STUDIO MUSIC TEACHERS

and

PUBLIC MUSIC EXAMINATIONS:

THE QUALITY INTERFACE

A thesis

submitted in fulfillment of the requirements of

the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

at

James Cook University

by

Ivan Holmes B. Mus. Dip. Ed. (Melb) Grad. Dip. Lic.Ex.AGM ATCL A.Mus.A LLCM Hon. FAGM.

2006

School of Creative Arts

STATEMENT OF ACCESS

I, the undersigned, the author of this work, understand that James Cook University will make this thesis available for use within the University Library and, via the Australian Digital Theses network for use elsewhere.

I understand that, as an unpublished work, a thesis has significant protection under the Copyright Act and;

I do not wish to place any restriction on access to this work. ☐

OR

I wish this work to be embargoed until ☐

OR

I wish the following restrictions to be place on this work ☐

....
Signature Date

ELECTRONIC COPY

I, the undersigned, the author of this work, declare that the electronic copy of this thesis provided to James Cook University Library is an accurate copy of the print thesis submitted, within the limits of the technology available.

....
Signature Date

STATEMENT OF SOURCES

DECLARATION

I declare that this thesis is my own work and has not been submitted in any form for another degree or diploma at any university or other institution of tertiary education. Information derived from the published or unpublished work of others has been acknowledged in the text and a list of references given.

....
Signature Date

STATEMENT OF THE CONTRIBUTION OF OTHERS

Support for the completion of this thesis was obtained via the following sources.

FEES:

Funded by a James Cook University Research Training Scheme place.

Any other assistance:

Australian Guild of Music Education Inc: Access to Electronic Examination Reports.

DECLARATION ON ETHICS

The research presented and reported in this thesis was conducted within the guidelines for research ethics outlined in the *National Statement on Ethics in Research Involving Human (1999),* the *Joint NHMRC/AVCC Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice (1997),* the *James Cook University Policy on Experimentation Ethics, Standard Practices and Guidelines (2001)* and the *James Cook University Statement and Guidelines on Research Practice (2001)*. The proposed research methodology received clearance from the James Cook University Experimentation Ethics Review Committee (approval number H1541).

....
Signature Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The concept and title of the research was initially conceived within an aura of doubt and even some negativity but, after the mental confusion and indecision at the thought of commencing a major project in my seventy seventh year dissipated (fifty years after concluding the Bachelor of Music Degree at Melbourne University!), it soon became a deeply absorbing undertaking that was skillfully nurtured within a positive environment of forward vision that was constantly encouraged by Professor Diana Davis, Head of the College of Music, Visual Arts and Theatre (COMVAT) at James Cook University, Queensland, Australia. This exceptional academic with her keen mind and equally keen perceptive powers, enabled me to develop and fulfill the maturing vision of the work ahead. For all of this I am indebted, and I sincerely and unequivocally thank Professor Davis for her unstinting guidance so readily given, which together with her persistence, and tremendous support, has now very much become a part of me and will forever remain so.

Grateful acknowledgement is unhesitatingly offered to:

- Professor Helene Marsh, Dean of Postgraduate Studies, James Cook University for her compassionate understanding of my status as a veteran of the Second World War.
- The Office staff at COMVAT (James Cook University) for their readiness to co-operate and respond to my requests, when printing and other tasks of communication became essential.
- Ryan Daniel, staff member and fellow student at COMVAT, James

Cook University who was always ready to provide assistance to my requests, even though he, at the same time, was preparing his own doctoral thesis.

- My long suffering wife, Violet Jean who spent many a silent hour by herself during the long and yet surprisingly short six years, passing innumerable cups of coffee down to me over the staircase railings whilst I was writing this thesis in the girls' old rumpus room with the computer keyboard for company and at odd times on the pianoforte keyboard to keep the technique under control. To say that I am most grateful for her understanding and constant support in what developed into a massive research undertaking that made many demands upon our personal life and recreation time, is a major understatement.
- My entire family for their constant support. In particular I thank my three girls, all of whom have University Degrees ranging from Bachelor to Masters, for their untiring vocal stimulation. They constantly wanted to know now things were going. "How much longer Dad?"
- The Office staff of the Australian Guild of Music Education Inc. (Melbourne) in making available from their very extensive archives, many thousands of I.T files of practical Public Music Examinations.
- The James Cook University Ethics Committee for granting me ethical access to these archives which was vital for the ultimate success of the research.
- Dr. E Knoop, Director of the Australian Guild of Music and Speech Education Inc. for his strong personal support in taking over my many academic duties with the Australian Guild for six years, thus enabling me to allocate time to meet the maturing demands of the study.

