there are a number of factors supporting this conclusion, it is most apparent in the nature of the content organising strands. In the PYP AS&S, the use of the 'arts' generic strands of creating and responding for all four artforms implies blurred boundaries between the different subject areas, which collectively constitute the 'arts' (IBO, 2009a). As outlined in the background section of this article, this is not the case in the CAK6S, as each 'arts' subject has its own independent content organising strands.

Another aspect of each curriculum, which suggests far stronger classification on the part of the CAK6S, is the manner in which they advise teachers regarding the development of teaching and learning units or programs. The CAK6S provides five options to teachers regarding how they structure these teaching and learning units, stating that they "may begin with musical concepts as a specific focus, repertoire as a focus, performing as a focus, organising sound as a focus or listening as a focus" (BOS NSW, 2006, p. 12). Moreover, they state that, "Each of these offer valuable approaches to the teaching and learning of music and should be varied over the entire program" (p. 12). The IB, however, provides different guidance, stating that, "wherever possible, arts should be taught through the units of inquiry" (IBO, 2009b, p. 128). Although, they do acknowledge that "direct teaching of arts in a unit of inquiry may not always be feasible" (p. 128). If this is the case, teachers may either incorporate 'arts' teaching before or following on from a unit of inquiry, or alternatively, teachers may develop an independent arts unit (IBO, 2009a, 2009b). However, if teachers decide to develop an independent arts unit they are advised to identify an 'arts' generic conceptual understanding and how it can "help to develop a central idea into which students can inquire" (IBO, 2009a, p. 8). These two main approaches to developing units are termed, respectively, "within" and "outside" the program of inquiry (p. 8). In summary, the IB's model of a

transdisciplinary curriculum, in which the 'arts' are ideally taught through units of inquiry, clearly suggests weak classification when compared to the guidelines provided to teachers in the CAK6S, which places an aspect of music learning firmly at the centre of all learning engagements.

What, however, are the strengths and limitations of strong and weak classification in relation to primary music curriculum frameworks? The first level of 'best practice', outlined by Jeanneret and Stevens-Ballenger (2013), is that music educators take an integrated approach to the teaching and learning of musical knowledge and skills. While such practice could technically occur using both frameworks, the relatively stronger classification of the CAK6S results in it providing more comprehensive support and guidance to music teachers in this regard. Moreover, the BOS NSW (2006) explicitly promotes such practice in relation to the teaching and learning of musical skills stating, "Leaning in music is most effective when learning experiences in performing, organising sound and listening are integrated" (p. 12). Thus the strengths of the relatively strong classification of music, in relation to the other 'arts' areas in the CAK6S, is that it provides a clear and comprehensive framework for musical knowledge and skill development. This framework, placed in the right hands, facilitates the development of integrated music teaching and learning engagements, which the CAK6S not only facilitates but actively promotes.

The relatively weak classification of music within the PYP, on the other hand, does not provide the same level of guidance and support to teachers. This is evident in the IB's use of 'arts' generic content organising strands and the absence of a substantial framework for musical knowledge development (IBO, 2009a, 2009b), which in the CAK6S (BOS NSW, 2006) takes the form of the musical concepts. This latter point is concerning, as in the IB's learning continua for music, specific reference to musical elements is made four times (IBO, 2009a). For example, in a phase three learning outcome for the strand responding, it states, "analyse different

compositions describing how the musical elements enhance the message" (IBO, 2009a, p. 12). For generalist teachers unaware of what musical elements are, this outcome will be difficult to address.

Moreover, due to the absence of any substantial information regarding the musical elements or concepts in the PYP, continuity regarding how they are addressed and conceptualised between multiple teachers within the same PYP school, and between teachers across multiple PYP schools, is not assured. While this may not be a significant issue for schools that use the PYP alongside another curriculum program, that has some kind of framework for musical knowledge development, it is a problem for those international schools that rely solely on the PYP. In summary, the omission of a framework for musical knowledge development is problematic for a curriculum program that aims to promote continuity in learning (IBO, 2018a). The inclusion of such a framework would facilitate teaching within the PYP to reflect Jeanneret and Stevens-Ballenger's (2013) first level of 'best practice' regarding an integrated approach to musical knowledge and skill development.