- Professor Don Close (James Cook University) for advice with quantitative methods.
- Professor Warren Bebbington, Dean of the Melbourne University Conservatorium for his support and interest, who, at the time was the Chairman of the Australian Music Examinations Board.
- Ms Elizabeth Mitchell, Staff member of the College of the Arts (Victoria), an AMEB examiner, who was most helpful and supportive.
- Ms Christinne Patton of Wollongong, (NSW), the Trinity College of Music (London) representative who provided a great deal of valuable data.
- Mrs Joyce Trickett, Director of the Australian Music Teachers Register (Victoria), afforded me very much appreciated publicity on her Web Site
- The Victorian Music Teachers Association (VMTA) who published my request in their regular Magazine (Music and the Teacher) for teachers to respond to a Questionnaire concerning the Private Music Teacher and the Public Examination System.

For all of this I am grateful, as without the data collated from these sources, the successful completion of this research would not have been possible.

Ivan Holmes. Date. 2006

ABSTRACT

The research focuses on quality issues within the private music teaching industry and the public music examination system (PMES).

It is clear that there is a schism between the formalized structures and accountabilities of music in the school system and the lack of such structures and accountabilities with the private studio music teaching industry. The Thesis traces the literature documenting the rise of the private music teacher and the accountability rationale implicit in the development of the public music examination system. The dual aims of the research focus on the need to profile the private music teaching industry in Australia and to probe the extent to which the public music examination system might, in practice, afford a window of accountability on to this industry.

The literature foregrounding this study derives from three areas: the historical development of the private music teaching industry; the concomitant need for certification - and the resultant development of the public music examination system; finally the issue of performance assessment across the relevant disciplines is explored to provide research direction for music.

A limited profile of the private music teacher emerged from the first phase of the study. While the respondent sample was smaller than was originally envisaged, comparison with other studies (e.g., Gibbs 1999) suggested that the findings from the current study were consistent. The second phase focussed specifically on the public music examination system and its tangible outcomes

in the form of the examination report.

Five examiners were male and three female. Reports were analyzed in terms of the relevant examination sections with a primary focus on the Technical and Performance lists sections. In each section reports were segmented into idea units as the basic unit for analysis. Categories were derived from the data and each idea unit was categorized accordingly. Examiners' use of categories was analyzed in each section and comparisons made between examiners. Considerable examiner variability was identified.

A discussion of gender differences in accessing categories generates hypotheses for further research. Discussion of marks awarded by examiners leads to hypotheses about the implications of exposure to one examiner rather than another.

While this is but a small scale study and possibly the first in the music genre, its implications for further research are far-reaching. Implications for the discipline are also explored.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE **Page**

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Those Who Can and Those Who Can't 1

1.2 The Development of a Music Teaching Profession 4

1.3 Measuring the Outcomes of Music Teaching 8

1.4 Research Directions? 13

1.5 Rationale for and Aims for the Study 18

1.6 Organization of the Study 21

CHAPTER TWO

THE PRIVATE MUSIC TEACHING INDUSTRY

2.1 Genesis and Development 23

2.2 Windows onto a Faceless Profession 26

2.3 Private Studio Teaching: Precepts and Practices. 30

2.4 Studios and Schools 34

2.5 Quality Issues 38

2.6 *De Facto* Quality Control 42

2.7 Issues in Search of Resolution 44

CHAPTER THREE

ASSESSMENT IN MUSIC: INSTRUMENTAL PERFORMER

3.1 Curriculum and Assessment in Music 48

3.2 Graded Music Examinations: The Drivers 50

3.2.1 Assessment as Motivational Strategy 50

3.2.2 Perceived Benefits for Students 52

3.2.3 The Parental Imperative 53

3.2.4 Quality Control 55

3.3 Managing Music Examinations 61

3.3.1 Music Examining in Australia 62

3.3.2 Dominant Music Examining Bodies in Australia 67

3.3.3 Trinity College of Music (London) 68

3.3.4 AMEB (Australian Music Examinations Board Inc.) 71

3.3.5 AGMS (Australian Guild of Music and Speech Inc.) 77

3.4 Examiners and their Perspectives 82

3.5 Perspectives from the Consumers: Teachers and Students 85

CHAPTER FOUR

PERSPECTIVES ON ASSESSMENTS OF PERFORMANCE

4.1 The Vexed Issue of Performance Assessment 88

4.2 Performance Assessment in Music 92

4.3 Performance Assessment in Medicine and Dentistry 101

4.4 Performance Assessment in Writing 108

4.5 Performance Assessment in Dance 114

4.6 Reconceptualizing Performance Assessment 121

CHAPTER FIVE

THE PRIVATE MUSIC TEACHER: WINDOW ONE

5.1 Directions from the Literature 125

5.2 Accessing the Private Studio Music Teacher: Methodology 126

5.3 Determining the Relevant Parameters for the Questionnaire 129

5.4 Distributing the Questionnaire 130

5.4.1 Strategy One: Initial proposed Distribution 130

5.4.2 Strategy Two: Approach to State Associations 130

5.4.3 Strategy Three: Approach to National Associations 131

5.4.4 Strategy Four: Leaflet with Retail Organization 131

5.4.5 Strategy Five: Personal Contact Approach 131

5.4.6 Strategy Six: Interview Schedule 132

5.5 The Dead End: Limitations of the Sample 133

5.6 The Private Music Teacher in Australia: A Limited Window 134

5.7 Music Teaching Studios 137

5.8 Attitudes Towards Teaching 139

5.9 Aspirations of the PMT Sample 143

5.10 Teachers' Experience and Working Conditions 144

5.11 Approaches to Teaching 145

5.12 Use of the Public Music Examination System 146

5.13 Examination Preparation 149

5.14 Access to and use of Information Technology in the Music Studio 151

5.15 Perspectives from Private Music Teachers 154

5.15.1 The Nexus between Curriculum, Assessment and Examining 155

5.15.2 Music Examinations and Examining 158

5.16 A Potential Escape from the *cul-de-sac* 159

CHAPTER SIX

THE PUBLIC MUSIC EXAMINATION SYSTEM: WINDOW TWO

6.1 Potential Sources of Data 160

6.2 A Sample to Test 167

6.3 Towards a Framework for Analysis 168

6.4 Overview of Examiners' Summative Comments 174

6.5 Examiners' Summative Style 178

6.5.1 Examiner One 178

6.5.2 Examiner Two 179

6.5.3 Examiner Three 179

6.5.4 Examiner Four 179

6.5.5 Examiner Five 180

6.5.6 Examiner Six 180

6.5.7 Examiner Seven 180

6.5.8 Examiner Eight 180

6.5.9 Examiner Nine 181

6.5.10 Examiner Ten 181

6.6 Repeated Formulaic Comments 181

6.7 Summative Comment in Review 186

6.8 Category System in Review 187

6.9 Analysis of Technical and Aesthetic Sections of the Reports 188

CHAPTER SEVEN

ANALYSIS OF THE TECHNICAL SECTION

7.1 The Technical Section 190

7.2 Application of the Technical Category System 191

7.3 Profiling the Technical Section of the Examination 194

7.4 Profiling Individual Examiner's: Technical Section 202

7.4.1 Kevin 203

7.4.2 Stan 204

7.4.3 Wally 205

7.4.4 Silas 206

7.4.5 Hugh 207

7.4.6 Vera 208

7.4.7 Gail 209

7.4.8 Lois 210

7.4.9 Global Profile of Technical Comments 211

7.5 Across Examiner Comparisons: Technical Section 211

7.6 Repeated Comments: Technical Section 214

7.7 The Technical Section in Review 220

CHAPTER EIGHT

ANALYSIS OF PERFORMANCE LISTS

8.1 Performance Lists 222

8.2 Developing a Category System 222