Frame

The differences between these two curriculum frameworks are not as apparent when applying Bernstein's (1971) concept of frame, as both provide significant flexibility in regard to "the selection, organization, and pacing of the knowledge transmitted and received in the pedagogical relationship" (p. 206). However, overall, the PYP (IBO, 2009a, 2009b) has relatively weaker framing than the CAK6S (BOS NSW, 2006). Moreover, the CAK6S appears to implicitly emphasise more of a teacher-directed approach in the pedagogical relationship, while the PYP explicitly emphasises student choice and agency over a teacher-directed approach.

In regard to the selection and organisation of knowledge, the CAK6S states, "Learning about musical concepts and learning to manipulate musical concepts are aspects of musical learning

that should be present in all learning experiences" (BOS NSW, 2006, p. 54). However, what aspects of the musical concepts are addressed, as well as what repertoire is explored, is not prescribed, but left open to teachers' discretion and judgement. The only requirement is that teachers provide students with sequential and developmental learning experiences in music, "revisiting musical concepts within a range of repertoire and at increasing levels of complexity and understanding" and provide a "balanced experience of all musical concepts through performing, organising sound and listening" (p. 85). The CAK6S provides ample examples of how this may occur, but throughout emphasises that these are possibilities not requirements.

While this might appear as relatively weak framing of educational knowledge, the IB gives even more control to teachers, stating that each strand's conceptual understandings and learning outcomes "indicate learning possibilities for that strand. Schools may find that they have other learning outcomes relevant to their particular context and may choose to document these within their own arts scope and sequences" (IBO, 2009a, p. 6). In addition to teachers, the PYP provides considerable control to students in the pedagogical relationship with its emphasis on an inquiry pedagogical framework. Such an approach emphasises that students' questions and interests should direct learning and 'arts' projects over teacher-led initiatives (IBO, 2009b).

In regard to the pacing of knowledge, the PYP again suggests relatively weaker framing when compared to the CAK6S. In the PYP AS&S, the overall expectations and learning outcomes are arranged in relation to four phases of development, which are presented within learning continua. This method of presenting learning objectives was "designed to recognize that learning in arts is a developmental process and that the phases through which a learner passes are not always linear or age related" (IBO, 2009a, p. 6). The CAK6S (BOS NSW, 2006) also presents its foundation statements

and learning objectives in relation to four stages of development. However, instead of flexible phases, that are not age or year-level related, their four stages are fixed.

The BOS NSW (2006) consider that "most students will achieve the outcomes of each stage in the years listed" (p. 23). Although, "Some students who have certain learning needs may not achieve the outcomes in the same way nor demonstrate the same pattern or rate of progression" (p. 23). It is important to note, however, that while the CAK6S has stronger framing when compared to the PYP in this regard, it is still relatively weak when compared to other curriculum frameworks. This finds support in the nature of the learning outcomes themselves, which despite being fixed according to stage, are quite open-ended leaving room for interpretation. For example, the progression from MUS1.1 to MUS2.1 involves a minimal change in language from "demonstrating an awareness of musical concepts" to "demonstrating a basic knowledge of musical concepts" (p. 25). Such a statement can be interpreted in multiple ways.

What then are the advantages of strong and weak framing in relation to primary music curriculum frameworks? In regard to the PYP, its weak framing, resulting in substantial freedom to both teachers and students in the selection, organisation and pacing of educational knowledge, means that there is considerable flexibility to be creative and innovative in the development of teaching and learning engagements that are sensitive to the needs and interests of students within a particular context. Furthermore, the PYP's (IBO, 2009a, 2009b) emphasis on child-centred and constructivist pedagogical practices, evident in its inquiry and concept-based approach to teaching and learning, appears to embody many of the aspects of 'best practice' advocated by Zemelman et al. (2012). The downside, however, is that very minimal guidance is provided to teachers regarding what content is to be selected and what constitutes age appropriate music teaching and learning experiences. For appropriately trained primary music specialists,

this is not likely to be a significant issue, as they can draw on their music education training and previous professional experiences. However, for PYP generalist teachers this may be problematic. The research literature emphasises that primary generalist teachers typically have low self-efficacy in relation to teaching music (de Vries, 2011; Garvis, 2013; Hallam et al., 2009; Hennessy, 2000; Holden & Button, 2006; Power & Klopper, 2011; Russell-Bowie, 2002, 2009; Wiggins & Wiggins, 2008). The PYP's music curriculum documents do not help this situation, as they provide teachers with little guidance and support regarding how to implement and structure music teaching and learning in a systematic and sequential manner.

The CAK6S (BOS NSW, 2006), with its relatively stronger framing than the PYP (IBO, 2009a, 2009b) provides more guidance regarding the selection, organisation and pacing of musical knowledge. The provision of information regarding musical concepts and repertoire, with potential learning experiences listed under each, provides a useful starting point from which teachers can plan suitable music learning engagements in a sequential manner. While the pacing of knowledge and skill development is not as flexible as that found in the PYP, the achievement levels listed in the foundation statements and learning outcomes for each stage are flexible enough to allow for substantial differentiation, sensitive to the needs of individual students. This is supported in the BOS NSW (2006) statement, that the approach in the CAK6S takes into account "the critical role of the teacher in providing learning experiences that are suited to the students' abilities and developmental needs and interests" (p. 6). Overall, the relatively stronger framing of musical knowledge in the CAK6S can be seen as advantageous, as it is not overly prescriptive, limiting teacher and student choice, but prescriptive enough to provide sufficient guidance to teachers regarding what is taught and at what level.

Conclusion

This paper has systematically compared the music components of both the BOS NSW (2006) CAK6S and the IB PYP (IBO, 2009a, 2009b) using Bernstein's (1971) concepts of classification and frame to structure the analysis. Overall, the music component of the CAK6S has relatively stronger classification and framing when compared to that in the PYP. However, while the PYP clearly represents what Bernstein (1971) terms an "integrated type" curriculum, it cannot be said that the CAK6S is typical of a "collection type" (p. 205). In this paper, the differences between these two curriculum frameworks, regarding their classification and framing, have only been described in relation to each other, not relative to other programs. In all, the CAK6S does exhibit some aspects of an integrated type curriculum. This is evident in a short section titled, "Links Between the Artforms and Other Key Learning Areas", which acknowledges that transdisciplinary learning can successfully occur between artforms and other key learning areas (BOS NSW, 2006, p. 19). However, unlike the PYP, it does not mandate this approach and cautiously emphasises that "teachers are mindful of the syllabus outcomes in each of the artforms" and do not lose focus of their "unique characteristics and content" (p. 19).

In regard to the overall strengths of each curriculum framework, the analysis undertaken in this paper suggests that the relatively stronger classification and framing of educational knowledge in the CAK6S is advantageous for teachers in that it provides a clearer and more comprehensive framework regarding the teaching of musical knowledge and skills when compared to that present in the PYP. While a clearer and more comprehensive framework does not ensure more effective teaching and learning of music, it is difficult to see how it could be detrimental. This aspect of the CAK6S, in combination with its guidance regarding musical content, suggests that it may be a more accessible and usable document for both music specialists and generalist teachers

alike than those currently provided by the IB PYP (IBO, 2009a, 2009b). Issues relating to access and use are important, as the literature shows that generalist teachers typically lack confidence in relation to the teaching of classroom music (de Vries, 2011; Garvis, 2013; Hennessy, 2000; Holden & Button, 2006; Power & Klopper, 2011; Stunell, 2010) and in some instances struggle to provide effective music learning experiences (Wiggins & Wiggins, 2008). I am thus concerned that music teaching by many generalist teachers in international schools, using only the PYP, may be of poor quality, and in some instances nearly non-existent, in the absence of suitably qualified music specialists. However, further study would be needed to determine to what extent this may or may not be the case.

Regarding Jeanneret and Stevens-Ballenger's (2013) two levels of 'best practice', both curriculum frameworks embody these to varying degrees. The CAK6S clearly encourages and facilitates the development of an integrated approach to the teaching and learning of musical skills and knowledge. However, the PYP appears to more explicitly encourage and facilitate the development of the fourteen principles of 'best practice' outlined by Zemelman et al. (2012) through its uniform inquiry and concept-based approach to pedagogy across all subject areas. In all, both curriculum frameworks have different strengths and something to offer the other. Perhaps the environments that have the potential to offer the most effective music teaching and learning experiences can be found in schools that combine both frameworks. Further study exploring schools that are teaching both frameworks side-by-side would be insightful and beneficial in this regard.