8.3 Application of the Category System 224

8.4 Performance List A Comments Analysis 229

8.5 Individual Examiners' Profiles: Performance List A 233

8.5.1 Kevin 233

8.5.2 Stan 235

8.5.3 Wally 237

8.5.4 Silas 239

8.5.5 Hugh 241

8.5.6 Vera 243

8.5.7 Gail 245

8.5.8 Lois 247

8.6 Performance List B Comments Analysis 249

8.7 Individual Examiners' Profiles: Performance List B 253

8.7.1 Kevin 253

8.7.2. Stan 255

8.7.3 Wally 257

8.7.4 Silas 259

8.7.5 Hugh 261

8.7.6 Vera 263

8.7.7 Gail 265

8.7.8 Lois 267

8.8 Performance List C Comments Analysis 269

8.9 Individual Examiners' Profiles: Performance List C 273

8.9.1 Kevin 273

8.9.2 Stan 275

8.9.3 Wally 277

8.9.4 Silas 279

8.9.5 Hugh 281

8.9.6 Vera 283

8.9.7 Gail 285

8.9.8 Lois 287

8.10 Examiners' Repeated Comments across Performance Lists A, B and C 289

CHAPTER NINE

ACROSS PERFORMANCE LISTS COMPARISONS

9.1 Key Comparisons 301

9.2 Performance Lists A, B and C: Kevin 301

9.2.1 Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Kevin 303

9.2.2 Categories across all Performance Lists: Kevin 303

9.3 Performance Lists A, B and C: Stan 304

9.3.1 Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Stan 306

9.3.2 Categories across all Performance Lists: Stan 306

9.4 Performance Lists A, B and C: Wally 306

9.4.1 Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Wally 308

9.4.2 Categories across all Performance Lists: Wally 308

9.5 Performance Lists A, B and C: Silas 308

9.5.1 Performance Lists Comparisons: Silas 310

9.5.2 Categories across all Performance Lists: Silas 310

9.6 Performance Lists A, B and C: Hugh 310

9.6.1 Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Hugh 312

9.6.2 Categories across all Performance Lists: Hugh 312

9.7 Performance Lists A, B and C: Vera 312

9.7.1 Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Vera 314

9.7.2 Categories across all Performance Lists: Vera 314

9.8 Performance Lists A, B and C: Gail 314

9.8.1 Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Gail 316

9.8.2 Categories across all Performance Lists: Gail 316

9.9. Performance Lists A, B and C: Lois 316

9.9.1 Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Lois 318

9.9.2 Categories across all Performance Lists: Lois 318

9.10 Examiner Comparisons across Performance List A 318

9.10 1 Examiner Comparisons: Performance List A 321

9.10.2 Across Examiner Category Comparisons: Performance List A 321

9.11 Examiner Comparisons across Performance List B 321

9.11.1 Examiner Comparisons: Performance List B 324

9.11.2 Across Examiner Category Comparisons: Performance List B 324

9.12 Examiner Comparisons across Performance List C 324

9.12.1 Examiner Comparisons: Performance List C 327

9.12.2 Across Examiner Category Comparisons: Performance List C 327

9.13 Examiner Comparisons across all A, B & C Performance Lists 327

9.14 Comparison of Examiners' Use of Repeated Comments 332

CHAPTER TEN

THE CULMINATION: AWARDING MARKS

10.1 The Group of Eight 336

10.1.1 The Role of Experience 336

10.1.2 Studios, Teachers and Candidates 338

10.1.3 The Grading System 339

10.2 Overview of Grade Certification Outcomes 340

10.3 Kevin 344

10.4 Stan 349

10.5 Wally 354

10.6 Silas 359

10.7 Hugh 364

10.8 Vera 369

10.9 Gail 374

10.10 Lois 379

10.11 Analysis of Marking in Specific Sections 385

10.11.1 Technical Section 387

10.11.2 Performance Lists 387

10.11.3 Sight Reading 387

10.11.4 Ear Tests 387

10.11.5 General Knowledge 387

10.12 From the Perspective of Experience 388

10.13 The Relationship between Idea Units and Marks Awarded. 389

10.14 Which Examiner? Does it Matter? 391

CHAPTER ELEVEN

THE ROLE OF GENDER

11.1 The Relevance of Gender 394

11.2 Idea Unit Production: Gender Comparisons 396

11.3 Technical Section: Gender Comparisons 398

11.4 Performance Lists: Gender Comparisons 401

11.5 Repeated Comments: Gender Comparisons 411

11.6 Marks Awarded: Gender Comparisons 413

11.7 Perspectives and Profiles 417

CHAPTER TWELVE

DIRECTIONS FROM AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

12.1 The Nature of the Data 418

12.2 Perspectives on the Outcomes of the Research 426

12.3 Music Examiner Attributes 432