Acknowledgment

The author gratefully acknowledges the advice of Dr Paul Denley.

References

- Anderson, W. T. (2011). The Dalcroze approach to music education: Theory and applications. *General Music Today*, 26(1), 27-33. doi: 10.1177/1048371311428979
- Battersby, S. L., & Cave, A. (2014). Preservice classroom teachers' preconceived attitudes, confidence, beliefs, and self-efficacy toward integrating music in the elementary curriculum. *Update: Applications of Research in Music Education*, 32(2), 52-59. doi: 10.1177/8755123314521033
- Bernstein, B. (1971). *Class, codes and control: Theoretical studies towards a sociology of language* (Vol. 1). London, United Kingdom: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Board of Studies NSW. (2006). *Creative arts K-6 syllabus*. Sydney, Australia" Author.
- Boyer, E. L. (1995). *The basic school: A community for learning*. Princeton, NJ: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.
- Department of Education, Science and Training. (2005). *National review of school music education: Augmenting the diminished*. Retrieved from http://researchrepository.murdoch.edu.au/id/eprint/9459/1/music_review_reportFINAL.pdf
- de Vries, P. (2001). Reevaluating common Kodály practices. *Music Educators Journal*, 88(3), 24-27.
- de Vries, P. (2011). The first year of teaching in primary school: Where is the place of music? *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 12(2), 1-25. Retrieved from <http://www.ijea.org/v12n2/>
- Education Act 1990* (NSW). Retrieved from <https://www.legislation.nsw.gov.au/inforce/fc4bcf6a-d005-68af-fa91-fd9a7d10cd09/1990-8.pdf>
- Forrest, D., & Watson, A. (2012). Music in essential learning frameworks in Australian schools. *International Journal of Music Education*, 30, 148-160. doi: 10.1177/0255761412439923
- Garvis, S. (2013). Beginning generalist teacher self-efficacy for music compared with maths and English. *British Journal of Music Education*, 30, 85-101. doi: 10.1017/S0265051712000411
- Groulx, T. J. (2013). Three nations, one common root: A historical comparison of elementary music education in the United Kingdom, the United States, and Australia. *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education*, 34, 137-153. doi: 10.1177/153660061303400205
- Hallam, S., Burnard, P., Robertson, A., Saleh, C., Davies, V., Rogers, L., & Kokatsaki, D. (2009). Trainee primary-school teachers' perceptions of their effectiveness in teaching music. *Music Education Research*, 11, 221-240. doi: 10.1080/14613800902924508
- Hennessy, S. (2000). Overcoming the red-feeling: The development of confidence to teach music in primary school amongst student teachers. *British Journal of Music Education*, 17, 183-196. doi: 10.1017/S0265051700000243
- Holden, H., & Button, S. (2006). The teaching of music in the primary school by the non-music specialist. *British Journal of Music Education*, 23, 23-38. doi: 10.1017/S0265051705006728

- International Baccalaureate Organization. (2009a). *Arts scope and sequence*. Cardiff, Wales: Author.
- International Baccalaureate Organization. (2009b). *Making the PYP happen: A curriculum framework for international primary education* (Rev. ed.). Cardiff, Wales: Author.
- International Baccalaureate Organization. (2017). *Preparing for the enhanced PYP*. Retrieved from <http://blogs.ibo.org/sharingpyp/files/2017/09/FINAL-TEXT-Preparing-for-the-enhanced-PYP.pdf>
- International Baccalaureate Organization. (2018a). *Key facts about the PYP*. Retrieved from <http://www.ibo.org/programmes/primary-years-programme/what-is-the-pyp/key-facts-about-the-pyp/>
- International Baccalaureate Organization. (2018b). *The IB by country: Australia*. Retrieved from <http://www.ibo.org/country/AU/>
- Jeanneret, N. (2010). Musical futures in Victoria. *Australian Journal of Music Education*, 2, 148-164.
- Jeanneret, N., & Stevens-Ballenger, J. (2013). The generalist and the specialist: Serendipity in preservice education. *Australian Journal of Music Education*, 1, 64-75.
- Kidson, P., Odhiambo, G., & Wilson, R. (2018). The International Baccalaureate in Australia: Trends and issues. *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/03057925.2017.1415751
- NSW Education Standards Authority. (2017a). Creative arts K-6 draft directions for syllabus development. Retrieved from <http://bosnsw-k6.nsw.edu.au/wps/wcm/connect/85304e02-64fb-4046-ad93-787d39220962/ca-k-6-draft-directions-syllabus-development-2017.pdf?MOD=AJPERES&CVID=>
- NSW Education Standards Authority. (2017b). *Stage statements and time allocation kindergarten to year 6*. Retrieved from <http://educationstandards.nsw.edu.au/wps/portal/nesa/k-10/understanding-the-curriculum/curriculum-syllabuses-NSW/stage-statements-and-time-allocation>
- Phillips, D., & Schweisfurth, M. (2014). *Comparative and international education: An introduction to theory, method, and practice*. (2nd ed.) [iBooks version]. Retrieved from <https://itunes.apple.com/au/book/comparative-and-international-education/id794034856?mt=11>
- Power, B., & Klopper, C. (2011). The classroom practice of creative arts education in NSW primary schools: A descriptive account. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 12(11), 1-26. Retrieved from <http://www.ijea.org/v12n11/>
- Roberts, J. C. (2015). Situational interest of fourth-grade children in music at school. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 63, 180-197. doi 10.1177/0022429415585955
- Russell-Bowie, D. (2002). Where in the world are we? How the perceptions of Australian primary teacher education students differ from those from four other countries in relation to their background and confidence in music education. *Australian Journal of Music Education*, 1, 33-44.
- Russell-Bowie, D. (2009). What me? Teach music to my primary class? Challenges to teaching music in primary schools in five countries. *Music Education Research*, 11, 23-36. doi: 10.1080/14613800802699549
- Shiobara, M. (1994). Music and movement: The effect of movement on musical comprehension. *British Journal of Music Education*, 11, 113-127. doi: 10.1017/S0265051700001005
- Shouldice, H. N. (2014). Teachers' beliefs regarding composition in elementary general music: Definitions, values, and impediments. *Research Studies in Music Education*, 36, 215-230. doi: 10.1177/1321103X14556574
- Stakelum, M. (2008). Primary music education: The misrepresentation of the ideals of curricula in research. *Irish Educational Studies*, 27, 281-293. doi: 10.1080/03323310802242229
- Stunell, G. (2010). Not musical? Identity perceptions of generalist primary school teachers in relation to classroom music teaching in England. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, 9(2), 79-107.
- Taylor, D. M. (2012). Orff ensembles: Benefits, challenges, and solutions. *General Music Today*, 25(3), 31-35. doi: 10.1177/1048371311414879
- Vicente-Nicolás, G., & Ruairc, G. M. (2014). Music activities in primary school: Students' preferences in the Spanish region of Murcia. *Music Education Research*, 16, 290-306. doi: 10.1080/14613808.2014.912261
- Victorian Curriculum and Assessment Authority. (2015). *Music: Introduction: Learning in music*. Retrieved from <http://victoriancurriculum.vcaa.vic.edu.au/the-arts/music/introduction/learning-in-music>
- Wiggins, R. A., & Wiggins, J. (2008). Primary music education in the absence of specialists. *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 9(12), 1-26. Retrieved from <http://www.ijea.org/v9n12/>
- Zemelman, S., Daniels, H., & Hyde, A. (2005). *Best practice: Today's standards for teaching and learning in America's schools* (3rd ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.
- Zemelman, S., Daniels, H., & Hyde, A. (2012). *Best practice: Bringing standards to life in America's classrooms* (4th ed.). Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Timothy Norman holds a Bachelor of Music (Music Education) (Honours) from the University of Sydney and a Graduate Certificate in Educational Leadership from the University of New South Wales. Prior to taking up the position of Junior School Music Teacher at Burgmann Anglican School in Canberra, Timothy worked as a classroom music teacher at a number of independent schools in Sydney as well as overseas at the International School of London Qatar. Timothy is an early-career researcher, who is primarily interested in exploring music education practice within the International Baccalaureate programs.