12.4 Where do we go from here? 437

12.5 Implications for the Public Music Examination System 441

12.6 Regulation of the Profession: Critical Issues and Directions 442

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.4.1	Key Research Foci Reviewed in Selected Countries: 2000-2004	17
3.3.1	Public Music Examination Organizations in Australia: A Snapshot of the Period 1880 - 2006	66
3.3.2	Genesis of Principal Public Music Examination Boards in Australia	67
4.4.1	Essay Rankings: Bull and Stevens (1976)	110
5.2.1	Overview of Potential Methods for Eliciting Research Data	128
5.5.1	Comparison of Private Music Teacher Samples: UK and Australia	134
5.6.1	Comparison of PMT Samples: UK and Australia	135
5.7.1	Profile of 50 Teaching Studios	138
5.8.1	Teachers' Reasons for Becoming a Music Teacher	140
5.8.2	Teachers' Reported Enjoyment of Music Teaching	142
5.9.1	Nature of Qualifications sought by Teachers	143
5.12.1	Examinations for which Teachers prepared Students	147
5.12.2	Perceptions of Studios' Dependence upon Students' Examination Success	148
5.13.1	Frequency of changes to Examination Repertoire	150
5.15.1	A Profile of Interviewees	157
6.1.1	Examination Boards' Reporting Practices	160
6.1.2	Examination Reports: 15 Examiners across the Period 1995-2001	162
6.1.3	Instrument/s, Area/s, Levels of Examinations: Twelve AGMS Examiners	164-66
6.3.1	Initial Framework of Analysis: Categories	169
6.3.2	Final Analytic Framework: Including Repeated Formulaic Overlay	171
6.3.3	Examples of Application of Category System	173

6.4.1	Frequency of Examiners' Summative Comments by Category	175
6.4.2	Percentages of Examiners' Summative Comments by Category	177
6.6.1	Overview of Repeated Summative Comments: 1995 - 2001	184
6.8.1	Profiles of the Ten Examiners Selected: Primary Training	188
7.1.1	Technical Section Categories	190
7.2.1	Analysis of Technical Reports: Stage One (N=200)	192
7.2.2	Percentages within Technical Categories: Stage One (N=200)	193
7.3.1	Frequency of Examiners' Comments per Category across the Technical Section: Stage Two (N=400)	195
7.3.2	Percentages of Examiners' Comments per Category across the Technical Section. Stage Two. (N=400)	196
7.3.3	Typical Positive Comments by Examiners in the Technical Section	198
7.3.4	Typical Implied and Direct Negative Comments by Examiners in the Technical Section	200
7.4.1	Profile of Kevin's Technical Comments	203
7.4.2	Profile of Stan's Technical Comments	204
7.4.3	Profile of Wally's Technical Comments	205
7.4.4	Profile of Silas's Technical Comments	206
7.4.5	Profile of Hugh's Technical Comments	207
7.4.6	Profile of Vera's Technical Comments	208
7.4.7	Profile of Gails's Technical Comments	209
7.4.8	Profile of Lois's Technical Comments	210
7.4.9	Global Profile of Technical Comments	211
7.6.1	Analysis of Examiners' Frequently Repeated Comments: Technical Section	215-16
7.6.2	Classification of Repeated Comments: Technical Section	219
8.2.1	Performance Lists Categories System	223

8.3.1	Exemplar Comments: The Performance Category System	225-28
8.4.1	Frequency of Examiners' Comments on Performance List A per category	230
8.4.2	Percentages Analysis of Examiners' Comments on Performance per category	232
8.5.1	Performance List A Comments: Kevin	234
8.5.2	Performance List A Comments: Stan	236
8.5.3	Performance List A Comments: Wally	238
8.5.4	Performance List A Comments: Silas	240
8.5.5	Performance List A Comments: Hugh	242
8.5.6	Performance List A Comments: Vera	244
8.5.7	Performance List A Comments: Gail	246
8.5.8	Performance List A Comments: Lois	248
8.6.1	Frequency of Examiners' Comments on Performance List B per Category	250
8.6.2	Percentages of Examiners' Comments on Performance List B: per Category	252
8.7.1	Performance List B Comments: Kevin	254
8.7.2	Performance List B Comments: Stan	256
8.7.3	Performance List B Comments: Wally	258
8.7.4	Performance List B Comments: Silas	260
8.7.5	Performance List B Comments: Hugh	262
8.7.6	Performance List B Comments: Vera	264
8.7.7	Performance List B Comments: Gail	266
8.7.8	Performance List B Comments: Lois	268
8.6.1	Frequency of Examiners' Comments on Performance List C per Category	270
8.6.2	Percentages of Examiners' Comments on Performance List C per Category	272

8.9.1	Performance List C Comments: Kevin	274
8.9.2	Performance List C Comments: Stan	276
8.9.3	Performance List C Comments: Wally	278
8.9.4	Performance List C Comments: Silas	280
8.9.5	Performance List C Comments: Hugh	282
8.9.6	Performance List C Comments: Vera	284
8.9.7	Performance List C Comments: Gail	286
8.9.8	Performance List C Comments: Lois	288
8.10.1	Nature and Number of Repeated Comments per Examiner across Performance Lists A, B and C	290-93
8.10.2	Classification of Repeated Comments per Examiner: Frequencies and Percentages	295
9.2.1	Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Kevin	302
9.3.1	Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Stan	305
9.4.1	Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Wally	307
9.5.1	Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Silas	309
9.6.1	Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Hugh	311
9.7.1	Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Vera	313
9.8.1	Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Gail	315
9.9.1	Across Performance Lists Comparisons: Lois	317
9.10.1	Across Examiner Comparisons: Performance List A	319-20
9.11.1	Across Examiner Comparisons: Performance List B	322-23
9.12.1	Across Examiner Comparisons: Performance List C	325-26
9.13.1	Mean Number of Comments per Examiner: Across all Performance Lists Reports	328
9.13.2	Number of Comments per Category across Performance Lists A, B and C: All Examiners	329

9.13.3	Use of Categories by all Examiners: Performance Lists A, B, C	330
9.14.1	Number and Percentages of Examiners' Repeated Comments across all Examination Sections	333
10.1.1	Qualifications and Experience of Examiners	337
10.1.2	An Overview of Studios, Teachers and Candidates	339
10.1.3	The Grading System	340
10.2.1	Sampled Examination Reports per Examiner and Examination Level (1995-2001)	341
10.2.2	Examination Marks by Examination Level	343
10.3.1	Kevin's Marks	344
10.3.2	Kevin's Extended Marking Profile	347-8
10.4.1	Stan's Marks	350
10.4.2	Stan's Extended Marking Profile	352-3
10.5.1	Wally's Marks	355
10.5.2	Wally's Extended Marking Profile	357-8
10.6.1	Silas's Marks	360
10.6.2	Silas's Extended Marking Profile	362-3
10.7.1	Hugh's Marks	365
10.7.2	Hugh's Extended Marking Profile	367-8
10.8.1	Vera's Marks	370
10.8.2	Vera's Extended Marking Profile	372-3
10.9.1	Gail's Marks	375
10.9.2	Gail's Extended Marking Profile	377-8
10.10.1	Lois's Marks	380
10.10.2	Lois's Extended Marking Profile	382-3
10.10.3	Mean Marks Awarded by Gender of Candidate and Teacher	384

10.11.1 Analysis of Marking in Specific Sectors 386

10.12.1 Grade Level Marking as a Function of Examiner Experience 388

10.13.1 Correlations between Number of Idea Units in Reports and Marks Awarded per Examiner 390

11.2.1 Idea Unit Production: Gender Analysis by Examination Section 397

11.3.1 Analysis of Male and Female Examiners' Use of Categories in the Technical Section 399

11.4.1 Gender Comparisons: Performance List A 402

11.4.2 Gender Comparisons: Performance List B 403

11.4.3 Gender Comparisons: Performance List C 404

11.4.4 Gender Comparisons: 8 No. Comments per Category across Performance Lists A, B and C 406

11.4.5 Gender Comparisons: Category use across Performance Lists A, B and C 409

11.5.1 Repeated Comments in the Technical Section, Performance Lists A, B and C and Overall Summation: Gender Analysis 412

11.6.1 Marks Awarded by Male and Female Examiners 413

11.6.2 Gender Comparisons: Extended Marking Profiles 416

12.1.1 Percentage Comparison of Category use across Examination: Boards: Technical Section 420

12.1.2 Percentage Comparison of Category use across Examination Boards: Performance Lists 425

12.2.1 Overview of the Aims of the Study 427

12.3.1 Attributes Desirable in Examiners: Paediatric and Music 434

12.3.2 A Possible Model for Examiner Selection (after Khera *et al*, 2005:48) 436

13 Overview of Appendices 468

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure		Page
3.3.1	Student Participation Rates in **AMEB** Public Music Examinations	74
3.3.2	Student Participation Rates in **AGMS** Public Music Examinations	80
3.3.3	Malaysia and Singapore Student Examinations: Years 2000-2005	81
4.2.1	Examiner and Solo Performer Related Factors Impacting on Performance Assessment	96
4.3.1	Grades in Oral Component of MRCGP Examination (Global)	122
5.10.1	Teaching Experience in Years: 50 Teachers	144
10.3.1	Kevin's Mean Marks across the Grade Levels	345
10.4.1	Stan's Mean Marks across the Grade Levels	351
10.5.1	Wally's Mean Marks across the Grade Levels	356
10.6.1	Silas's Mean Marks across the Grade Levels	361
10.7.1	Hugh's Mean Marks across the Grade Levels	366
10.8.1	Vera's Mean Marks across the Grade Levels	370
10.9.1	Gail's Mean Marks across the Grade Levels	376
10.10.1	Lois's Mean Marks across the Grade Levels	381
12.6.1	PMES: The *Status Quo*	443
12.6.2	Coalescing Music Education: Towards an Inclusive Model	448

LIST OF PLATES

Plate		Page
1.1.1	Vignettes of Divergent Societies and Diverse Instruments.	3
4.3.1	Cartoon: Variation among Examiners	101

GLOSSARY

AAGM	Associate Diploma Australian Guild of Music
ABRSM	Associated Board of the Royal Schools of Music
ABS	Australian Bureau of Statistics
Adv.Dip	Advanced Diploma: Music
AES	Army Education Service
AFL	Australian Football League
AGM:ED	Australian Guild of Music Education Inc.
AGMS	Australian Guild of Music and Speech Inc.
ALCM	Associate Diploma London College Music
AMEB	Australian Music Examinations Board
A Mus A	Associate Diploma Music Australia (AMEB)
AMTA	Associate Music Teachers Association
ANZCA	Australian New Zealand Cultural Arts
APU	Category Framework (1983)
ARC	Australian Research Council
ARCM	Associate Diploma Royal College of Music
ATCL	Associate Diploma Trinity College London
AYMF	Associate Diploma Yamaha Music Foundation
BAMER	Bibliography of Australian Music Education Research
BERA	Music Education Review Group (UK 2004)
D.Teach.	Diploma of Teaching
D.Th.	Diploma of Theory
ESL	English as a Second Language
Ex Dip.	Examiners Diploma

FAGM	Fellowship Diploma Australian Guild of Music Education Inc.
Grad.Dip.	Graduate Diploma
GUILD	Australian Guild of Music Education Inc. (Conservatorium)
IMT	Independent Music Teacher
IPR	Interpersonal Process Recall
ISM	Incorporated Society of Musicians (UK)
IT	Information Technology
LAGM	Licentiate Diploma Australian Guild of Music Education Inc.
LCM.	London College of Music
L Mus A	Licentiate Diploma. Music Australia (AMEB)
LRAM	Licentiate Diploma Royal Academy London
LTCL	Licentiate Diploma Trinity College London
MRCGP	Membership of the Royal College of General Practitioners
MTASA	Music Teachers Association of South Australia
MTNA	Music Teachers National Association (USA)
NACTMUS	National Council of Tertiary Music Schools
NAEP	National Assessment of Educational Progress (USA)
NBPTS	National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (USA)
NCTE	National Council of Teachers of English (USA)
NCTA	National Commission on Teaching and America's Future
NCTM	Nationally Certified Teacher of Music (UK)
PME	Public Music Examinations
PMES	Public Music Examination System
PMT	Private Music Teacher
QCA	National Qualifications and Curriculum Authority (UK)

QMTA	Queensland Music Teachers Association	
r	Pearson Product Moment Correlation	
RCM	Royal Conservatory of Music Examinations Canada	
RSME	Research Studies in Music Education (1993)	
SAA	Society of Australian Arts	
TCL	Trinity College London	Now Trinity-Guildhall: 2006
TCM	Trinity College of Music	
T.Mus.A	Teachers Music Diploma Australia (AMEB)	
T.Cert.	Teaching Certificate	
VCM	Victoria College of Music (UK)	
VMTA	Victorian Music Teachers Association	

Education in music is most sovereign, because more than anything else rhythm and harmony find their way to the inmost soul and take strongest hold upon it, bringing with them and imparting grace, if one is rightly trained. (Plato, The Republic, 428–347BC)